



**Staff development & continuing
professional education:
Policy and practice in academic libraries
within the M25 (CPD25), NoWAL, SALCTG
Consortia and Oxford University**

A report by CPD25

June 2004



Contents

	Page
Executive summary	3
1. Introduction: the context	5
2. Objectives of the survey	5
3. Methodology	5
4. The analysis of results	
4.1 Respondents	6
4.2 Policy	7
4.3 The way in which staff development activity is organised	8
4.4 Characteristics of staff development programmes	10
4.5 Levels of staff development activity	12
4.6 Factors influencing staff development	13
4.7 Recognition and incentives	15
4.8 National accreditation schemes	17
4.9 Evaluation	18
5. Conclusion	20
Appendices	
1. Survey form	22
2. List of participating library and information services	26
3. List of tables	28



Executive summary

The aim of this survey is to assess the current state of staff development policy and practice in the academic library consortia training support organisations of M25 (CPD25), NoWAL, SALCTG and Oxford University Library Services. Seventy four individual library and information services replied giving a response rate of 77%. This survey was based on a questionnaire used to conduct a survey of staff development policy and practice in Australian libraries in 2001 (Smith 2002). A second phase of this study will examine comparisons between Australian and British survey results.

A summary of the key findings is given below:

- 50% of services had a formal staff development policy, particularly among larger institutions
- Development programmes were mainly provided on a planned basis with overall coordination by a designated member of staff
- Just under half of the services operated a Staff Development Committee
- In those services providing figures on staff development funding the portion of the staffing budget allocated to development fell in a range between 0.2 to 2.0%
- Services made extensive use of external trainers to supplement training programmes
- Standard activities such as courses, conferences, meetings, visits were common across all services. However, support for publication and research projects as development activities was less common as were job exchanges within and between services
- Around 75% of services cited an increase in development activity over the last 5 years
- Issues which had an impact on development activity included IT, staff structural changes, teaching and learning developments, legal compliance and external accreditation such as Investors in People
- VLEs are beginning to make an impact on the delivery of staff development activities
- Support for staff in terms of funding and time off is almost universal
- Documenting staff development activities is largely achieved by records in personal files



- Almost one third of services had achieved Investors in People accreditation, either as a department or within the whole organisation
- Almost two thirds of services provided a Route A CILIP Chartership training programme
- Evaluation of development activities is usually undertaken by completion of a form at or shortly after the event and by periodic reviews of the overall training programme

In summary staff development is largely undertaken through a managed and structured approach and is a significant theme in library strategic planning.

Jean Yeoh. Chair CPD25

Val Straw. Personal Effectiveness & Management Task Group Member

Caroline Holebrook. Administrator CPD25

Smith, I (2202) Staff development and continuing professional education policy and practice in Australian academic and research libraries.

IFLA satellite meeting, Aberdeen.

<http://www.lib.latrobe.edu.au/staff/jf-staffdev.html> Accessed 28 May 2004



Introduction: the context

Library and information services are operating in a complex and challenging environment. Our clients have increasing expectations while funding levels are static or reducing in real terms. Scholarly communication has been transformed and new technologies continue to come on stream at a rapid pace. Many services have undergone substantial restructuring processes in order to meet these new demands.

Critical to the success of information services are skilled and knowledgeable staff who can respond flexibly and creatively to change. A clear understanding of the requirements of efficient resource management is fundamental and competent management skills are increasingly essential.

In times of volatility and rapid change, providing support for staff development to meet the needs of clients must be a major priority. A search on the LISA database suggested that there have been no recent comprehensive surveys of training and development activity in academic libraries in the United Kingdom. Academic and other library training consortia are well established, but to place their programmes in context they need to develop an understanding of the policy and practice of their member institutions.

2.Objectives of the survey

The aim of the survey was to provide an overview of the current state of staff development policy and practice in academic libraries and to ascertain how staff development is managed and organised. This survey is part of a two-stage investigation. This report contains the results of the first phase and looks at a cross section of academic library services in order to provide an up to date picture of current practice and provision. The survey design was undertaken in partnership with Ian Smith (2002), the originator of an Australian questionnaire. Some adaptations were made for the United Kingdom and Irish context. The second phase of the investigation will benchmark the Australian and United Kingdom and Irish results in collaboration with the Australian author.



3. Methodology

A survey questionnaire was posted on the CPD25 website in February 2004 and 96 libraries, belonging to the M25/CPD25 (56), NoWAL (15) and SALCTG (24) groups of libraries, and the Oxford University Library Services, were invited by email to respond. Tabulation and analysis of the survey results was undertaken using MS Access, MS Excel and SPSS software. The survey was conducted in consultation with the consortia and Oxford and aimed to provide a representative sample of academic library and information services.

The survey questionnaire was based on an Australian survey, developed by Ian Smith from La Trobe University Melbourne (2002), and conducted in Australia in 2001. Some adjustments were made to the original questions to ensure relevance to the British context but the survey instrument is largely unchanged in order to benchmark results against the Australian data.

4. The Analysis of results

4.1 Respondents

A total of 74 library and information services replied to the survey providing a response rate of 77%. The breakdown of respondents by consortia is as follows: 42 from CPD25, 17 from SALCTG, 14 from NoWAL and a single response from Oxford University. A full list of respondents is provided in Appendix I.

Where individual totals in the following tables are less than 100% the balance is made up of nil responses and where totals are greater than 100% some responses were made in more than one category. For ease of reading nil responses have not been included in the tables in this report, but were identified in the Access and SPSS analyses. Survey returns were largely submitted by a senior manager with responsibility for staff development or the head of service (Table A). Duplicate returns were eliminated from the analysis

Percentages and numbers have been provided in most of the following tables. Individual data is available for Oxford, but for the purposes of this report the Oxford responses are only included in the overall total column in each table. It should be noted that the consortia vary in size, with a considerably higher number of libraries



within the CPD25 grouping. Therefore straight percentage comparisons may not be reliable indicators of differences although they may be useful in identifying trends.

	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
The Director or equivalent of the library	12 (29%)	2 (14%)	4 (24%)	18 (24%)
A senior manager whose responsibilities include staff development in the library as a whole	17 (40%)	10 (71%)	8 (47%)	36 (49%)
A middle manager whose primary responsibility is for staff development in the library as a whole	3 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (5%)
A middle manager whose responsibilities include staff development in the library as a whole	9 (21%)	2 (14%)	4 (24%)	15 (20%)
Other	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)

A wide range of services responded. Services varied in size from under 20 FTE staff to over 200 FTE staff. Table B shows the range of operational and managerial arrangements among respondents. The survey did not aim to investigate the impact of merged structures on staff development but they may have influenced answers to some of the survey questions.

	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
Merged library and computing service	5 (12%)	2 (14%)	2 (12%)	9 (12%)
Computing and library services managerially but not operationally merged	16 (38%)	1 (7%)	4 (28%)	21 (28%)
Separate computing and library services	15 (36%)	8 (57%)	9 (53%)	33 (45%)
Other structure	6 (14%)	3 (21%)	2 (12%)	11 (15%)

4.2 Policy

More than half of all respondents reported having a formally stated policy on staff development. Not surprisingly larger services were more likely to have a formal policy (Tables C and D)



Table C Services with formally documented staff development policies				
	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
Yes	25 (60%)	6 (43%)	9 (53%)	40 (54%)
No	17 (40%)	8 (57%)	8 (47%)	34 (46%)

Table D Staff development policies and staffing levels		
Number of staff	Yes	No
1 –20	1	15
21 – 80	18	12
81- 200+	20	6

4.3 The way in which staff development activity is organised

Questions in this section of the survey looked at levels of staff development planning, links to overall strategic planning, coordinating responsibilities and the role of staff development committees.

Table E Strategies for organising staff development activities				
	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
The library has a planned staff development programme	27 (64%)	9 (64%)	9 (53%)	46 (62%)
The library has an informal approach to staff development	17 (40%)	4 (29%)	8 (47%)	29 (39%)
The library regards staff development as primarily the responsibility of individual staff members	2 (5%)	2 (14%)	2 (12%)	6 (8%)

Some common themes emerged (Table E):

- Planned staff development strategies either at service or institutional level.
- Planned training programmes
- Use of appraisal and annual review processes to inform training plans
- Very few services felt that training was purely an individual responsibility

Differing planning approaches included:

“We don’t have a written programme but we do have agreed priorities and practices.”

“We have a career review system where staff development priorities are set.”



“The plan and the actions arising from it are reviewed in the department’s annual quality report.”

	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
Staff development is the responsibility of a library staff development committee	6 (14%)	2 (14%)	3 (18%)	11 (15%)
Overall co-ordination of staff development is the responsibility of a designated library staff member	22 (52%)	7 (50%)	7 (41%)	37 (50%)
Responsibility for staff development is shared between local campus managers/section heads and a staff member with designated authority for staff development	17 (40%)	4 (29%)	3 (18%)	24 (32%)
There is no overall co-ordination of staff development in the library; staff development is the responsibility of managers in each area of the library	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	4 (24%)	6 (8%)
Other	1 (2%)	1 (7%)	1 (6%)	3 (4%)

Staff development is coordinated by a designated staff member in around half of the services surveyed, with almost a quarter of services deploying local campus managers or sections heads combined with a designated individual (Table F).

	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
Yes	19 (45%)	5 (36%)	5 (29%)	30 (41%)
No	23 (55%)	9 (64%)	12 (71%)	44 (59%)

Overall, 41% had staff development committees (Table G), ranging between 45% in CPD25 and 29% in SALCTG. A number of comments were made about the role of staff development committees:

“The Library Staff Development Committee has a major role to play in policy and planning.”

“There is an overall coordinator who is supported by a staff development advisory group.”

One service that did not have a staff development committee noted:

“Staff development needs are identified by library managers and coordinated by senior staff meetings.”



Reporting lines for those who did have a committee were split approximately 50:50 between the head of service and the library senior management team. Around two third of committees had defined terms of reference.

A question on funding was designed to elicit the percentage of staffing budget allocated to staff development as a means of measuring the priority given to staff support. Many respondents did not reply to this question, but of those which did, percentages fell in a range between 0.2% and 2.0% (Table H). However it is not clear whether all percentages were derived from the staff budget only or the overall budget.

Number of Library services	% of (pay) budget
1	0.2%
1	0.275%
2	0.45%
3	0.5%
1	0.8%
5	1.0%
1	1.1%
1	1.2%
1	1.27%
4	1.5%
1	1.7%
4	2.0%
Total 25	

4.4 Characteristics of staff development programmes

This section of the survey examined modes of delivery and the range of development activities undertaken.

	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
On the job	42 (100%)	14 (100%)	17 (100%)	74 (100%)
In-house with internal library trainers	37 (88%)	13 (93%)	16 (94%)	67 (91%)
In-house with external trainers	36 (86%)	12 (86%)	14 (82%)	63 (85%)
Externally	42 (100%)	14 (100%)	17 (100%)	74 (100%)
Institutional staff development office	35 (83%)	11 (79%)	14 (82%)	61 (82%)
In other ways	4 (10%)	6 (43%)	4 (24%)	14 (19%)



On the job training, in-house events with both internal and external trainers and external training activities were all widely used modes of delivery. Similarly, over 80% reported a high usage of institutional staff development programmes/trainers (Table I). Comments on strategies for making time available for development activities included:

“Closed an hour every week in the summer vacation [and a] statement that each member of staff is entitled to a training hour every week for self-training.”

“Staff development mornings three times a year for all staff provided by the library and other college staff.”

“Weekly training hour for all staff.”

“Away days.”

“University has two training days where we close for training.”

	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
Appraisals	34 (81%)	10 (71%)	13 (76%)	58 (78%)
Personal development plans/Portfolios	19 (45%)	8 (57%)	8 (47%)	35 (47%)
Orientation/induction programmes	42 (100%)	14 (100%)	16 (94%)	73 (99%)
Attendance at conferences	40 (95%)	14 (100%)	17 (100%)	72 (97%)
External study courses (Degree, Diploma, etc.)	28 (67%)	13 (93%)	14 (82%)	56 (76%)
Institutional short courses	31 (74%)	13 (93%)	13 (76%)	58 (78%)
External short courses	35 (83%)	14 (100%)	15 (88%)	65 (88%)
Seminars/workshops	41 (98%)	14 (100%)	16 (94%)	72 (97%)
In-service training programmes	29 (69%)	11 (79%)	14 (82%)	54 (73%)
Job exchanges within the library	8 (19%)	4 (29%)	6 (35%)	19 (26%)
Staff exchanges with other organisations	4 (10%)	5 (36%)	9 (53%)	18 (24%)
Visits to other libraries	40 (95%)	14 (100%)	17 (100%)	72 (97%)
Support for research projects and/or activities	15 (36%)	6 (43%)	9 (53%)	30 (41%)
Support for publication	9 (21%)	2 (14%)	6 (35%)	17 (23%)
Guest speakers	27 (64%)	10 (71%)	10 (59%)	48 (65%)
Other	3 (7%)	14 (100%)	1 (6%)	19 (26%)

There is considerable uniformity of responses between the three groups about the type and range of activities undertaken, with conferences, external short courses and seminars, visits and workshops attracting very high figures across the board (Table J). Less common development activities included job exchanges within services, support for research projects and support for publication. Notably, 53% of SALCTG



services reported job exchanges between institutions. Comments on job shadowing and exchanges included:

“We hope to look at exchanges with other organisations in the future.”

“Exchanges of experience seminars with staff in other libraries involved with similar roles.”

“We are about to begin staff exchanges with other libraries.”

4.5 Levels of staff development activity

Respondents were asked to assess whether levels of development activity had changed over the last five years and identify factors leading to any change.

Table K Levels of staff development activity over the past five years				
	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
Increased	33(79%)	8 (57%)	13 (76%)	55 (74%)
Decreased	1 (2%)	1 (7%)	1 (6%)	3 (4%)
About the same	8 (19%)	4 (29%)	3 (18%)	15 (20%)

Staff development activity has increased over the last five years for most services (Table K). A number of factors were cited to account for the increase:

“We recently had a change of leadership which has strengthened the role of staff development.”

“..more opportunity for training and development in line with the strategic plan.”

“...it [is] one of the strands in the strategic plan.”

“The library became an Investor in People...”

“...staff development activity has become very focussed, therefore the amount may have increased but the diversity has decreased.”

Very few services noted a decrease in development activities. Low staff turnover was cited by some services for a static or decreased level of activity. In some cases intense activity surrounding restructuring processes made it difficult to gauge the state of affairs.

“Most of the staff are well established with a low turnover and the incentive for people to take up training opportunities has decreased.”

“...it is difficult to ascertain...after a major restructure and merger.”



4.6 Factors influencing staff development

Respondents were specifically asked about the influence of technology on training activity (Table L), the significance of staff development in strategic plans (Table M) and to comment on any other significant external factors.

	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
Impact on focus and content	32 (76%)	10 (71%)	11 (65%)	53 (72%)
Greater need for training in IT applications	38 (90%)	14 (100%)	17 (100%)	70 (95%)
Increased uses of IT in development programmes e.g. VLEs	12 (29%)	7 (50%)	5 (29%)	24 (32%)
Other	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	1 (6%)	3 (4%)

Information technology is an integral component of service delivery with a need for an understanding of the technologies driving service development and for increased levels of technical skills. Between 60 - 75% of information services reported that IT had made an impact on focus and content of staff training programmes.

“ECDL is increasingly used but not necessary for all staff. Increased need just to keep staff up to date with new developments, applications and resources.”

Providing equal access to training opportunities for part time staff has always been challenging but VLEs are beginning to make an impact in this area. Table L also shows a small but increased use of VLEs in staff development programmes:

“E.resources and IT development will [be] a core part of our new training and development programme. Blackboard is used and promoted within the department.”

“We have recently started to make staff development material available on Blackboard because of the advantages of availability especially for part time staff...but further work is required to make this an effective model of delivery.”

	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total replies
Service has strategic plan	31 (74%)	11(79%)	12 (71%)	55 (74%)
Library does not have strategic plan	10 (24%)	3 (21%)	4 (24%)	17(23%)
Staff development has high priority in plan	22 (52%)	7 (50%)	5 (29%)	35 (47%)
Staff development has medium priority in plan	9 (21%)	3 (21%)	8 (47%)	20 (27%)
Staff development has low priority in plan	1 (2%)	1 (7%)	3 (18%)	5 (7%)



Respondents were asked if their library and information service had a strategic plan and what level of priority was given to staff development within their plans. More than 70% of services had a formal strategic plan and around 50% gave staff development a high or medium priority in those plans (Table N).

Table N Services identifying other organisational and external factors influencing staff development				
	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total replies
Yes	24 (57%)	9 (64%)	11 (65%)	45 (61%)
No	8 (19%)	2 (14%)	4 (24%)	14 (19%)

Comments concerning external influences largely focussed on teaching and learning, legal compliance, change management and accreditation (Table N). Change management was the area that attracted most comments reflecting a significant number of institutions undergoing large scale restructuring or reconfiguration of service delivery. A few comments referred to the training requirements relating to the introduction of new systems but these were in the minority overall. Typical comments on organisational and external influences included:

Change Management

“Convergence of the Library and Computing Department into a single directorate.”

“Major staff restructuring.”

“Campus moves resulting in relocation of ...staff highlighting need for managing change.”

“Growing department has led to more team building activities.”

“Staff restructuring and matrix management, with staff sometimes split between two teams/sections, means that staff development programme has become more complex.”

“Internal restructuring has necessitated extensive training for all staff in business planning and personal development planning over the last year.”

Teaching and learning

“Development of e.learning and the need for awareness and skills training.”

*“Increasing involvement with delivery of academic programmes [and] professional staff needing to acquire teaching skills, ILT membership.”
[Institute for Learning & Teaching now Higher Education Academy]*

“Within the institution we have responded to e.learning initiatives by providing training on Blackboard.”



“Greater emphasis on information skills training due to VLEs.”

Legal compliance

“Institutional priorities (e.g. distance delivery) and legal compliance (e.g. Special Educational Needs and Disability Act) have both generated additional training requirements.”

“Diversity and employment legislation have impacted [on] management training requirements.”

“FOI [Freedom of Information] and DDA [Disability Discrimination Act] have had a significant impact...”

Accreditation

“...going for and gaining Investors in People.”

“Working towards and maintaining our Charter Mark...”

The impact of academic library training consortia provision of cost effective training was also noted:

“Availability of high quality training form SALCTG on a non-commercial basis is a great help.”

“CPD25 has increased the quality and quantity of affordable training opportunities.”

“Membership of NoWAL has increased opportunities for affordable courses.”

4.7 Recognition and incentives

These questions looked at support for staff in terms of funding and time off to attend events and at the role of formal accreditation of training activities.

	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
Paid time to attend staff development activities	39 (93%)	14 (100%)	15 (88%)	69 (93%)
Travel and subsistence allowances	39 (93%)	14 (100%)	16 (94%)	70 (95%)
Payment of course fees	40 (95%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	41 (55%)
Other	1 (2%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	3 (4%)

The figures in Table O indicate that there is a consistent level of support across the groups for supporting staff in financial terms. Staff can expect to be paid for the time they spend at training and development events. Staff can also expect their travel costs to be met, and in CPD25 course fees for professional qualifications are also

often absorbed by the employer, although staff may need to meet specific criteria.

Comments on funding support included

“Funding for higher degrees in Library & Information Studies”.

“Opportunity for staff to widen experience enabling them to apply for possible re-grading”.

“Allowing staff to move from f/t to p/t to undertake qualifications”.

	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
Formal accreditation/certification	5 (12%)	4 (29%)	3 (18%)	13 (18%)
In-house certification	7 (17%)	3 (21%)	17 (100%)	28 (38%)
Documented on personal file	29 (69%)	6 (43%)	11 (65%)	47 (64%)
None	9 (21%)	4 (29%)	4 (24%)	17 (23%)
Other	3 (7%)	2 (14%)	1 (6%)	7 (9%)

Development activities were frequently recorded in staff files (64% overall). In-house accreditation was used by a relatively small number of institutions with the exception of SALCTG. Formal accreditation or certification was also relatively uncommon. Not surprisingly however in this context respondents mentioned NoWAL’s accredited CLIP (Certificate in Library & information Practice) programme:

“Formal accreditation for the NoWAL CLIP programme.”

Another service noted that it was investigating accreditation:

“We are currently looking at formal accreditation e.g. SEDA (Staff and Educational Development Association), for example, to see if this will work for the department”.

Other methods of recording activity included:

“An annual record of all attendance at staff training & development events is posted on the Library’s Intranet - other than that, we’ve not been good at formally recognising participation. That’s something we perhaps need to work on”.

“Staff often report back on training courses by means of lunchtime briefings or articles in the Library Bulletin”.

“Staff are expected to keep training files, in which they record their own staff development activities”.

An alternative approach was identified as:

“a formal scheme to encourage development and internal promotion through success in achieving identified competencies”.

4.8 National accreditation schemes

The survey asked about the Investors in People scheme and CILIP chartership.

Table Q				
Investors in People (IiP) accreditation				
	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
Yes	12 (29%)	7 (50%)	4 (24%)	23 (31%)
No	30 (71%)	7 (50%)	13 (76%)	51 (69%)
Investors in People accreditation: within information service or institution as a whole				
Within library	5 (42%)	2 (14%)	1 (6%)	8 (11%)
Whole institution	7 (58%)	5 (36%)	3 (18%)	15 (20%)

50% of respondents from the NoWAL consortium had achieved IiP accreditation followed by CPD25 (29%) and SALCTG (24%). A greater number of services had achieved accreditation through an institution wide approach rather than as individual departments (Table Q).

Table R				
Plans to seek Investors in People accreditation				
	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
Planning to apply	8 (27%)	0 (0%)	3 (18%)	11 (15%)
Currently undergoing the process	3 (10%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	4 (5%)
Not planning to apply	17 (57%)	6 (43%)	10 (59%)	34 (46%)

Of those services that did not have IiP accreditation eleven were either planning to apply or currently undergoing the process. Seventeen institutions had no current plans to apply for accreditation (Table R).

Table S				
Services with CILIP Route A Chartership programmes				
	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
Yes	28 (67%)	8 (57%)	8 (47%)	45 (61%)
No	14 (33%)	6 (43%)	9 (53%)	29 (39%)

61% of institutions provided a route A CILIP training programme although it was not currently active in all of them. The opportunity to access professional qualifications seemed well established across the institutions (Table S). A number of institutions did not have a standard Route A programme but did provide individual programmes if required:



“We do an individual Route A programme as and when needed. We do not always have staff in this position.”

“We use individual CILIP training programmes (3 approved recently) as these are matched to the individual and more flexible than a standard programme.”

4.9 Evaluation

This section asked about the types of mechanisms used to evaluate development activities.

Table T Mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of staff development activities				
	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
Yes	33 (79%)	10 (71%)	10 (59%)	54 (73%)
No	9 (21%)	4 (29%)	6 (35%)	19 (26%)

Table U Types of staff development evaluation mechanisms				
	CPD25	NoWAL	SALCTG	Total
Completion of a pre-event objective setting form	10 (24%)	7 (50%)	3 (19%)	21 (28%)
Completion, by participants, of evaluation forms at the end of a training/development activity	23 (55%)	8 (57%)	10 (63%)	42 (57%)
Completion by participants of evaluation forms at some time after the completion of a training/development activity	13 (31%)	2 (14%)	3 (19%)	18 (24%)
Review of evaluation forms by the person/s with primary responsibility for staff development	22 (52%)	4 (29%)	7 (44%)	34 (46%)
Review of evaluation forms by the Staff Development Committee	6 (14%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	7 (9%)
A periodic review of the staff development policy	21 (50%)	4 (29%)	6 (38%)	32 (43%)
A periodic review of the overall staff development programme	22 (52%)	6 (43%)	8 (50%)	37 (50%)
Other	4 (10%)	0(0%)	2 (13%)	20 (27%)

Almost 75% of services had some form of formal evaluation process in place (Tables T and U). The most common methods of evaluation were the completion of evaluation forms at or after the event and review of evaluation forms by the individual with responsibility for staff development. Regular evaluation of the training



programme as a whole was undertaken by half of the services. The difficulties around obtaining systematic evaluation of training and development activities is highlighted in the following comment:

“Timing and type of evaluation varies - it's often hard to get meaningful feedback, but we try different ways/ timings.”

Much evaluation that takes place is fairly informal:

“Staff are asked to provide feedback informally. Also discussed at appraisal”.

“This is done in 1 to 1s throughout the year”.

“Informal report back (email or verbal) requested on all outside activities.”

“Staff attending seminars and conferences etc are required to write formal reports for general dissemination to other staff. Some kind of either formal or informal evaluation is usually required for other activities etc.”

Two institutions referred to pre-event evaluation:

“We are about to introduce pre-event analysis of anticipated benefit for external events, both for participants and line managers.”

“A more formal and thorough pre-evaluation form is required for external courses where a cost is involved.”

Formal links to library service objectives were mentioned by one respondent:

“As the person within the Library with overall responsibility for staff development, I will also contact a selection of staff who have undertaken staff development in order to evaluate how it has contributed to the Library's aims and the individual's personal development.”



5 Conclusion

This conclusion provides a broad overview of the state of staff development and support in academic institutions. Differing responses are influenced by the range of library and information services included in this survey, which (excluding Oxford) vary in size from under 20 to over 200 fte staff, the impact of institutional mergers and major internal restructuring.

The survey findings present a picture of staff development firmly fixed in a strategically managed and supportive organisational framework. Staff development is seen as a priority in strategic plans. Explicit commitment to staff development is demonstrated through the provision of staff development policies and planned staff training programmes. The number of services identifying increased levels of development activity over the past five years demonstrates the importance attached to staff support. Leadership and strategic planning are seen as drivers for this change.

There is clear evidence of a co-ordinated approach through a designated member of staff and through staff development committees. Further evidence of a managed approach to staff development is shown by the use of appraisals and personal development plans and portfolios. An indicator of commitment to staff training is the percentage of the staffing budget allocated to development activities. There was a low response to this question either because this information was regarded as too sensitive or because this information was not known or collected by services. A willingness to make a financial commitment to development is demonstrated through the use of purchased external trainers for in-house events, through supporting staff at external events and support for the attainment of professional library and information qualifications. Organisational commitment was also demonstrated through formal policies and statements. Some services made specific time available for development through service closure on a regular basis.

Traditional ranges of development activities are widely deployed including seminars, conferences, visits, in-service training programmes, and external study courses. Less in evidence was support for research projects and publication. Job exchanges within library services and between library services were not common, perhaps indicating the difficulty of managing these in practice.

Training programmes are strongly influenced by the impact of technology and the need for a broader range of skills in IT applications is widespread. Increasingly VLEs are being used to deliver development activities although their full potential in staff development has yet to be realised. Other significant factors influencing development programmes are staff restructuring, involvement in teaching and learning programmes and the introduction of VLEs. Legal compliance concerns were also significant, particularly Special Educational Needs and Disability and Freedom of Information.

A number of services reported the attainment of Investors in People (IIP) accreditation either through institutional approval or as a stand-alone department. IIP accreditation is an objective measure of active commitment to supporting staff and provides a positive indicator of the current health of staff development. CILIP Route A standard training programmes were commonly available. Individual programmes are more likely to be provided in small services and these are generally offered when needed.

Measuring the impact of individual development activities on service strategy and objectives is a challenging area and a range of formal and informal processes were used. There was evidence that services were beginning to investigate more objective and structured approaches to evaluation and impact of staff development activities.

References

Oldroyd, M ed. (2004) Developing academic library staff for success. London: Facet.

Smith, I (2002) Staff development and continuing professional education policy and practice in Australian academic and research libraries.

IFLA satellite meeting, Aberdeen.

<http://www.lib.latrobe.edu.au/staff/jf-staffdev.html> Accessed 28 May 2004

Consortia URLs

CPD25 www.cpd25.ac.uk

NoWAL <http://www.nowal.ac.uk/training/index.htm>

SALCTG <http://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/files/LIS-SALCTG/welcome.html>



Appendix 1: Survey form

(For the purposes of this study the term "staff development" is used to cover the broad areas of staff training, staff development and continuing professional education.)

To answer the questions please enter text or tick the appropriate box. Use the TAB function to move through the form.

1. Staff development policy	
1.1 Does your library have a formally stated policy on staff development?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 2)
1.2 If you answered YES to 1.1, would you be prepared to make a copy available to CPD25 for publication on their website?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments:	
2. Staff development in the library	
2.1 Which of these statements best describes your library?	<input type="checkbox"/> The library has a planned staff development programme <input type="checkbox"/> The library has an informal approach to staff development <input type="checkbox"/> The library regards staff development as primarily the responsibility of individual staff members
Comments:	
2.2 Which phrase best describes the approach of your library to staff development?	<input type="checkbox"/> Staff development is the responsibility of a library staff development committee <input type="checkbox"/> Overall co-ordination of staff development is the responsibility of a designated library staff member <input type="checkbox"/> Responsibility for staff development is shared between local campus managers/section heads and a staff member with designated authority for staff development <input type="checkbox"/> There is no overall co-ordination of staff development in the library; staff development is the responsibility of managers in each area of the library <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify):
2.3 Does your library have a Staff Development Committee?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (continue to question 2.4) <input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 3)
2.4 To whom does that Committee report?	
2.5 Does the Committee have defined Terms of Reference?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (go → to question 2.6) <input type="checkbox"/> No (continue to question 2.7)
2.6 Would you be prepared to make a copy of your Terms of Reference available to CPD25 for publication on their website?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2.7 What percentage of the staffing budget is allocated to staff development?	%
Comments:	



3. The characteristics of your staff development programme	
3.1 How are staff development activities conducted in your library? (tick as many as apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> On the job <input type="checkbox"/> In-house with internal library trainers <input type="checkbox"/> In-house with external trainers <input type="checkbox"/> Externally <input type="checkbox"/> Institutional staff development office <input type="checkbox"/> In other ways (please specify):
Comments:	
3.2 Does your library's staff development programme include... (tick as many as apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> Appraisals <input type="checkbox"/> Personal development plans/Portfolios <input type="checkbox"/> Orientation/induction programmes <input type="checkbox"/> Attendance at conferences <input type="checkbox"/> External study courses (Degree, Diploma, etc) <input type="checkbox"/> Institutional short courses <input type="checkbox"/> External short courses <input type="checkbox"/> Seminars/workshops <input type="checkbox"/> In-service training programmes <input type="checkbox"/> Job exchanges within the library <input type="checkbox"/> Staff exchanges with other organisations <input type="checkbox"/> Visits to other libraries <input type="checkbox"/> Support for research projects and/or activities <input type="checkbox"/> Support for publication <input type="checkbox"/> Guest speakers <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify):
Comments:	
3.3 Thinking about the staff development programme in your library over the past five years, has the amount of staff development activity...?	<input type="checkbox"/> Increased <input type="checkbox"/> Decreased <input type="checkbox"/> Stayed the same
Comments:	
4. Factors Influencing Staff Development	
4.1 How has the increased use of IT affected your staff development programme? (tick as many as apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> Increased information technology applications have had an impact on the focus and content of our staff development programme <input type="checkbox"/> Increased information technology applications have led to a greater need to train staff in IT applications <input type="checkbox"/> We make increased use of information technology in staff development programmes, for example VLE's (e.g. WebCT, Blackboard) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify):
Comments:	
4.2 Does your library have a formal Strategic Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (continue to question 4.4) <input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 4.5)
4.3 What level of priority is staff development allocated in the Strategic Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/> A high priority <input type="checkbox"/> A medium priority <input type="checkbox"/> A low priority



Comments:	
4.4 Have any other organisational or external factors had a significant influence on your staff development programme?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 5) If yes, please briefly outline what these factors are and how they have impacted:
5. Recognition and Incentives	
5.1 Does your library have in place any of these incentives to encourage staff members to undertake staff development activities? (tick as many as apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> Paid time to attend staff development activities <input type="checkbox"/> Travel and subsistence allowances <input type="checkbox"/> Payment of course fees <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): <input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 5.2)
Comments:	
5.2 Does your library have in place any of these forms of recognition for staff members who have participated in staff development activities? (tick as many as apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> Formal accreditation/certification following completion of staff development courses <input type="checkbox"/> In-house certification of participation in staff development activities <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation of participation on staff member's personal files <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): <input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 6)
Comments:	
6. National Accreditation	
6.1 Is your library an accredited "Investors in People" institution?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (continue to question 6.3) <input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 6.2)
6.2 If you are not an accredited IIP institution which of these statements apply to your institution?	<input type="checkbox"/> Planning to apply <input type="checkbox"/> Currently undergoing the process <input type="checkbox"/> Not planning to apply
6.3 Does your library have a CILIP "Route A" Standard Training Programme?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments:	
7. Evaluation	
7.1 Do you have mechanisms in place for evaluating the effectiveness of staff development in your library?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (continue to question 7.2) <input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 8)
7.2 What do the evaluation mechanisms comprise of? (tick as many as apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> Completion of a pre-event objective setting form <input type="checkbox"/> Completion, by participants, of evaluation forms at the completion of a training/development activity <input type="checkbox"/> Completion, by participants, of evaluation forms at some time after the completion of a training/development activity <input type="checkbox"/> Review of evaluation forms by the person/s with primary responsibility for staff development <input type="checkbox"/> Review of evaluation forms by the Staff Development Committee <input type="checkbox"/> A periodic review of the staff development policy



	<input type="checkbox"/> A periodic review of the overall staff development programme <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify):
Comments:	
8. Some information about you and your organisation	
8.1 Name of your library:	
8.2 How many staff (full-time equivalent) are employed in your library?	FTE
8.3 Of these, what proportion of the total are classified as:	Professional staff (library & others) % Library assistants, clerical & technical staff %
8.4 How many sites do you have?	
8.5 Which one of the following definitions best describes your library?	<input type="checkbox"/> Merged computing service and library <input type="checkbox"/> Computing and library services are managerially merged but the services are not operationally merged <input type="checkbox"/> Separate academic computing service and library <input type="checkbox"/> Other structure
Comments:	
8.6 Your name:	
8.7 Telephone contact number:	
8.8 Email address:	
8.9 Position (title):	
8.10 In this position are you:	<input type="checkbox"/> The Director or equivalent of your library <input type="checkbox"/> A senior manager whose responsibilities include staff development in the library as a whole <input type="checkbox"/> A middle manager whose primary responsibility is for staff development in the library as a whole <input type="checkbox"/> A middle manager whose responsibilities include staff development in the library as a whole <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify):
Any further comments you would like to make?	



Appendix 2: List of participating library and information services

CPD25

1. Anglia Polytechnic University
2. Birkbeck College
3. Brunel University
4. Kent Institute of Art & Design
5. Canterbury Christ Church College
6. Courtauld Institute
7. Goldsmith's College
8. University of Greenwich
9. University of Hertfordshire
10. Imperial College
11. Institute of Commonwealth Studies
12. Institute of Education
13. University of Kent
14. King's College London
15. Kingston University
16. London Business School
17. London Institute
18. London Metropolitan University (GH)
19. London Metropolitan University (RH)
20. London School Of Economics
21. London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
22. Middlesex University
23. Open University
24. Queen Mary Westfield College
25. Reading University
26. Royal Botanic Gardens
27. Royal Academy of Music
28. Royal College of Nursing
29. Royal Holloway College
30. Royal Veterinary College
31. St George's Hospital Medical School
32. St Mary's College Twickenham
33. School of Advanced Study
34. School of Oriental and African Studies
35. School of Pharmacy
36. Surrey Institute of Art and Design
37. University of Surrey
38. University of Surrey Roehampton
39. University of Sussex
40. Thames Valley University
41. University College London
42. University of Westminster

NoWAL

1. Bolton Institute
2. University of Central Lancashire
3. University College Chester
4. Cumbria Institute of Arts



5. Edge Hill College
6. Liverpool University
7. Liverpool Hope University College
8. Liverpool John Moores University
9. University of Manchester
10. Manchester Metropolitan University
11. Royal Northern College of Music
12. University of Salford
13. St Martin's College
14. UMIST

SALCTG

1. Aberdeen University
2. National Library of Scotland
3. University of Abertay Dundee
4. University of Dundee
5. University of Durham
6. Edinburgh College of Art
7. Edinburgh University
8. Glasgow University
9. University of Glasgow Caledonian
10. Herriot Watt University
11. Napier University
12. National University of Ireland Maynooth
13. Queen Margaret University College
14. Robert Gordon University
15. Royal Scottish Academy of Music and Drama
16. Scottish Agricultural College
17. University of Strathclyde

Other

1. Oxford University



Appendix 3. List of tables

- A. The role of survey respondents in their library and information service
- B. Organisational management arrangements
- C. Services with formal documented staff development policies
- D. Staff development policies and staffing levels
- E. Strategies for organising staff development activities
- F. Approaches to coordinating staff development
- G. Services with staff development committees
- H. Funding staff development
- I. Modes of delivery of staff development programmes
- J. Type and range of staff development activities undertaken
- K. Levels of staff development activity over the past five years
- L. Impact of increased use of IT on staff development activities
- M. Services with formal strategic plans
- N. Services identifying other organisation and external factors influencing staff development
- O. Incentives to encourage participation in staff development activities
- P. Recognition or certification of development activities
- Q. Investors in People accreditation
- R. Plans to seek Investors in People accreditation
- S. Services with CILIP Route A Chartership programmes
- T. Mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of staff development activities
- U. Types of staff development evaluation mechanisms