

***Continuing professional development & workplace learning –  
examining policy and practice in Australian & U.K.  
academic and research libraries***

*A paper presented by*

*Ian Smith*

*Manager – Human Resources.  
La Trobe University Library, Australia.*

*&*

*Secretary - Continuing Professional Development & Workplace  
Learning Section: International Federation of Library  
Associations & Institutions.*

*at the*

**Continuing Professional Education Conference 2006**

***Out of bounds and borders: a Trans-Tasman collaboration***

**19 - 20 April 2006  
Auckland, New Zealand**

-----

[i.smith@latrobe.edu.au](mailto:i.smith@latrobe.edu.au)

## **Abstract**

*This paper focuses on the policy and practice of continuing professional development and workplace learning (CPD&WL) in academic and research libraries in Australia and the U.K. The findings from surveys of CPD&WL policy and practice, conducted both in Australia and the U.K. are outlined, discussed and compared, and the Australian survey results contrasted with the results of earlier similar studies. The paper concludes with a discussion of the value of comparative studies such as these and examines the role that they may play in benchmarking and setting standards for best practice in the area of CPD&WL.*

## **CPD&WL in the library and information sector**

Why is it worthwhile to examine continuing professional development & workplace learning policy and practice in the library and information sector? The last two decades have seen greatly increased emphasis on access to information and knowledge management. Changes and developments in the ways and means of organising and accessing recorded knowledge have been rapid and significant with increasingly sophisticated information systems evolving. The pace of such change continues to accelerate. Libraries and those who work in them have an important role to play in such an environment. Futurist Wendy Shultz, opening the American Library Association Second Congress on Professional Education (ALA, 2001), summarised the societal factors currently impacting on the library and information profession thus:

- an accelerating pace of change
- ubiquity of technological innovation
- rapid globalization
- impact of economic issues
- expanding educational formats and opportunities
- demographic shifts and increasing population diversity
- changing workplace structures and ethics
- altered worker demands
- changes in customer expectations and lifestyles.

In the context of such rapid transformation, and in order to be able to respond to and cope with such change, it is critical that libraries and library and information professionals maintain and upgrade their skills, knowledge, and abilities. The reality of this imperative to continue to learn and develop has been increasingly recognised by both library and information sector organisations and the individuals who work in them. This paper firstly examines the picture of CPD&WL policy and practice in one sub-part of that sector – Australian and U.K. academic and research libraries – which has emerged from three recent surveys. Secondly, the benefits of comparing and benchmarking practice over time and between different countries is discussed, and pointers are given to further work which is currently underway to extend the practical benefits of such benchmarking.

## **The Australian surveys**

Two surveys have been carried out which examine CPD&WL practice in the Australian academic and research library sector. The first was conducted in 2001 with a repeat survey, with minor modifications, in 2005. (The survey instrument is appended below.) The survey covered all members of the Council of Australian University Librarians, the Council of Australian State Libraries (which includes the National Library of Australia) and, for the first survey only, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) Library Network. The 2001 survey (Smith, 2002) was conducted against the backdrop of two previous similar studies (Trask, 1983; Gray, 1986) which are discussed further in a following section of this paper.

### ***The 2001 survey***

A survey questionnaire was sent by email to the forty-nine organisations which comprise the Australian academic and research library sector. Forty-five of those libraries responded to the survey questionnaire. The respondents encompassed the CSIRO Library Network, the National Library of Australia, the eight State and Territory libraries, and thirty-five of the thirty-nine members of the Council of Australian University Librarians (CAUL). In the majority of cases the survey response had been completed at a senior organisational level – CEOs or senior managers whose responsibilities included organisation-wide human resource development.

The majority of the libraries responding to the survey demonstrated a strong commitment to the importance of CPD&WL in the achievement of strategic organisational objectives and priorities. Close to 80% of the respondents reported that CPD&WL was allocated a high priority in their organisational strategic plans.

Survey respondents were asked if their organisation had a formal statement of CPD&WL policy. Such policy statements are important because they formalise and actively state organisational commitment to staff development, give clear guidelines to staff members on the terms and conditions of organisational support for CPD&WL and set out the obligations on the part of staff members who are recipients of such support. Given the importance of such policies, a significant number of libraries, and 91% of the larger (130 FTE staff or more) libraries in the survey, reported having such a commitment stated in some form of human resource development policy. Examination of examples of these policies revealed these clear and recurrent themes:

- alignment of CPD&WL activity with strategic organisational objectives;
- emphasis on both individual staff and organisational development;
- recognition of the importance of CPD&WL in the provision of quality service to clients;
- emphasis on evaluating the effectiveness of staff development.

A wide range of modes of CPD&WL activity was reported. There was evidence of a good balance between training in both specific knowledge and job skills, and in broader professional developmental programs and activities. In many instances the libraries surveyed reported that they had a preference for CPD&WL that can be undertaken in-house. That, in part at least, appeared to be due to a need to achieve economies and to make CPD&WL budgets go further. Undertaking in-house training, however, can have strong benefits in its own right. By involving staff members in a process of actively passing on their skills to others the trainers themselves may gain a benefit –

extending their own skills and ability through the process of training and developing others.

The survey responses also indicated a strong and growing body of CPD&WL activity overall. All but two of the libraries in the study reported that over the previous five years CPD&WL in their organisations had either increased or been maintained at a constant level. Of the two libraries reporting a decrease, one noted that this was not due to any lack of commitment to human resource development but rather due to unrelated organisational factors.

Advances in both the sophistication of information technology applications and the wide scale use of such applications have had a major impact on libraries and information services. This, in turn, leading to a significant flow-on for CPD&WL programs. Over 90% of the libraries replying to the survey reported that the increased use of information technology had led to a greater need to train staff in the use of information technology applications and 75% of respondents noted an impact on the focus and content of CPD&WL programs. Many libraries reported that their growing role in teaching literacy and knowledge management skills had resulted in a greater need to develop these specific skills in their staff. This had been necessary both in order for staff to apply these skills in their own work as information professionals as well as in order to enable taking on a prime role in training library clients in information literacy.

Many libraries reported that budget constraints had impacted significantly on their organization, and in turn on their CPD&WL programs. Budgetary pressures were reported as impacting directly – reducing the money available for CPD&WL and forcing organizations to find ways to maintain their human resource development programs while spending less on that activity. However, despite these budget pressures, the majority of libraries surveyed continued to maintain their commitment to CPD&WL and to allocate a high priority to those programs within their budgets. Many libraries reported that they were actively seeking ways in which to make those budgets go further including, for example, making increased use of internal training resources and using online training resources. Contracting budgets also impacted indirectly on CPD&WL by reducing the overall number of staff positions available with resulting flow-on restrictions in opportunities for movement between jobs within organisations. Thus the potential was greater for stagnation at both individual and organizational levels. Interestingly, while a number of respondents noted such stagnation as a potential problem – staff members sometimes lacking interest in or commitment to undertaking CPD&WL – it was also seen by some as providing the impetus for creative organisational growth through individual, group and organisation-wide development programs.

Differences between larger and smaller libraries in the study group showed up mainly in two areas. Most of the larger libraries (that is those with over 130 FTE staff) had a formally stated CPD&WL policy, and more frequently reported having both a planned CPD&WL program and a designated staff member undertaking co-ordination of that program. This result was not surprising given the differences in size of the libraries within the sector. Smaller libraries may have neither the need nor the organisational capacity to sustain a position that is either fully or partially responsible for human resource development. The lack of such a position or of a stated human resource

development policy in these smaller libraries does not, however, imply any less a commitment to staff development. Over two thirds of the smaller academic and research libraries reported planned CPD&WL programs and a wide range of developmental opportunities available to their staff.

The overall picture presented by the 2001 survey was of a strong commitment, across the Australian academic and research library sector to, investment in human resource development. As such, this picture was very different to that of the paucity of human resource development, albeit balanced by an emerging recognition of the importance of such activity, which had emerged from the similar surveys conducted some twenty years earlier (Trask, 1983; Gray, 1986).

### ***The 2005 survey***

The survey was repeated, with minor modifications and using the same methodology, in 2005. The reason for the repeat survey was twofold: to update the results from the earlier survey in order to identify any significant changes, and; to allow comparison with the results of the comparable survey of U.K. academic libraries which had been conducted in 2004. The 2005 Australian survey utilised the same survey instrument and questions with the addition of a question regarding budget allocation to CPD&WL activity in order to allow direct comparison with the U.K. survey.

The response rate in 2005 was marginally lower – an 86% response rate compared with 92% in 2001. There were also some minor variations in the respondent pool – some who had replied previously did not do so the second time and some who had not replied to the survey in 2001 did do so in 2005. Importantly almost all of the larger libraries responded to the 2005 survey.

The responses regarding strategic organisational commitment to CPD&WL, modes and level of CPD&WL activity and the organisation of activities were essentially similar to those in the 2001 survey. The significantly different elements emerging were the factors influencing CPD&WL programs. Chief amongst these, particularly in the case of the universities, was the impact of organisational change and changing patterns of working including mergers and de-mergers of library and IT services. Other major influences on the focus of CPD&WL programs included:

- the dramatic increase in electronic publishing and consequent changes in required staff skills and knowledge
- the increasing involvement of university library staff in teaching information literacy with concomitant requirements for skill development on the part of those library staff taking on these responsibilities;
- the impact of quality assurance initiatives, such as the Australian Universities Quality Agency scrutiny of universities ( <http://www.auqa.edu.au/> ) and the best practice initiatives of the Council of Australian University Librarians ( <http://www.caul.edu.au/best-practice/> )
- organisational demographics – in particular ageing workforces, and actual or impending retirements of staff (particularly senior staff) and the resultant need to undertake succession planning and development of leadership and management capability

- development of knowledge and understanding of statutory compliance requirements – in particular in the areas of occupational health and safety and equity and opportunity.

Several of the regionally isolated libraries reported a particular need to be able to grow and develop skills and capability within their existing workforce – in the words of one respondent “*we have to grow our own talent*”. This was reported as due to the difficulty of attracting staff from the large, predominantly east coast, urban population concentrations and also the tendency of many staff members working in regional areas to remain working in their organisations for a long time.

The new question posed in the second survey was that of budget allocation for CPD&WL. The allocation of a specific budget for CPD&WL is important as it demonstrates an active commitment to supporting and funding such activity. Further, the dollar value of the budget allocated – as a percentage of overall staffing budget – is also significant as this gives a direct indication of the practical support provided to CPD&WL.

Ninety percent of the respondents stated that they do have such an allocated budget – the budget quantum (expressed as a percentage of total staffing budget) ranging from 0.5% to 2.00%, the median being 0.8%. The CPD&WL budgets of the national and state libraries were generally at the higher end of that range. Within the university libraries there was no significant correlation between staff size and budget allocation for CPD&WL. However, the average CPD&WL budget allocation quoted by respondents is still below several established benchmarks. For example:

- the *Australian Training Guarantee Act*, when this Act was in force in the early 1990’s, set targets of between 1% and 1.5% of staffing budget to be spent on human resource development;
- the *American Society for Training and Development* reported in its 2004 survey results ([http://www.astd.org/astd/research/research\\_reports](http://www.astd.org/astd/research/research_reports)) an average expenditure on human resource development of 2.4% of payroll;
- *UNESCO* has as its internal benchmark – for the period 2002 to 2007 – investment of up to the equivalent of 3% of staff costs in training and development activities ([http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=12876&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=12876&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)).

### **The U.K. survey – 2004**

This survey (Yeoh *et al*, 2004) covered a cross section of academic libraries in England and Scotland, plus one Irish library. The survey, which was coordinated by the London-based *CPD25* staff development consortium, received responses from 74 libraries – ranging in size from 20 to over 200 FTE staff. The online survey instrument mirrored the earlier Australian survey with additional U.K.-specific questions and a question regarding budget allocation for CPD&WL activity.

Key elements of the U.K. survey’s findings included:

- a strong commitment to CPD&WL as part of institutional strategic organisational management;
- formal written statements of commitment to CPD&WL in just over half of organisations surveyed;
- a planned and structured approach to CPD&WL in most organisations;

- structured appraisal and review of these activities in two thirds of organisations.

Seventy five percent of the respondents to the U.K. survey reported a significant increase in the levels of CPD&WL activity over the five years prior to the survey with the major influencing factors reported as:

- impact of information technology and the resultant need for a broader range of skills;
- staff and organisational restructuring including both convergence and de convergence of library and IT services;
- changes in methods of university teaching and learning including increased use of virtual learning environments with flow-on impact in university libraries, and;
- legal compliance issues including the impact of legislation in the areas of special education needs and disability services.

Budget allocation for CPD&WL in the U.K sample ranged from 0.2% – 2.00% as a percentage of total staffing budget. The median allocation was 1.1%.

In the U.K., external accreditation programmes such as *Charter Mark* (a U.K. Government national standard for excellence in customer service) and *Investors in People* (a U.K. originated, and now international standard, for human resource development) are widely adopted within the higher education sector (as well as in other sectors). These quality assurance programmes were cited as having significant impact on organisational human resource development priorities with 31% of respondents having achieved *Investors in People* accreditation.

Professional education for the library and information profession in the U.K. places a strong emphasis on workplace-based continuing professional development. This was reflected in survey responses with 61% of respondent organisations reporting active involvement in post-qualification professional Chartership programmes for their staff.

### **Benchmarking over time and across countries - comparing Australian and U.K. policy and practice**

The conduct of these Australian and U.K. surveys has provided a valuable opportunity to benchmark and compare practice in the two countries. In Australia, as has been noted, further comparison is also possible with two previous studies. A 1982 survey (Trask, 1983) found there to be, at that time, only a small number of libraries within the university library sector with well developed and coordinated human resource development programmes. Trask (1983, p.7) characterised CPD&WL activity at that time as “...sporadic, with limited annual planning, co-ordination and evaluation”. This somewhat gloomy picture was, however, balanced by Trask also noting “... a high degree of interest in further developing staff development programmes” with more than half of her survey group indicating that they had plans for major expansion of their CPD&WL programs. A subsequent survey (Gray, 1986) found some limited improvement. Gray’s survey identified an increased level of interest in the concept of CPD&WL, with many libraries having some form of CPD&WL activity in place although there was still no significant degree of formally stated organisational commitment to human resource development and/or organized CPD&WL programs.

Contrasting the results of these various surveys is interesting and valuable. In the case of the Australian surveys from the 1980s and those conducted two decades later the nascent recognition of the importance of human resourced development and the emerging organisational commitment to making this an organisational priority can be seen to have come to fruition. By 2001, encouraged by a public policy environment which, from the early 1990s onwards, had emphasised the importance of developing the people resources in organisations, Australian academic and research libraries could be seen to have overwhelmingly adopted a strong commitment to CPD&WL programs. That commitment had endured despite the pressures of contracting budgets in many parts of the sector and indeed was seen by many as an important element in coping with the organisational impact of budget strictures. The 2005 survey reinforced and updated that picture adding information – particularly concerning the extent of budget commitment for CPD&WL programs.

The results of the U.K. survey – which adopted the same core questions and focus as the Australian surveys – can also be usefully compared with the more recent Australian survey data. The pictures presented by both the Australian and U.K. surveys are broadly similar although with some differences in emphasis and detail. For example, the impact of regional isolation on CPD&WL practice was particular to Australia while the requirements for post qualification professional accreditation and the resultant impacts on the pattern of CPD&WL are unique to the U.K. Specific quality assurance frameworks – *Charter Mark* and *Investors in People* are a significant factor in the U.K. but are not as clearly apparent in the Australian context although quality assurance processes more generically are.

The range of budget allocations is wider in the case of the U.K. university libraries – with a significantly lower bottom point (0.2% in the U.K. compared with 0.5% in Australia). However the median budget allocation in the U.K. (1.1%) is higher than that in Australian university libraries (0.8%).

These similarities and differences are not unexpected. The higher education sectors in both countries, while different in gross scale, are comparable in character and have been subjected to similar political and public policy impacts. At the same time there are factors unique to one or other country which flow through into these survey results. In the case of Australia the overall geographical dispersal of the population combined with a pattern of several bulked urban concentrations on the east/southeast coastline plus other isolated pockets of population is a factor with noticeable impact.

## **Next steps and directions in benchmarking CPD&WL policy and practice**

While originating in the for-profit sector and rooted in the search for industry best practice leading to better profit making ability, benchmarking has increasingly found a place in the not-for profit sector. In the latter the intention in applying benchmarking remains as identifying and understanding best practice and in doing so to set useful targets by which achievement can be measured. A number of forms of best practice benchmarking have become well established in the Australian higher education sector – the work of the *Australian Universities Quality Agency* (<http://www.auqa.edu.au/>) and the quality measurement surveys regularly conducted by the *Council of Australian University Librarians* (<http://www.caul.edu.au/>) are two examples. Benchmarking for quality assurance is also embedded in the U.K. university sector – the *Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education* (<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/>) being the pre-eminent quality assessment body. In the university library sector specifically, *LibQUAL* benchmarking program (<http://www.libqual.org/>) is increasingly being adopted by university libraries as a means of identifying, and measuring against best practice, in library services.

Benchmarking can be usefully applied to CPD&WL activities. Browell (2000) suggests that benchmarking has particular applicability for staff development and continuing professional education because these activities naturally lend themselves to cooperative and collaborative activity between institutions. She describes the process of benchmarking in this case as one of sharing information for mutual benefit, (such as sharing information on successful or unsuccessful approaches to dealing with particular training and development needs), and establishing points of reference from which standards may be set and measurements may be made. This characterisation of benchmarking describes well what has been achieved so far with the surveys and benchmarking outlined in this paper.

The surveys discussed here have sought to reveal the current state of CPD&WL practice in the academic and research library sector – comprehensively in the case of Australia and in a representative sample of U.K. institutions. The surveys have shown CPD&WL in those sectors to be in a healthy state, well aligned to the achievement of strategic organisational objectives and accorded significant organisational priority. The next step in the process, and one on which this author is currently engaged along with colleagues in both the U.K. and the U.S.A, is to develop models and guidelines which may inform and measure good CPD&WPL practice. As an example the *CPDWL Section of the International Federation of Library Associations & Institutions (IFLA)* (<http://www.ifla.org/VII/s43/index.htm>), is currently developing evidence-based guidelines for assessing the quality and effectiveness of CPD&WL activities, programs and events. These guidelines, which aim to address variations in the needs of professional practitioners in a range of countries and cultures, will be able to be used by both individuals and organisations providing CPD&WL activities and by those undertaking or purchasing such activities. Coverage will include:

- content - the means for assessing the content of programs and activities;
- delivery - assessment of different modes of delivery;
- format and instructional strategies - assessing the appropriateness and effectiveness of format and instructional strategies;
- impact/outcomes assessment techniques - how success and quality may be measured.

Work is also underway towards extrapolating best practice guidelines from the U.K and Australian surveys – this work to be published in a professional journal later in 2006 or early 2007. In undertaking this next step the benefit derived from undertaking these surveys in Australia and the U.K. will be expanded. At a base level the surveys have revealed a picture of how CPD&WL is carried out in the Australian and U.K. academic and research library sector – a picture which could only be guessed at in the absence of any concrete and coordinated data. The next step in the process – using the data gathered and knowledge gained to begin the process of proposing best practice guidelines which are based on current professional practice – has the potential to add significant value to the initial survey endeavours.

## **Conclusion**

This paper began by noting the rapid pace of change and development in the library and information profession. In the context of such change it is critical that library and information professionals maintain and upgrade their skills, knowledge, and abilities. The survey results outlined in this paper show that CPD&WL has established an enduring and important place in Australian and U.K academic and research libraries. The opportunity now exists for these survey results to provide a framework from which to build benchmarks which may guide and assess good CPD&WL practice.

## **References**

- American Library Association (ALA), (2001) Second Congress on Professional Education, November 17–19, 2000, Final Report of the Steering Committee.  
<http://www.ala.org/ala/hrdrbucket/2ndcongressonpro/2ndcongressprofessionaleducationfinal.htm>
- Browell, S., (2000), “Staff development and professional education: a cooperative model”, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 12, Iss. 2, pp. 57–65.
- Gray, J. L, (1986), “Staff Development policies and practices in some Australian libraries”, in *Lifestyles and Librarians, Proceedings of the 24<sup>th</sup> LAA Conference*, A. J. Walker (Ed.), Library Association of Australia, Sydney, pp. 443-451.
- Smith, I. W., (2002) "Staff development and continuing professional education: policy and practice in Australian academic and research libraries", in Layzell Ward, P. (Ed.), *Continuing Professional Education for the Information Society, the 5th World Conference on Continuing Professional Education for the Library and Information Service Professions*,. K.G. Saur, Munich, pp. 25 – 38.  
<http://www.lib.latrobe.edu.au/about/publications/sd&cpe.pdf>
- Trask, M., (1983), *Staff Development in Libraries; Report of a Study Project September 1981 – June 1982*, Kurin-gai College of Advanced Education, Lindfield, N.S.W.
- Yeoh, J., Straw, V., Holebrook, C., (2004), *Staff development and continuing professional education: policy and practice in academic libraries within the M25(CPD25), NoWAL, SALCTG consortia and Oxford University: a report by CPD25*.  
<http://www.cpd25.ac.U.K./Report.pdf>

## Appendix - Survey Questionnaire (Australian Survey – June 2005)

### **“Staff Development & Workplace Learning – Policy and Practice in Australian Academic & Research Libraries – 2005 Update Study”**

#### **Survey Questionnaire**

Your participation in this update study is important in providing current data on this topic. This research project is investigating current staff development\* policy and practice in Australian academic and research libraries. This builds on, and updates, a study undertaken by this researcher in 2001. A copy of the report that resulted from the 2001 study is available at:

[http://www.lib.latrobe.edu.au/publications/mw-conference\\_papers.html](http://www.lib.latrobe.edu.au/publications/mw-conference_papers.html) .

The results of the project will be benchmarked with a similar survey undertaken in the UK in 2004 (more information at:

[http://www.sconul.ac.uk/pubs\\_stats/newsletter/33/5.rtf](http://www.sconul.ac.uk/pubs_stats/newsletter/33/5.rtf) ). The end product of this research project will be to add to the body of knowledge of contemporary human resource management and human resource development practice in Australian and UK libraries and will be published in a professional journal. Copies of the research findings will be made available, before publication, to all participants in this survey.

All information provided in response to the questionnaire will, unless specific approval is given by the information provider, be non-identifiable in the final research report.

If you have any questions about any aspect of this research project please contact me: [i.smith@latrobe.edu.au](mailto:i.smith@latrobe.edu.au), 03 9479 1918.

Ian Smith  
Senior Librarian (Personnel)  
La Trobe University.  
1/6/2005

*(Notes. For the purposes of this study:*

*\* the term "staff development" is used to cover the broad areas of staff training, staff development and workplace learning.)*

*\*\* the term "organisation" is taken to mean library or other organisational unit which includes library and other related services (such as IT services).*

**To answer the questions please check the appropriate box or enter text. Use the TAB function to move through the form. There are eight question groups. It should take no more than 15 minutes to complete the survey form.**

<b>1. Staff development policy</b>	
1.1 Does your organisation** 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

<p>you be prepared to make a copy available to this researcher?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p><b>2. Staff development in your organisation</b></p>	
<p>2.1 Which of these statements best fits your organisation:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The organisation has a planned staff development program</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The organisation has an informal approach to staff development</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The organisation regards staff development as primarily the responsibility of individual staff members</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>2.2 Which of these phrases best describes the approach of your organisation to staff development:</p>	<p><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</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Overall co-ordination of staff development is the responsibility of a designated organisation staff member</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Responsibility for staff development is shared between area managers and a staff member with designated authority for staff development</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Staff development is the responsibility of a staff development committee</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify):</p>
<p>2.3 Does your organisation have a Staff Development Committee?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (continue to question 2.4)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 3)</p>
<p>2.4 To whom does that Committee report?</p>	
<p>2.5 Does the Committee have defined Terms of Reference or a role statement?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>2.6 If yes, would you be prepared to make a copy available to this researcher?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p><b>3. Budget allocation for staff development</b></p>	
<p>3.1 Is there a budget allocation for staff development?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (continue to question 3.2)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 4)</p>

3.2 What is the staff development budget allocation expressed as a percentage of the organisation's <b>staffing</b> budget?	%
Comments:	
<b>4. The characteristics of your staff development program</b>	
4.1 How are staff development activities in your organisation conducted? (check as many as apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> On the job <input type="checkbox"/> In-house with internal organisation trainers <input type="checkbox"/> In-house with external trainers <input type="checkbox"/> Externally <input type="checkbox"/> In other ways (please specify):
Comments:	
4.2 Does your Library's staff development program include... (check as many as apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> Orientation/induction programs <input type="checkbox"/> Attendance at conferences/ pre/post conference workshops with Organisation support. <input type="checkbox"/> External study courses (Degree, Diploma, etc) <input type="checkbox"/> In-house short courses <input type="checkbox"/> External short courses <input type="checkbox"/> Seminars/workshops <input type="checkbox"/> In-service training programs <input type="checkbox"/> Job exchanges within the organisation <input type="checkbox"/> Staff exchanges with other organisations <input type="checkbox"/> Attendance at continuing professional education programs <input type="checkbox"/> Visits to other organisations <input type="checkbox"/> Support for research work <input type="checkbox"/> Reports of research work in progress and/or completed <input type="checkbox"/> Support for publication <input type="checkbox"/> Guest speakers <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)
Comments:	
4.3 Thinking about the staff development program in your organisation 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:	
<b>5. Factors Influencing Staff Development</b>	

<p>5.1 Has the use of information technology in service delivery in the library and information services sector affected your staff development program?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (continue to question 5.2) <input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 5.3)</p>
<p>5.2 Which of the following statements apply to your library? (check as many as apply)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Increased use of information technology applications has had an impact on the focus and content of our staff development program <input type="checkbox"/> Increased use of information technology applications has led to a greater need to train staff in IT applications <input type="checkbox"/> We make increased use of information technology in staff development programs (e.g. computer aided instruction) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>5.3 Does your organisation have a formal Strategic Plan?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (continue to question 5.4) <input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 5.5)</p>
<p>5.4 What level of priority is staff development allocated in the Strategic Plan?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> A high priority <input type="checkbox"/> A medium priority <input type="checkbox"/> A low priority</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>5.5 Have any other organisational or external factors had a significant influence on your staff development program?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 6) If yes, please briefly outline what these factors are and how they have impacted.</p>

<p><b>6. Incentives and Recognition</b></p>	
<p>6.1 Does your organisation have in place any of these <u>incentives</u> to encourage staff members to undertake staff development programs? (check as many as apply)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, paid time to attend staff development programs <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, travel and <i>per diem</i> allowances <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, payment of course fees <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) <input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 6.2)</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>6.2 Does your organisation have in place any of these forms of <u>recognition</u> for staff members who have participated in staff development activities: (check as many as apply)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Formal accreditation/certification following completion of staff development courses <input type="checkbox"/> In-house certification of participation</p>

	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 7)
--	---

Comments:

**7. Evaluation**

7.1 Do you have mechanisms in place for evaluating the effectiveness of staff development in your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (continue to question 7.2) <input type="checkbox"/> No (go → to question 8)
---	---

7.2 Do the evaluation mechanisms comprise: (check as many as apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> Completion, by participants, of evaluation forms at the completion of a training/development program <input type="checkbox"/> Completion, by participants, of evaluation forms at some time after the completion of a training/development program <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 specific parts of the staff development program <input type="checkbox"/> A periodic review of the overall staff development program <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)
---	--

Comments:

**8. Some information about you and your organisation**

8.1 Name of your organisation or organisational unit:	
---	--

8.2 How many staff (equivalent full time) are employed in your organisation?	EFT
--	-----

8.3 Which of these best describes your organisation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Stand-alone library service <input type="checkbox"/> Merged information technology services and library services with discrete operational services <input type="checkbox"/> Merged information technology services and library service with merged operational services Other organisational structure (please specify) Comments
--	--

8.4 Of these, what proportion of the total are classified as:	Professional staff % Para-professional staff % Library Assistants, administrative staff and/or technical staff %
8.5 Your name	
8.6 Telephone contact number	Area code Tel:
8.7 Your email address:	
8.8 Your position title	
8.8 In this position are you...	<input type="checkbox"/> The Director of equivalent of your organisation <input type="checkbox"/> A senior manager whose responsibilities include staff development in the organisation as a whole <input type="checkbox"/> A middle manager whose responsibilities include staff development in the organisation as a whole <input type="checkbox"/> A middle manager whose <b>primary</b> responsibility is for staff development in the organisation as a whole <input type="checkbox"/> Other: (please specify)

Do you have any other comments you would like to make?
--

**Thank you for completing this questionnaire. I appreciate the time you have taken.**

**Please SAVE your document as [StaffDev05Reply.doc](#), and return the survey by email as a Word file attachment to [i.smith@latrobe.edu.au](mailto:i.smith@latrobe.edu.au). Alternatively, you can print the form and post it to Ian Smith, Senior Librarian (Personnel), La Trobe University, Victoria 3086. Please return the completed survey by July 1<sup>st</sup> 2005.**

**If you have any questions or comments you can contact me by telephone: 03 9479 1918, or by email [i.smith@latrobe.edu.au](mailto:i.smith@latrobe.edu.au)**

Copies of the report of the report on the research findings will be made available to all participants. Please indicate below if you wish to receive a copy of the report on the research findings.

- No**  
 **Yes**

**Ian Smith. 1/6/2005**