ARL Libraries and Staff Development: A Suggested Model for Success

Pat Weaver-Meyers

An education model of staff development, the Readiness, Planning, Training, Implementation, and Maintenance Model (RPTIM) is described. Concepts in the model are related to a broad overview of current staff development and continuing education efforts in academic libraries. Results of a survey of staff developers in ARL libraries suggest that 80 percent of the model describes practices appropriate to the academic/research library setting. In addition, respondents indicated that existing staff development programs generally did not meet the criteria staff developers agreed should be part of their libraries' program.

effective continuing education and staff development programs in libraries are becoming more pressing needs as fast-paced change remains with us. Sheila Creth identifies continuing education as a priority and exhorts academic librarians to assess critically the degree of support continuing education receives from library administrators. This study examines RPTIM, the Readiness, Planning, Training, Implementation and Maintenance model. Devised for use with staff development programs for education professionals, RPTIM is a potentially valuable tool for improving staff development efforts in the field of academic librarianship as well. This study, which surveyed Association of Research Libraries (ARL) staff development and personnel officers, is offered in support of the RPTIM model's applicability to the academic library environment. The survey assesses the status of current ARL staff development library programs in relation to the ideal practices embedded in the model. The following review of library staff development and continuing education programs is provided as background to the survey results.

CURRENT EFFORTS IN CONTINUING EDUCATION

Continuing education (CE) and staff development (SD) are important components of librarianship in these days of rapid technological change and intensified career concerns. Elizabeth Stone, in her thorough analysis of continued learning in our profession, draws a distinction between CE and SD programs. Specifically, she defines staff development as continued learning that fulfills the needs or goals of the institution and continuing education as any kind of learning experience that will introduce new skills or concepts, fulfilling the needs of the individual for career advancement and improved personal competency. Although such

Pat Weaver-Meyers is Access Services Department Head at the University of Oklahoma Libraries, Norman, Oklahoma 73019-0528. Much of the interpretation of the RPTIM model is taken primarily from a series of lectures presented by Fred H. Wood. Assistance with the statistical analysis was provided by Robert Shull, University of Oklahoma Statistical Computing Laboratory.
distinctions are important, particularly to this study, staff development and continuing education remain closely intertwined. In this paper, the focus will be on staff development as Stone defines it, but CE efforts will be reviewed due to their close relationship to staff development.

Several organizations provide CE opportunities to librarians. According to Brooke Sheldon, continuing education programs are being provided by numerous associations: American Society of Information Science, Special Library Association, the Continuing Library Education Network and Exchange of the American Library Association, International Federation of Library Associations, and others. However, extensive efforts by such organizations to provide "quantity and accessibility" have not been particularly successful. For example, Marion Paris and Herbert White indicate that continuing education in the area of special librarianship lacks a unified core of coursework related to special library issues. Brooke Sheldon points out that only a small percent of librarians participate regularly in CE offerings.

A discussion of the quality assurance concerns of the associations and some analysis of their offerings are provided by Peggy O'Donnell, who concludes that association offerings are especially important since they represent "the concerns and voluntary professional involvement of the individual librarian." Sheldon's summary analyses of CE and SD in the most recent volumes of the ALA Yearbook demonstrate a high level of activity on the part of associations in developing programs and in analyzing the most effective organizational stance towards these efforts. Recently, a study sponsored by the Ontario Library Association analyzed various existing CE models with the intent of proposing an organizational coordinating body and defining its responsibilities. This is one example of how library organizations are reassessing their commitment to CE.

Regional and state library agencies are alternative providers of CE. William Asp and Suzanne Mahmoodi describe existing programs nationwide. Learning in Prog-

ress by Joan Wright and Douglas Zweizig focuses on existing state programs and the coordination of all types of providers including library schools and associations. James Nelson points to coordinating, planning, financing, linking (to national and regional programs), licensing, providing, consuming and advocating as the major roles in CE and SD that should be assumed by stage agencies. In many cases public, although not necessarily academic, libraries benefit from the efforts of state agencies. Further, state agencies do much toward providing more staff development-type programming for non-professionals, rather than just CE for professionals.

Another logical provider of continuing education and staff development opportunities is the library school. Marilyn Miller provides a comprehensive analysis of the state of library schools in the continuing education effort. She cites certificates of advanced study and sixth-year programs as examples of CE programming. In addition, she analyzes the number of CE courses provided by schools. From this analysis, Miller concludes that library schools have lost the initiative and failed to seize the opportunity to assume a dynamic leadership role in this arena. However, she maintains that they continue to have a place in the continuing education system. One example of a healthy library school CE program is offered at the University of Wisconsin–Extension. This program involves teleconferencing of CE units in such subjects as management and automation. In brief, library schools, like associations and state agencies, appear to play one part in the overall continuing education effort. The other players in this effort are the individual and the employer.

CURRENT EFFORTS IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

The preceding review has concentrated on continuing education, because it seems that CE offerings in the form of workshops, CEU training programs, and pre-conferences often constitute all the staff development some librarians encounter. This lack of in-house staff development is
disturbing, since personal experience suggests that these CE programs, attended with enthusiasm and interest, can be quickly forgotten. What is taught is not always implemented in the workplace. This may be because it is not seen as relevant to the attendee’s current duties, because of lack of interest, or because of lack of follow-up by the supervisor. This does not mean that such coursework for the expansion of an individual’s skills is a waste. It is a necessary part of career development. The problem lies in the assumption by the institution that such programming represents an adequate staff development program.

Although staff development in some libraries may be limited to CE coursework, some academic institutions are recognizing that staff development requires a more complex response. In a recent article describing a residency training program at the University of Michigan Library, Richard Dougherty convincingly states that “the intellectual demands are too diverse, and time too short for library schools to assume the entire responsibility for training practicing librarians.” Although training new library graduates in practical applications is not new to library managers, Dougherty is emphasizing the responsibility of the library administrator to formalize strategies for such efforts. Ronald Powell’s recent study suggests that ARL librarians would prefer to acquire more of their professional knowledge through continuing education and staff development activities. What is the current trend in academic libraries? The following section examines current staff development and training programs in academic libraries with the intention of laying a framework for the use of the RPTIM model in a systematic staff development effort.

On-the-job training has been employed by libraries. The Office of Management Services/Association of Research Libraries has recognized the need to improve training and has developed a new course that focuses on the learning process. It is directed toward personnel officers and staff involved in coordinating training activities. This is one of many institutes and programs offered by OMS. According to their 1987 annual report, OMS has trained over 7,000 librarians since 1973. The emphasis of OMS has been on self-study programs and the use of institute and retreat formats in training programs is consistent with current research in the most effective adult training techniques.

The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) is another provider of CE opportunities for academic librarians. Through local state chapters, their coursework is accessible to many unable to participate in national preconferences. Although these organizations, particularly OMS with its onsite applied approach toward training, provide important development opportunities, the consistent application of this training within the library remains a responsibility of the individual and the institution.

In addition to institutes, OMS has a specific program that pulls together in-house documents from different libraries. These kits serve as resources for self-training in academic libraries and provide a simple yet effective form of peer exchange. Several other recent publications provide a compendium of effective training techniques in all types of libraries. Although their coverage is not limited to paraprofessionals, most of these works emphasize practical training approaches to clerical tasks. The British seem to excel in developing such programming, but paraprofessional training is also present in American academic libraries. Jacquelyn Gavryck describes a program developed at the SUNY Albany Libraries. What is particularly noteworthy about this program to train clerical staff is that an existing cadre of trainers was used to provide training within the organization rather than bringing trainers in from the outside. The assignment of personnel charged with the coordination of staff training efforts has occurred in larger academic libraries and a movement in this direction is gaining momentum in smaller academic libraries as well.

Evidence of an increased emphasis on in-house training is demonstrated in the Resource Notebook on Staff Development by Jane Rosenberg and Maureen Sullivan.
This volume contains examples of current efforts in staff development at various academic libraries. The inclusion of program statements used at various institutions is also useful. These authors stress that changes in library organization increase the need for a dynamic process of staff development. Defining career ladders and job exchange are two ideas suggested. The concept of diversifying staff and promoting flexibility fits with a new emphasis in the quality of work life, cited by Rosenberg and Sullivan as an important trend forwarded by Charles Martell. Importantly, these authors conclude that the formal acknowledgement of staff development programming is a necessary prerequisite to formal budgetary commitment.

Jana Varlejs addresses budgetary commitment on the part of library administrators through modeling of costs. In one example, she compares in-service training to off-site training. Varlejs further raises the question of how much should be spent for adequate staff development and suggests that modeling may be used to arrive at a possible recommendation. Once a budgetary commitment is made, a closer examination of effective programs is necessary to insure value for each dollar spent. Examination of proven models of staff development is one method of arriving at a successful strategy.

"Research by Jana Varlejs suggests that learning styles should be taken into consideration in the formulation of continuing education and staff development work."

Such an examination of models in continuing education has been done in the formulation of much of our present-day library continuing education. Model comparison and formulation in staff development practice are now being done. Margaret Trask describes several presuppositions in Australian libraries' staff development, which can serve as a base model and Christian Vink suggests some practical guidelines as well. Malcolm Knowles has put forth a model based on adult learning theory, which in many ways parallels the RPTIM model this paper will examine. Furthermore, research by Jana Varlejs suggests that learning styles should be taken into consideration in the formulation of continuing education and staff development work. The RPTIM model does this. Finally, the RPTIM model has been applied to higher education personnel, not the group for which it was originally formulated, and found to be an appropriate guide for staff development.

THE RPTIM MODEL

The RPTIM model has five major subdivisions from which the acronym is formed: readiness, planning, training, implementation, and maintenance. Within these broad categories are thirty-eight specific practices that are stressed as important ingredients in an effective staff development program. In their original presentation of the model, Fred Wood, Steven Thompson, and Sister Francis Russell forward these categories as essential to a "coherent paradigm for constructing (staff development) programs." In addition to the 38 practices, the authors based their model on a series of assumptions or beliefs. The model was supported by practitioners in teacher/staff development. The following is a brief description of these categories as they relate to the academic library environment.

Readiness, the first step in the model, refers to the establishment of a positive work climate for staff development. This climate is characterized by the development of trust among colleagues, support, and open communication between administrators and staff. A clear vision of the organization's goals are put forth by the library director, and the administration and staff work together to formulate goals that will achieve the vision.

Why is readiness a necessary component of the staff development process? One reason is that change is a high-risk venture for an individual and activities such as team-building exercises foster a sense of support and gain the trust of

"..."
those involved. In addition, readiness is a
time when loyalty for the chosen goals is
established and participation gives every­
one the sense of ownership necessary for
successful change. Also, readiness activi­
ties refocus the attention of the group
away from present concerns toward a new
agenda. The Management Review and
Analysis Program used by the Office
of Management Studies, Association of Re­
search Libraries and other OMS self-study
programs include some of these con­
cepts.30 Readiness is not then a totally new
concept in library management, but seems
to be infrequently applied in any system­
atic manner in staff development pro­
gramming.

Some of the existing programs in aca­
demic libraries detailed in Resource Note­
book on Staff Development indicate a climate
that provides opportunities for staff devel­
opment, but little mention is made of team
building or actual staff input into defining
beneficial staff development opportuni­
ties.31 The Texas A&M staff ex­
change/sharing program is a positive ex­
ception. This program allows depart­
ments to plan, outline and train partici­
pants in an employee exchange
program.32 However, in goal formulation
and analysis of options, the participation
of staff in libraries still seems limited. Sys­
tematic connection between organization
goals and staff development is also rare.

Planning, the second component of the
RPTIM model, generally occurs in most
organizations, and academic libraries are
no exception. Most academic libraries can
produce a plan or policy for staff develop­
ment when asked. However, how was
that plan devised? Was information on
weaknesses and strengths in work prac­
tices gathered from the staff? Did the plan
include assessment of participants learn­
ing styles or was it based on research find­
ings about adult learners? Did the plan­
ers determine how the program related
to a long-term plan for improvement and
did they include a list of in-service re­
sources such as videotapes, university
personnel staff development offerings,
money for trainers, release time available,
or in-house experts? Who did the
planning—personnel officers, directors,
or everyone? These questions exemplify
the focus of this stage in the model.

Needs assessment, a part of planning, is
being done in academic libraries. Rosen­
berg and Sullivan include some good ex­
amples of survey forms designed to ascer­
tain staff needs.33 In addition, their
suggestions for information gathering in­
clude many of the steps in this model.

Training steps in the RPTIM model
might best be understood by asking the
following questions. Did the training pro­
gram divide the group into teams to dis­
cuss and share experiences? Were the
training program objectives chosen by
group consensus? Who selected the pro­
gram and was attendance required? Did
the training program include practice ses­
sions in which all the participants could
try out the new behaviors presented dur­
ing training? Was the training program
presented by colleagues? Did the library
director or a supervisor attend the ses­
ion? Were group leaders experts in the
subject presented, or were they depart­
ment heads or divisional leaders? As the
training session progressed, did the
trainer expect the participants to rely more
on themselves to generate activities? Did
the participants emerge from the training
session more confident?

Sue Courson’s and Kenna Forsyth’s
public library program, in which librarians
were given training in adult learning the­
ory, learning objectives, needs assess­
ment, training styles, transfer of learning
and evaluation, and the new OMS course
on training trainers, is evidence of in­
creased awareness of these questions in li­
brary staff development.34 Stone also dis­
cusses quality control issues that relate to
the concerns in this step of the model.35

The implementation criteria in the RPTIM
model seem to be ignored most when li­
braries rely on continuing education op­
portunities to fulfill staff development
needs. Most continuing education pro­
grams stop at an evaluation survey passed
out during the last fifteen minutes of the
session. Libraries could maximize CE of­
ferings by sending more than one partici­
pant. When they returned to the work­
place, they could observe one another
using the new work practices, thereby en-
hancing implementation. Following up with resource support would also assist. Such follow-up activities are not common in CE coursework, but are sometimes emphasized in on-the-job training. On-site institutes such as those provided by OMS improve the chances of implementation through the use of applied techniques.

Maintenance is a method of assuring that the new work practices are stabilized and continued. The level of success with maintenance is usually reflected in performance evaluations. Some self-evaluation techniques are also used to maintain new work behaviors. However, self-evaluation is underutilized. Most maintenance is closely tied to personnel office procedures that address performance evaluation. There is no problem with this approach, as long as it does not lead to a consistently negative view, lack of positive feedback, and an inadequate period of time to implement the change before evaluation takes place. What seems to be missing is the use of measures that reflect improvement in overall quality with regard to the change in work practice.

Measuring increased efficiency in cataloging is merely one use of quantitative techniques for determining the effects of change in work procedure. They are quite rightly used. Qualitative changes are harder to measure, and perhaps for that reason seem to remain unrelated to staff development efforts. The debate about effective performance measures will continue for many years to come. Once these measures become more refined, they should be included in the evaluation of staff development programs. It should be emphasized that staff development ultimately rests on the assumption that improvement and change in job practice benefits the organization and the individual. Furthermore, organizational improvement should be measurable in terms of the patron’s rate of success in filling information needs.

**METHOD**

In April of 1988, a questionnaire surveying RPTIM model practices was mailed to the staff development and personnel librarians in all ARL member libraries. Appendix A reproduces the survey form. The form is adapted from the survey form originated by Steven Thompson and used by Ana Albino to assess perceptions of faculty development practices in higher education personnel. Wording was altered as little as possible and most changes related to position titles e.g., librarian = teacher or director = principal. One additional question was added, belief ten. The first section of the survey lists ten beliefs or assumptions that underlie the model and asks respondents to rate whether they agree or disagree with the statements.

The second section of the survey lists the thirty-eight practices that comprise the model. In this section, respondents are asked to rate the degree to which they think these practices should be part of library staff development efforts and the degree to which they think the practices now exist in staff development efforts in their library. The survey closed with a query about who is responsible for staff development and the number of staff in the library. The question of size was used later as a control, because earlier research shows that size is highly correlated with change and the adoption of new technology, the end result of many staff development programs.

One hundred and sixteen surveys were mailed with a response rate of 47 percent. The objective of the survey was twofold. First, a confirmation of the model as appropriate to the academic and research library setting was sought. Second, a measurement of the current state of staff development in these libraries in comparison to the model’s criteria was reviewed to determine how current staff development efforts might be improved.

**FINDINGS**

General descriptive analysis of respondents shows that 26 libraries qualified as small with fewer than 200 staff members. Large libraries, with staff greater than 200, accounted for 24 respondents. One respondent failed to complete the question. Fourteen libraries indicted they had staff development offices. When asked who was responsible for staff development programming, the responses varied con-
siderably. Two libraries indicated no one had that responsibility while one library indicated that university personnel training services performed this role. Several libraries indicated individual supervisors and administrative officers were responsible. Most frequently, personnel managers, staff development officers, or personnel managers in conjunction with professional development committees were responsible.

"Staff should be closely involved in the planning and selection of a program."

The use of a committee made up of paraprofessionals and professionals charged with establishing training priorities closely follows the planning techniques stressed in the RPTIM model. The model suggests that staff should be closely involved in the planning and selection of a program. A professional development committee was listed by seventeen of the responding libraries as the party responsible for staff development. One library indicated it had such a committee, but it was a committee for paraprofessional training. Professionals were held responsible for their own continuing education.

Although the questionnaire was mailed to the "personnel/staff development librarian" the title of the respondents confirmed that not all libraries have such a person. Directors, personnel librarians, assistant directors, and chairs of professional development committees completed the forms. General commentary indicated that several libraries were newly involved in staff development programs and had hopes of increasing their commitment. One library emphasized the importance of shared responsibility between the organization and the individual. Another indicated that evaluation was important but was underemphasized in the RPTIM model. Three respondents mentioned that they were unclear about the difference between continuing education, inservice, on-the-job training and staff development and therefore had trouble answering some parts of the survey.

Quantitative analysis of the data focused on the two objectives of the study. The mean of each question was examined to determine if respondents agreed with the beliefs and practices the model listed. If the mean response was less than 3.0, the questions were considered unimportant by respondents and excluded from analysis. The remaining responses were deemed important to the survey group. Beliefs 6, 8 and practices 16, 21–25, and 32 were excluded. This left a total of eight beliefs and thirty-one practices that were supported by respondents. Table 1 is a list of the means for the eight questions concerning beliefs.

Table 2 is a list of all the practices with a mean greater than 3.0 in the "should" categories. In addition, the table lists the F and p values for the repeated measures MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance) compiled for the difference between "should" and "exists" (statistics compiled by the SAS General Linear Models Procedure). The table shows significant values for all the questions.

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>STD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Library personnel need inservice</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Significant improvement takes time</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inservice education focus on improving</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Staff motivated to learn new things</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Staff varies in competencies and readiness</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The working climate influences success</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The library has responsibility for providing resources</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The library should provide inservice activities</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SHOULD AND EXISTS
FOR THOSE QUESTIONS WITH A MEAN > 3.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>should</th>
<th>exists</th>
<th>difference</th>
<th>F*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. A positive work climate is developed | 52 | 3.34 | 2.59 | .75 | 44.165
| 2. Library goals written collaboratively | 52 | 3.41 | 2.56 | .85 | 43.764
| 3. Improvement goals for three to five years | 53 | 3.60 | 2.73 | .87 | 33.284
| 4. The library staff adopts goals | 52 | 3.51 | 2.66 | .85 | 41.974
| 5. Current library practices are examined | 48 | 3.39 | 2.50 | .89 | 47.305
| 6. Current work practices are examined | 51 | 3.09 | 2.25 | .84 | 57.614
| 7. Staff identifies plans to achieve goals | 53 | 3.24 | 2.56 | .68 | 41.057
| 8. Leadership responsibility of library (a) director/dean | 52 | 3.51 | 2.96 | .55 | 25.591
| (b) associate directors/deans | 52 | 3.51 | 3.08 | .43 | 30.966
| (c) staff development officer | 49 | 3.77 | 3.32 | .45 | 10.348
| 9. Differences of desired and actual practices are examined | 54 | 3.33 | 2.44 | .89 | 67.392
| 10. Planning of staff activities relies on information | 54 | 3.42 | 2.94 | .48 | 23.597
| 11. Inservice planners use information | 54 | 3.14 | 2.03 | .84 | 82.886
| 12. Staff development include inservice activities | 54 | 3.00 | 1.71 | 1.29 | 97.137
| 13. Resources are identified prior to planning activities | 53 | 3.50 | 2.98 | .52 | 22.563
| 14. Staff development activities for three to five years | 53 | 3.09 | 1.73 | 1.36 | 132.242
| 15. Specific objectives are written | 53 | 3.45 | 2.36 | 1.09 | 54.807
| 16. Staff development objectives include knowledge | 53 | 3.45 | 2.96 | .85 | 25.432
| 18. Staff development objectives include skill development | 53 | 3.37 | 2.86 | .51 | 23.479
| 19. Leadership is shared among librarians | 53 | 3.28 | 2.55 | .73 | 45.767
| 26. Leaders selected according to expertise | 53 | 3.45 | 3.11 | .34 | 12.718
| 27. Leadership behavior becomes less directive | 48 | 3.04 | 2.61 | .43 | 24.805
| 28. Leader transfers responsibility | 49 | 3.32 | 2.54 | .78 | 65.145
| 29. Participants have access to support services | 50 | 3.38 | 2.12 | 1.26 | 101.069
| 30. Library staff members are recognized | 52 | 3.46 | 2.35 | 1.11 | 82.096
| 33. Resources are allocated to support new practices | 51 | 3.25 | 2.12 | 1.13 | 77.939
| 34. The library director support changes | 51 | 3.62 | 3.02 | .60 | 24.955
| 35. Systematic program is used | 53 | 3.09 | 2.07 | 1.02 | 60.536
| 36. Library staff use systematic techniques | 52 | 3.07 | 1.84 | 1.23 | 127.887
| 37. Performance used to monitor new practices | 52 | 3.01 | 1.98 | 1.03 | 75.675
| 38. Responsibility for maintenance is shared | 52 | 3.42 | 2.39 | 1.03 | 62.308

*Wilks Lambda values
† p < .05 for all questions, df = 1

btw

This suggests that the staff development programs in ARL libraries fall short of what experts in the field agree should exist. As shown in table 2, all but four of the practices that should be part of staff development according to respondents fell below the 3.0 level when respondents rated the programs in their libraries.

As mentioned earlier, libraries were grouped in small and large categories to determine if size had any significant effect on responses. No significant difference was found in a repeated measures MANOVA (multivariate analysis of variance) of the two-by-two interaction between should—exists and small—large. In addition, ANOVA (analysis of variance) results of tests between small and large libraries show no significant difference with the exception of readiness one, a question concerning the importance of positive work climate. This question had an F value of 4.48 with p = .0394. The mean values were greater for small libraries indi-
eating the smaller library respondents supported the importance of positive work climate and felt it existed to a greater degree in their libraries.

DISCUSSION

The survey results suggest that academic and research library staff developers feel that 80 percent of the RPTIM model practices should be part of staff development efforts in their libraries. In addition, there is a significant difference between existing conditions and what these same developers feel should be part of their library’s programs. Although the RPTIM model is not comprehensive, it may be an appropriate beginning checklist for academic and research libraries interested in improving their staff development programming.

Most of the practices in the RPTIM model that were not confirmed by the survey fall in the training category. Further research is needed to discover why experiential activities, peer teaching, self-determination and participation by administrators are not important concepts to library staff developers. Perhaps few librarians have personal experience with staff development that includes these practices. Also learning theory-based techniques may be more familiar to educators, the groups surveyed in earlier studies.

An important trend can be seen in the difference column in table 2. Those questions with the greatest difference between what should be and what exists in staff development programs occurred in planning, implementation, and maintenance.

This suggests that academic libraries interested in improving their programs might concentrate limited resources in these areas. In addition, those organizations involved with continuing education programming that is fulfilling staff development needs should place some emphasis on the use of training after participants return to their offices.

There are some important limitations to this study. As mentioned earlier, a few respondents were confused about the general definitions of in-service, staff development, continuing education, and on-the-job training. No effort was made to define the concepts in a survey introduction, so it must be presumed that respondents answered based on their own interpretation of staff development. Four respondents expressed difficulty in interpreting questions or felt some of the wording was ambiguous. Also, comments suggested that evaluation of the quality of staff development programs should be a part of the model. One respondent questioned the need to formalize staff development to such a degree.

Further research using parallel models should be done to confirm these findings. Additional refinement of the RPTIM model by including a section on evaluation and by revising the section on training should be part of any further testing. This study serves as an initial focus in the review of appropriate practice in academic and research library staff development and can be used by personnel officers and administrators as a guide in planning the most effective programs possible.
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**APPENDIX A. RPTIM QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY FORM**

**STAFF DEVELOPMENT SURVEY**

Below you will find a list of beliefs that could shape practices for staff development. Next to each statement there is a column of numbers. Please indicate the degree to which you agree with the statement by circling the number beneath the appropriate descriptor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All library personnel need inservice throughout their careers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant improvement in library programs and services takes considerable time and long-term inservice programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice education should focus on improving the quality of library programs and services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staff are motivated to learn new things when they have some control over their learning and are free from threat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staff vary widely in their competencies and readiness to learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth requires commitment to new performance norms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The working climate of the library, including such factors as social climate, trust, confidence, open communication, and support from colleagues for changes in practices, influences the success of professional development.

8. The library is the most appropriate target of change in work practice, not the university or the individual.

9. The library has the primary responsibility for providing the resources and training necessary for library staff to establish new programs and improve efficiency.

10. The library should provide inservice activities to insure the application of continuing education training.

Listed below you will find statements that could be used to describe several practices in library staff development programs. Next to each statement there are two columns. In the first column, please indicate, placing a circle round the number beneath the appropriate descriptor, the degree to which you believe each practice describes what should be in your library to guide the design of staff development programs. In the second column, indicate the degree to which you believe the practice describes what exists in your library.

**SHOULD BE**

1. A positive work climate in the library is developed before other staff development efforts are attempted (a positive climate is characterized by open communication, confidence, trust and supportive relationships).

2. Goals for library improvement are written collaboratively by staff, librarians, library administrators, and personnel office staff.

3. The library has a written list of goals for the improvement of library programs during the next three to five years.

4. The library staff adopts and supports goals for the improvement of library programs and services.

5. Current library practices are examined to determine which ones are congruent with the library's goals for improvement before staff development activities are planned.

6. Current work practices recommended in the literature and found in best practice are examined to determine which ones are congruent with the library's goals for improvement before staff development activities are planned.

**EXISTS**

1.2.3.4

1.2.3.4

1.2.3.4

1.2.3.4

1.2.3.4

1.2.3.4
7. The library staff identifies specific plans to achieve the library’s goals for improvement.

8. Leadership and support during the initial stage of staff development activity are the responsibility of the library

   a) director/dean
   b) associate directors/deans
   c) staff development officer

PLANNING
9. Differences between desired and actual practices in the library are examined to identify the inservice needs of the staff.

10. Planning of staff development activities relies, in part, on information gathered directly from library staff members.

11. Inservice planners use information about the learning styles of participants when planning staff development activities.

12. Staff development programs include objectives for inservice activities covering three to five years.

13. The resources available for use in staff development are identified prior to planning inservice activities.

14. Staff development programs include plans for activities to be conducted during the following three to five years.

15. Specific objectives are written for staff development activities.

16. Staff development objectives include objectives for attitude development (new outlooks and feelings).

17. Staff development objectives include objectives for increased knowledge (new information and understanding).

18. Staff development objectives include objectives for skill development (new work behaviors).

19. Leadership during the planning of inservice programs is shared among librarians, staff and administrators.

TRAINING
20. Staff development activities include the use of learning teams in which two to seven participants share and discuss learning experiences.

21. Individual library staff members choose the staff development objectives for their own professional learning.

22. Individual library staff members choose the staff development activities in which they participate.
23. Staff development activities include experiential activities in which participants try out new behaviors and techniques.

24. Peers help to teach one another by serving as inservice leaders.

25. Library directors and associate directors participate in staff development activities with their staffs.

26. Leaders of staff development activities are selected according to their expertise rather than their position.

27. As participants in staff development activities become increasingly competent, leadership behavior becomes less directive or task-oriented.

28. As participants in staff development activities become increasingly confident in their abilities, the leader transfers increasing responsibility to the participants.

IMPLEMENTATION

29. After participating in inservice activities, participants have access to support services to help implement new behaviors as part of their regular work.

30. Library staff members who attempt to implement new learning are recognized for their efforts.

31. The leaders of staff development activities visit the job setting, when needed, to help the inservice participants refine or review previous learning.

32. Library staff members use peer supervision to assist one another in implementing new work behaviors.

33. Resources are allocated to support the implementation of new practices following staff development activities (funds to purchase new materials or technologies, time for planning, and so forth).

34. The library director and associate directors actively support efforts to implement changes in professional behavior.

MAINTENANCE

35. A systematic program of supervision is used to monitor new work behavior.

36. Library staff members utilized systematic techniques of self-monitoring to maintain new work behaviors.

37. Library performance measures are used to monitor new practices.

38. Responsibility for the maintenance of new practices is shared by the librarians, staff, and administrators.
Please state the position title of the person completing this form ________________________________.

Is there an office of staff development in your library? _____yes _____no.

If not, describe who is responsible for such efforts.

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

Approximately how large is your library system? (please circle the correct answer)
a) 150-200 total staff
b) 200-250 total staff
c) 250-300 total staff
d) 300-350 total staff
e) 350-400 total staff
f) more than 400 total staff

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Any comments?

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

Form adapted from the original and used with the permission of Steven R. Thompson.
To Stay Ahead in Science and Technology...

You Need Bowker's A&I Journals.

Comprehensive, Worldwide Coverage of Today's Crucial SciTech Issues!
In today's world, up-to-date and accurate information on science and technology is vital. Each week, hundreds of science and technology periodicals publish thousands of important articles that can make a significant difference in your work.

Where can you turn for help in finding that information? Bowker's A&I Journals! Offering easy access to current developments in robotics, artificial intelligence, and CAD/CAM, as well as coverage of a multitude of topics related to the environment, energy, and acid rain, Bowker's A&I Journals provide incisive abstracts drawn from the scientific and technical literature published world-wide. These abstract journals will make research faster and easier and help you do your job better.

Reference Resources for Everyone
Whether your patrons are scientists engaged in research, business people who depend on closely monitored news, public officials involved in policy formulation, or members of the public looking for the hard facts, Bowker's A&I monthly* Journals provide information on everything from renewable resources to robotic locomotion to waste management, as well as thousands of other topics.

Convenient and Easy-to-Use
Compiled by specialists in their fields, each Journal's abstracts provide an accurate, comprehensive 100-word summary of each entry, plus all the bibliographic information needed for further research. With its vast array of current literature, the A&I Journals free you from time-consuming information searches by allowing patrons to work independently with research sources screened and compiled in one place.

In-Depth Coverage
Indexing over 1,800 scientific, technical, academic, and related journals published in over 50 countries, Bowker's A&I Journals also provide access to a wide range of conference proceedings, government studies, patent publications, and other significant, hard-to-find materials.

Reference Resources for Every Library
Bowker's A&I Journals are the perfect tool for collection development, keeping you alerted to the latest scientific trends. And, since you can order full-text microfiche of over 80% of our cited articles, you can offer your patrons access to information beyond your current periodical holdings.

Bowker A&I Journals
- Environment Abstracts
- Acid Rain Abstracts
- CAD/CAM Abstracts
- Robotics Abstracts
- Energy Information Abstracts
- Artificial Intelligence Abstracts

Bowker's A&I Journals are also available online or in annual cumulative volumes.

Call Now For a free Sample Journal!
To order, or for more information about our integrated services of monthly journals, annual indexes, microfiche, and online databases, CALL TOLL-FREE 1-800-521-8110 (In NY, AK, or HI call collect 1-212-463-6869).
*bi-monthly for Acid Rain.

Bowker Publishing
The Abstracting and Indexing Division of R.R. Bowker
245 West 17th Street, New York, NY 10011