

Libraries Together: Liverpool Learning Partnership
Staff Development Day, 12th June 2012
Liverpool Libraries: What's New?

EVALUATION FEEDBACK

The 2012 Libraries Together staff development day, hosted by The University of Liverpool and held in the Rendall Building on the University campus, attracted a large number of participants; there was a total of 82 staff and guests from the partner institutions.

A total of 53 feedback sheets were returned most of those gave a high level of positive feedback but there were relatively few suggestions for future events and additional comments. Requesting the completion of the form on the day – and before lunch – might well have had the effect of reducing the amount of time people were prepared to spend completing the form. Equally, a number of participants commented that the form asked for comments on catering but that they had not yet experienced the lunch.

By and large, the responses received showed the event to have been well defined and achieved and that the length of the conference was about right for the amount of material delivered. A majority of participants felt the day had been informative; that the conference was well organised. Satisfaction levels decreased with the evaluation of the venue and the catering but by and large were generally approving.

The question about whether the events should continue to be held produced an overwhelming affirmative.

The following pages show the full results of the questionnaire:

53 forms were returned.

PURPOSE OF DAY

Clearly defined	1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all apparent
	29	18	5	1	-	-	

Achieved	1	2	3	4	5	6	Absolute failure
	26	21	6	-	-	-	

The average score for clearly defining the day was **1.58**, with a slight dip in terms of its having been achieved to **1.62**, but with clearly an overwhelming majority feeling that the purpose of the day was both well defined and achieved.

SUBJECT MATTER

Too much crammed in	1	2	3	4	5	Not enough information
	5	8	37	2		

Informative	1	2	3	4	5	6	Did not teach me anything
	26	22	4	1	-	-	

A well-balanced response to the amount of material covered, with an average of **2.69** (an ideal score being 3.0) and one that's clearly preferable to a weighting greater than 3.0, towards the "not enough information" end of the scale. The score for how informative the day was hit a very positive **1.62**.

DURATION

Too long	1	2	3	4	5	Not enough time available
	1	5	35	8	3	

The half-day conference format was repeated again year with a majority of attendees clearly feeling that was about right for the amount of information conveyed. The overall average of **3.13** compares well with the optimum score of 3.0

ORGANISATION

Well organised	1	2	3	4	5	6	Disorganised
	33	13	7	-	-	-	

With an average score of **1.51**, the majority of those completing the form felt the event was very well organised. Nobody ranked the organisational quality towards the lower end of the scale.

DELEGATE INFORMATION

Relevant & Useful	1	2	3	4	5	6	Of Little Value
	25	17	7	3	1	-	

All the information provided to delegates is delivered through the LT:LLP web site and, with an average score of **1.86**, it seems that most people found the information useful and relevant.

VENUE

Ideal for the event	1	2	3	4	5	6	Not at all suitable
	13	19	13	5	2	1	

The event was held at the Rendall Building on the University of Liverpool's central campus for the first time. While a comfortable majority of participants rated the suitability of the venue in the top half of the scale, the overall average score was **2.38**, the lowest satisfaction rating for any of the categories; although the score does show that a majority ranked the venue towards the approving end of the scale. (The benefits of the venue are that it is fairly conveniently located close to a number of the other partner institutions; that it contains the size and variety of rooms required for the format of conducting a number of simultaneous sessions and, importantly, that it is inexpensive to hire. There were some issues reported with difficulties in parking and the building and rooms are, at best, functional in appearance.)

CATERING
42 responses

Good	1	2	3	4	5	6	Poor
	12	14	10	4	1	1	

Participants were asked to complete their evaluation forms before actually receiving lunch and, although a number clearly did fill out the forms at a later stage, eleven delegates left this section blank. Overall, the verdict on the catering produced an average score of **2.31**, again showing that a clear majority viewed the refreshments and food provided positively.

HOW SATISFACTORY DID YOU FIND THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS IN THE DAY'S PROGRAMME?

Highly satisfactory	1	2	3	4	5	6	Most unsatisfactory
<i>Format of several short sessions</i>	34	16	2	-	1	-	
<i>Structure of the day</i>	31	18	3	1	-	-	
<i>Quality of discussions</i>	18	29	5	1	-	-	
<i>Opportunity to network</i>	25	17	8	3	-	-	

The general satisfaction level with the format of the day averaged at **1.45**, with that for the overall structure, slightly lower at **1.51**. For the quality of the discussions in the workshops, there was a dip in satisfaction levels to an average of **2.11**, and for the opportunity to network, the satisfaction level rose again to **1.79**. There was also one free text comment indicating dissatisfaction with how well the discussions in the sessions went; it might be that some advice or training about facilitating discussions might be of some use.

The further, free text comments provide some additional feedback on how the various elements of the day's programme were received. Not everybody returning a form completed all the free text sections and some who did identified more than one aspect of the day as most enjoyable or useful.

WHICH PARTS OF THE DAY'S EVENTS DID YOU MOST ENJOY?

All	12
Turning library sessions on their head	11
Central Library up-date	10
Popular culture archives at LJMU	6
Networking	4
Science Fiction Foundation archive	4

WHICH PARTS OF THE DAY'S EVENTS DID YOU FIND MOST USEFUL?

Mobiles, tablets and pads	7
All	7
Central Library up-date	5
E-books	5
Turning library sessions on their head	5
Reaching out to researchers	4

WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE THESE EVENTS CONTINUING TO TAKE PLACE?

Yes 47
No response 6

The enthusiasm for the conference continues to be high, with no entirely dissenting voices to the general agreement that the events should continue.

The free text comments called for suggestion for possible future topics or changes to the structure of the conference and then invited any other comments. The responses inevitably crossed over from category to category:

DO YOU HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR TOPICS/ALTERNATIVE STRUCTURES FOR FUTURE EVENTS?

The vast majority of completed form made no suggestion for topics for future sessions or changes to the structure. Similarly, most made no further comments. These are the responses that were received:

- Current structure good – I wouldn't change it
- Wouldn't change things really
- The "What's new" theme works well and allows good practice across a range of subjects to be shared
- Slightly longer would be good – more networking over lunch. Maybe 10.00 – 3.00?
- Run it from 10:30 perhaps?
- Sessions to be one hour long and [event] lasting the whole day
- Specific one for public libraries where each can talk about a specific new service topic
- Supporting students remotely
- Digital literacy
- Practical use of i-phones and i-pads
- Update on e-books, tablets, i-pads
- Integration of technology and traditional library provision/services
- More IT stuff
- More info on archives would be interesting
- Post-fees increase difference in student expectations
- Minute Madness might work well – used at EBLIP conference and others

ANY OTHER COMMENTS?

- Enjoyable and useful morning
- Very enjoyable and informative (2)
- Good event
- Very good
- Excellent morning of workshops
- Thanks! (3)
- Thank you for an informative morning. Enjoyed it! Excellent
- Excellent networking opportunity
- Good to have the mix of sectors represented
- Some sessions could have benefitted from more structures discussion elements – some presenters may need tips on good ways of doing this
- Suggest City Library hosts next event so we can all see the rebuild at first hand
- The venue wasn't great: old. Dirty and not a good reflection of the University

- Mid-morning break a little long – time could have better been used for more questions in sessions
- Slow queues for coffee/lunch – more tables needed

Overall, the conference was well received and the majority of participants found the event enjoyable and useful. The per capita cost of £11.00 was about the same level as in previous years, perhaps a little lower and certainly compares very favourably with the cost of attendance at similar external events. The popularity of the annual conference remains high and future organisers will take into account the comments which have been made about the 2012 event.

ij
5/11/12