Continuing Education and Staff Development: Needs Assessment, Comprehensive Program Planning, and Evaluation

by Carolyn A. Snyder and Nancy P. Sanders

The following essay surveys continuing education/staff development in large academic libraries and reviews pertinent library and management literature. The steps leading to the development of a comprehensive CE/SD program at Indiana University are detailed, with emphasis on both formal and informal means of needs assessment.

The subject of staff development and continuing education has received increasing emphasis in the past decade as is indicated by the numerous articles, conference papers, and committee discussions on the topic. A sound theoretical base for its support has been established in the management and behavioral sciences by the work of Likert, McGregor, Argyris, Herzberg, and others. Each, from a somewhat different perspective, has described the factors that contribute to optimum productivity— noting the role of continuous individual growth as a key to a healthy organization. These and other theories have also been extended and applied to the library, in research studies by Stone and Marchant and in thought-provoking pieces by Goodman, DeProspo, Kaser, Conroy and others.

Library administrators generally agree that continuing education and staff development are essential goals of any organization. But in moving from theory to action, roadblocks often appear. In a tight economy, funding one endeavor almost inevitably means reducing or not funding another; unfortunately, continuing education programs are often among the first to go. First, administrators are often presented with lofty ideals and only minimal cost justification for staff development programs; second, the staff development/continuing education program is perceived by both the staff and administration as a self-contained unit or separate entity rather than as an integral part of library activities and the development of every individual in the organization.

The first argument regarding cost benefits of continuing education is more than a little difficult to counter. The cost of NOT training in a library setting is not well documented, and it is almost impossible to ascertain the cost benefit of many activities falling within the continuing education/staff development definition. How does one, for example, assign a value to several hours spent at ALA cocktail parties, where one somewhat soggy, but later refinable, idea may emerge; or to released time spent in sometimes dull, but occasionally brilliant seminars and workshop sessions? Substantiation of cost-benefit claims for such activities would be difficult at best, yet many feel some of their most valuable ideas emerged from just such sessions.

The second perception of staff development is that it is unrelated to the vital maintenance activities of the organization; it is often considered a “boondoggle.” Sometimes it is. More than one seminar/workshop has been a day-long vacation from the usual routine, justifiable primarily for a short-term increase in morale. Yet both these objections can be met by using available techniques, which have been successfully used in many libraries. The formula includes a staff-wide needs-assessment survey; comprehensive program planning, including the development of action-based objectives; and an evaluation system predicated on previously-developed program objectives.

Comprehensive Planning

The survey of needs must include within its scope the individual, the organization, and the user community. The survey instrument, usually a questionnaire/interview combination, should elicit staff development needs from the entire library staff—librarians, support staff, and administrators. Based on this assessment, the objectives of the program should be determined and a comprehensive program developed. Objectives should be action-oriented and achievable in concrete terms. The program should touch on every aspect of the educational maintenance activities of the staff and should be aimed at building a climate for constant awareness of the potential for learning and growth in even the...
most mundane daily activity. The plan should not be limited to workshops and seminars. In addition, the evaluative component is essential; both short-term evaluations of each activity and long-term overall reviews of the entire program should be planned from the outset. It is at this point that the typical approach differs from the ideal. Whereas the ideal program is based on a comprehensive look at the needs of the entire library system over time, the profession's usual approach has been to respond only to the short-term needs by applying a "Band-Aid" workshop or lecture as a palliative. With comprehensive planning followed by evaluation of the program in terms of the stated long- and short-term objectives, the continuous need to maintain and expand the competency of the library staff can be effectively met.

Realization of the need for this type of comprehensive program is a relatively new phenomenon. In the late 1960s, Elizabeth W. Stone, one of the strongest voices in library continuing education today, began to focus the attention of libraries on this area. In June 1970, the first workshop on the topic at an annual ALA Conference was held by the Staff Development Committee of the Personnel Administration Section of the Library Administration Division. In 1972 and 1973 the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), while conducting regional hearings, found

Whereas the ideal program is based on a comprehensive look at the needs of the entire library system over time, the profession's usual approach has been to respond only to the short-term needs by applying a "Band-Aid" workshop or lecture as a palliative.

Particularly significant are Conroy's definitions of staff development and continuing education, which have been widely accepted and used as the basis for numerous discussions and studies. Conroy has recently revised and expanded these definitions:

Staff Development—is intended to strengthen the capability of an organization to perform its mission more effectively and more efficiently by encouraging and providing for the growth of its human resources. Staff development affirms the ability of the individual and the organization to grow and for each to contribute to the growth of the other. Staff development makes the most of the present potential and prepares the individual and the organization for the future.

Continuing Education—learning opportunities utilized by individuals in fulfilling their need to learn and grow personally and professionally, following their preparatory education and work experience.

Practical Implementation

In recent years, against a backdrop of rapid changes in society in general and academic libraries in particular, library staffs have developed a broader and deeper knowledge of their environments. Particularly important in this changing scene has been the development of consultative/participatory styles of management, where more staff members participate in library concerns outside their particular units. In this process, many staff members have also improved their communications and human-relations skills or have come to realize the importance of such skill development. In his article in the Library Trends issue, "Personnel Development and Continuing Education in Libraries," Merchant substantiates from his study that staff development and sound management practices complement and reinforce one another. Other major changes in libraries in recent years have resulted in the need for new or expanded skills and abilities; these changes include the implementation of new technologies such as computer-based cataloging, automated circulation systems, and online access to machine-readable bibliographic databases and the development and formalization of personnel policies and procedures (strongly influenced by university affirmative action/equal opportunity employment plans).

Most academic libraries have assigned staff development and continuing education responsibilities to a personnel librarian or to an officer with librarian and/or support staff advisory committee(s). Exceptions include the University of Tennessee, which appoints a staff development officer who has some related personnel responsibilities, and Columbia University, which funded both positions for a period of less than one year. The University of California, Berkeley, has a personnel officer and a training officer; a committee of the Librarians' Association also plays a major role in planning activities.

As individual libraries have continued their development processes, a viable national group has developed for persons assigned primary responsibility for staff development. A group of librarians interested in staff development in libraries from the membership of the Association of Research Libraries began to meet informally in 1975 in San Francisco; the group now provides a regular forum for the exchange of ideas. Its activities are focused in two areas: sharing information about specific activities, and more recently,
emphasizing elements of systematic staff development planning. For example, in relation to specific activities, the Association of Research Libraries/Office of Management Studies (OMS) distributed a questionnaire to determine what staff development activities had already been initiated by Staff Development Committee libraries. From the returns, an analysis by type of program was compiled and is now available from OMS. Copies of actual program materials have also been distributed through OMS. In the area of systematic planning, the group held a day-long workshop on needs assessment at the 1977 ALA Midwinter Conference. In addition, the meetings during that conference included discussion of definitions of SD/CE and in particular the role of SD/CE in academic libraries.

A Case in Point

Indiana University has been involved in the process of comprehensive planning based on systematic needs assessment and has experienced many of the developmental factors described earlier in this article. A review of the evolution of its staff development plan may be of some benefit to other institutions embarking on similar programs. The Librarians' Advisory Committee was formed in 1970 to serve as a channel of communication between librarians and the library administration, and in 1972 the Clerical Organization of the Indiana University Libraries at Bloomington (COIL) was established. The Indiana University Librarians' Association, with a committee structure promoting professional growth, was formed as a result of an organized effort (beginning in 1969) to gain faculty status for librarians. Fee remission for course work, on-the-job training, and some travel support (primarily for administrative travel and ALA trips for unit heads) were the major opportunities available before the late 1960s. Many additional staff development and continuing education opportunities have been made available since January 1973 with the creation of a new position: Dean of University Libraries. The dean is appointed with direct budgetary responsibility for the Bloomington Libraries and coordinating responsibility for the libraries on the six regional campuses and for the seven libraries at the Indianapolis campus. This position replaced the more limited position of Director of Libraries, Bloomington, and had major implications for system-wide CE/SD planning. In July 1973, a personnel librarian with system-wide staff development and continuing education responsibilities was appointed.

Organizational changes at Indiana University have provided a major impetus for continuing education and staff development. The approval of library faculty rank and tenure in 1972, with implementation effective July 1, 1974, resulted in the formation of a library faculty organization, consisting of an elected library faculty council and several committees, for the Bloomington libraries. For the university-wide library system, an umbrella representative council with a few committees and boards was established. For Bloomington support staff, the Support Staff Organization (replacing COIL) was developed, with standing committees and an elected council. In addition, two major programs have been implemented for the support staff—para-professional job categories to provide career ladder opportunities and flexible scheduling opportunities for the 40-hour work week.

As these changes were occurring, various methods of informal needs assessment for CE/SD were being used, including observation, review of formal and informal performance appraisals, and group and individual conferences/meetings. The objective was to determine which CE/SD needs were top priority and should be provided as soon as possible. Participants in this ongoing process include the Dean of University Libraries, other administrators, unit heads, the Support Staff Council and its committees, and the Library Faculty Councils and their committees.

The SD/CE results of this continuous process in Bloomington included:

1. provision by the Dean of University Libraries of a portion of the Libraries' travel funds to a library faculty committee charged with allocating these monies on an equitable basis for travel to professional association activities and programs;

2. arrangement for library faculty members to attend courses during "usual" working hours; the implementation of flexible scheduling for support staff provided opportunities for course enrollment while employed full-time;

3. joint sponsorship with the Graduate Library School of convocation programs;

4. in-service activities, including a management course taught by School of Business faculty and sessions about automation and OCLC;

5. the establishment of a biweekly newsletter distributed to all library faculty and support staff;

6. development of a library orientation program for all new Bloomington library staff members; and

7. establishment of a sabbatical leave program for library faculty members.

The organization of library staff counterpart groups for the four state universities and the state library in Indiana has also provided opportunities for persons with similar responsibilities to discuss mutual concerns and possible cooperative efforts.

A related development occurred on August 1, 1974, when the IU Libraries, Bloomington, became a participant in ARL's Management Review and Analysis Programs (MRAP), which included staff development as one of the areas for study. The needs assessment survey questionnaire, sent to all Bloomington library faculty and support staff asked respondents to (1) describe feelings about opportunities; (2) make suggestions for improvement in the current program; and (3) make recommendations for new programs. The Staff Development Task Force, which was given the charge to review, analyze, and make recommendations concerning staff development programs, used the responses as background information. The task force conducted interviews and made 10 recommendations—some general, some specific. Two of major importance were the following:

1. The staff development program should be expanded, including improved in-service training, short courses and workshops developed to meet the expressed needs of the staff. The program should be carefully planned, timed and spaced, so that periods of major activity will not coincide with peak periods of operational activity and so that there will not be too many activities going on simultaneously.

2. Budgetary provisions should be made for staff development activities so that programs can be planned and
implemented in an orderly fashion throughout the year. 

By 1975 the need for a comprehensive program based on a much more systematic needs assessment became apparent to the personnel librarian. In the preceding two years, the library had responded to the most urgent needs, leaving future areas of concern not as well defined by the informal needs assessment process. Therefore, even prior to the release of the MRAP report and after discussions with the dean and a number of staff members, the Support Staff Organization CE/SD Task Force and the Subcommittee on Continuing Education of the Library Faculty Standards and Development Committee were asked to develop a framework for the IU Libraries CE/SD program. Initially, the two groups met separately, but as their work progressed, the personnel librarian and her assistant, sitting ex officio on the two committees, began to sense that the groups were moving in the same direction and suggested that they consolidate. At the outset, both committees wrestled with the inadequacy of the MRAP needs assessment data to answer all the specific questions concerning the libraries’ staff development/continuing education requirements. Referring to the book by Conroy for guidance, the consolidated group opted for a completely new needs assessment survey, preceded by a literature survey to ascertain the current state of the art.

The questionnaire they developed as the primary needs-assessment tool progressed through numerous revisions before being distributed to all staff members on the Bloomington campus. In final form (see appendix) the questionnaire requested information about each respondent’s status (faculty, support staff, supervisor, or nonsupervisor), years in the system, and location (branch, public, or technical services). The first question presented the CLENE definition for continuing education and asked respondents to state agreement or disagreement with it. The definition was inserted both to inform the staff of the committee’s basic premises and to ascertain whether they agreed with those assumptions. The remainder of the questionnaire assessed staff opinions on program priorities, desirable limitations on time and money spent on CE/SSD, activities currently available, and several miscellaneous items.

Upon return of the questionnaire, a two-part analysis was prepared. In the first phase, the responses were separated into two groups: support staff and library faculty. In the second phase, the support staff and library faculty groups were further subdivided into supervisory and nonsupervisory personnel and then into public service, technical service, and branch groups. The two-phase analysis provided, in the first phase, a means for ascertaining broad interest patterns and activities that should be planned on a continuous basis and in the second phase, a way to delineate smaller groups with special interests that might be met by tailor-made sessions.

 Incorporated into the data returned from the Bloomington campus was the information received from similar surveys conducted on the six regional campuses and the Indianapolis campus. In the development of the plan, the committees attempted, where possible, to meet the diverse needs of the entire university library system, ranging from the smallest regional campus library with two librarians to the Bloomington campus libraries with a professional staff of 106.

 Working with the accumulated data, the library’s administrative assistant, who had been working with the committees as an ex officio member, prepared a statistical analysis as well as an explanatory narrative to accompany the data. Two of the committee members then prepared a first draft of program objectives, and in a second session the objectives were revised. The committees felt that the importance of the objectives could not be underestimated and that the effort expended on their development was more than justified. It was here that the committees felt that they could best “sell” the program, because the section contained the most concise statement of the concepts guiding the development of the plan and the philosophy that would govern the future direction of the CE/SD program. In their final form the objectives were:

1. To provide greater organizational effectiveness through increased individual competency.

2. To develop a staff whose skills and knowledge keep pace with and/or anticipate user needs and promote greater user satisfaction.
   a. Expand library use through study and resultant application of innovative techniques.
   b. Provide opportunities for library staff to increase knowledge/skills of present specialization.
   c. Provide encouragement for library staff members to acquire further knowledge in order to serve client needs better.
   d. Increase library staff sensitivity toward the problems users encounter.

3. To aid the library staff in upgrading or securing skills required to perform present job responsibilities and to prepare for possible promotion to higher-level positions.
   a. Hold conferences, seminars, or other types of training sessions as need is expressed or otherwise made evident by technological advances or changing environments. In both planning and programming sessions, the needs of Indianapolis and Regional Campus Libraries should be considered. When appropriate, seminars/conferences should be geared to an audience composed of all three staff groups—Bloomington, Indianapolis, and Regional Campuses. However, the unique needs of any group should not be ignored; it may, therefore, be necessary to schedule sessions for relatively small groups. Care must also be taken to provide for differing levels of expertise on the part of seminar participates.
   b. Provide for interunit tours and working sessions to enhance understanding of the interrelationship of library operations.
   c. Provide the mechanism for access to professional journals.

4. To encourage the provision of a favorable environment for self-motivation toward continuing education.
   a. Enlarge the size of the IU Libraries Personnel Office staff to include a coordinator to provide
leadership and continuity for the Libraries' staff development/continuing education program.

b. Provide the mechanism for scheduling reasonable amounts of time within existing job responsibilities so that the staff feels it may take advantage of staff development opportunities without detriment to those responsibilities.

c. Provide reasonable amounts of money so that the staff may take advantage of staff development opportunities in locations other than their own libraries.

5. To provide some means of recognition for anyone completing an IU Libraries' sponsored conference or seminar.

6. To support and guide the efforts of the individual pursuing an organized program of continuing education/self development.

a. Urge individuals to take personal responsibility in planning their own continuing education program.

b. Promote active participation in the learning process.

c. Encourage the individual toward greater professional awareness.

7. To encourage supervisors to counsel their staff concerning establishment of goals and systematic participation in continuing education/self development.

8. To encourage the investigation of means by which library introductory orientation and on-the-job training might be improved. Written guidelines should be established to assist supervisors with initial on-the-job training and to assure more uniformity in continuous on-the-job training.

9. To structure the program so as to take advantage of existing opportunities for continuing education.

a. Establish and maintain contact with all possible sources of information on continuing education programs, trends, etc. (e.g., CLENE data base).

b. Establish and maintain a centrally-administered continuing education information depository.

c. Provide a means of rapid dissemination of this information.

10. To provide within the IU Library system committee structure a joint faculty-support staff oversight committee, operating in conjunction with the IU Libraries' Personnel Office, to continue and augment a continuing education/staff development program.

a. Establish methods for continual input concerning new priorities for the program as determined by technological changes and/or staff needs.

b. Provide a mechanism for the systematic interrelationship of individual projects, their content, learning experiences, and evaluation.

11. To provide continuous program evaluation within the responsibilities of the recommended Personnel Office position or the Continuing Education/Staff Development Implementation Committee. For specific events, the evaluation should include input from the sponsoring committee or group and the participants. The Committee or Personnel Office should:

a. Report the progress and value of the program to the library faculty and support staff organization at least biannually.

b. Evaluate from the viewpoint of the participants.

c. Evaluate from the viewpoint of the library users.

d. Evaluate from the viewpoint of the library administration.

At this point in the development of a comprehensive program, the Indiana University Libraries have implemented portions of a CE/SD plan and look forward to the appointment of the Oversight Committee and the initiation of several of the long-term projects. Although the plan is not totally operational as yet, the task force is working toward its goal of approval and implementation of the plan's major categories within the 1977/78 fiscal year. Meeting the goal will complete the first cycle from needs assessment to implementation and will initiate the continuous evaluation-planning-evaluation cycle, assuring that the future CE/SD needs of the library staff will be met. The library system, by putting a comprehensive plan in place, will have the means for a continuous conversion of ideas to active programs that benefit both the organization and the individual staff members.
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9. The Association of Research Libraries' SPEC (Systems & Procedures Exchange Center) kit on personnel organization provides descriptions of a number of personnel/staff development offices in academic libraries.

Needs Assessment Survey Questionnaire

The Support Staff Organization Staff Development/Continuing Education Task Force and the Library Faculty Standards and Development Subcommittee on Continuing Education are basing this questionnaire on the following definition.

Continuing education as defined by CLINE*: includes:

1. The notion of lifelong learning as a means of keeping an individual up to date with new knowledge; it prevents obsolescence

2. The updating of a person's education (e.g., makes an individual's education comparable to that of a person receiving a like degree or like certificate at the present time)

3. The allowance for diversification to a new area within a field (e.g., supervisory and management training)

4. The assumption that the individual carries the basic responsibility for his or her own development

5. Educational activities which are beyond those considered necessary for entrance into the field

Do you concur with the definition? Yes No No Opinion

Comments:

I. Please check all that apply to your position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch library</th>
<th>Length of employment in present position:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public services</td>
<td>less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical services</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library faculty</td>
<td>3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit head (head of main library dept. or branch)</td>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory (over full-time staff)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-supervisory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Listed below are a number of possible continuing education programs. Please check those which you would like to see initiated or continued.

A. Would you be interested in any of the following programs? Yes No

1. Graduate Library School courses for regular credit
2. Monroe County School Corporation adult education courses
3. Continuing Education, noncredit courses at IU
4. Evening school courses at IU
5. Correspondence courses with other colleges. (The committee has brochures which people may see if interested.)
6. Circulation of relevant articles from journals
7. Training sessions taught by IU Library personnel—please indicate which areas you think should be covered or that you would like to attend
   a. General IU Libraries personnel policies
   b. General IU Libraries payroll policies
   c. How to do effective evaluations of performance
   d. Student personnel procedures
   e. Telephone answering
   f. Library terminology
   g. Using common bibliographic tools
   h. Circulation policies and procedures
   i. Interlibrary loan operations
   j. Government publications
   k. Reference
   l. Cataloging
   m. Serials
   n. Acquisitions
   o. OCLC

8. Job rotation
   a. For 1-6 weeks
   b. For 3-6 months
   c. 6 months to a year
   d. Only within your own unit
   e. In other units with related activities

Comments:

9. Workshops on:
   a. Personnel management
   b. Library finance
   c. Copyright laws
   d. Management by objectives
   e. Public relations
   f. Collective bargaining and unions
   g. Sensitivity training
   h. Assertive training
   i. Others

Comments:

B. Do you feel you should have time off to attend:

1. Only one job-related conference per year
2. More than one job-related conference per year
3. Committee/task force meetings of job-related groups within the library system
4. Committee/task force meetings of job-related groups on university state or national levels
5. Committee/task force meetings of non-job-related groups on university, state or national levels
6. Classes, workshops or lectures which are job related
7. Classes, workshops or lectures which are not job-related

Comments:

C. Do you feel you should be allowed to take advantage of:

1. Educational leave without pay
2. Educational leave with pay

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Sabbatical leaves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Travel &amp; conference expenses (if available) should be provided for:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. At least one job-related conference, workshop, or seminar per person per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Program participation (giving talks, papers, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Others—please list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Should there be a limitation on:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The number of people attending conferences, workshops, etc. from one department at one time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The number of conferences, workshops, etc. one person may attend per year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The number of committees in which one person may hold membership?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The amount of travel money given any one person per year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Please answer all questions and comment as you feel necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Do you think some type of staff development is necessary?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Was the orientation received by you and/or your staff from the IU Personnel Department adequate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. By you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. By your staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Was the orientation received by you and/or your staff from the IU Library Personnel Office adequate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. By you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. By your staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Could your initial on-the-job training have been improved?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. On unit Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. On individual level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Do you think that the continuous on-the-job training is adequate at the unit level?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the individual job?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Should the library have opportunities for interdepartment training (tours, workshops, and/or job rotation)?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Would you like to have continuing education/staff development:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To aid you in present position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To aid you in meeting requirements for higher level positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. Are you willing to spend your own time on staff development/continuing education?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own money?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. 1. Do you feel your scheduled work time allows you to pursue a Continuing Education Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If you do, what percentage of your scheduled work time do you feel you can devote to Continuing Education without interfering with your work responsibility:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J. Do you think some kind of management supervisory training is essential:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For your staff?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For supervisors only?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K. 1. What kind of training would you like to see for your supervisor? (This is not limited to management training.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What kind of training would you like to see for your employees?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Further comments/suggestions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

We're Moving to Michigan

On August 1, editorial and production offices of the Journal of Academic Librarianship will be moved to Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Beginning then, all correspondence regarding the Journal should be addressed to: **P.O. Box 8330**, **Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107**.