

## 2018 LAUC-B Professional Development Survey - Report of Results

August 2018

Submitted by the 2017-2018 LAUC-B Committee on Professional Development:

Jean Ferguson  
Christina Fidler  
Becky Miller  
Jeremy Ott  
Liladhar Pense

During the 2017-2018 academic year, the LAUC-B Committee on Professional Development developed a survey for LAUC members in alignment with the Committee's charge to "assess members' professional development and training needs", and to enable the Committee to better provide professional development-related programming. The Committee on Research contributed additional helpful input on the survey. The final instrument consisted of 19 questions which were oriented along the following themes: Professional Development (PD) goals, participation in PD activities, funding, satisfaction in PD engagement, and the relationship between UCB Library PD programming and librarian needs. The survey was sent by e-mail to all 100 LAUC-B members, who were given a three week window (May 15 to June 05, 2018) to complete it.

41 librarians responded to the survey. Professional characteristics of respondents were as follows: 88% of respondents hold the rank of associate (34%) or full librarian (54%), and 41% of librarians fell within each of the groups of 1-10 and 11-20 years of experience as librarian. Librarians from Arts and Humanities (10, 24%), Social Sciences (7, 17%), and Life and Health Sciences (5, 12%) contributed more than half of all responses. Technical Services and Instruction Services were each represented by three responses (7% each). At least eight other divisions / units were represented by one or two responses.

The survey's results (see highlights below) demonstrate a high level of current participation in PD, as well as a desire for greater PD engagement and accompanying support. LAUC-B librarians are engaged locally and participate in PD on many levels, not just the conferences that are accounted for in funding requests. Results also suggest that current and future iterations of the Committee on Professional Development should maintain the existing level of PD programming, and identify areas of interest for PD workshops and talks. Moreover, respondents offered suggestions; for example, changes they would like to see concerning PD funding and reimbursement. To share the valuable feedback gained from the survey, this report will be distributed to LAUC-B ExComm, LAUC-B members, and Library Human Resources.

### Highlights from the Survey Results:

- Respondents reported the following as their goals in seeking professional (PD): to gain knowledge / skills; look broadly at field; network.

### Current Participation in Professional Development

- Regarding how often respondents report participating in professional development:
  - 27% attend international conferences at least once a year (46% at least every few years); 37% never attend international conferences.
  - 83% attend national conferences at least once a year
  - 73% attend regional conferences/workshops at least once a year
  - 88% attend on-campus conferences/workshops at least once a year (71% at least several times a year)
  - 80% attend webinars at least once a year (77% at least several times a year)
  - Most report attending other local on-campus (88%) and off-campus (63%) PD activities at least once a year.
- Other activities respondents listed as PD included international trips; library visits; book fairs; new librarians coffee; serving on committees; following list-servs and blogs
- The percentage who report organizing or presenting at professional development activities at least every few years is: 39% for international conferences/workshops (C/W) (22% at least once a year), 63% for national C/W (34% at least once a year), 56% for regional C/W (29% at least once a year), 73% for on-campus C/W (39% at least once a year), 34% for webinars (22% at least once a year), 59% for other on-campus PD activities (37% at least once a year); 32% for local off-campus PD activities (20% at least once a year).

### Funding for Professional Development

- 73% report spending more than three quarters of their PD funds each year. Reasons for not spending all funds included: the remainder of funds is not enough to do anything else; some spend all one year and then less another year; desired trainings/conferences too expensive; some do not attend conferences (at all or every year) for various reasons.
- Other PD funding sources (aside from annual LAUC / Library funds) respondents have used include grants (LAUC or external), AUL funds, and departmental funds.
- 93% of respondents have used personal funds for PD
- 54% report spending more than \$500 of their own funds on PD: 29% spend \$501-1,000 annually, while 24% spend \$1,001-4,000.
- 39% are discouraged from participating in PD by the reimbursement process

### Desires for Professional Development

- 54% are not satisfied with their current level of engagement in PD. The activities in which respondents most desire greater engagement are national C/W (29%), international C/W (26%), and regional C/W (14%). Comments from these people included wanting to do more internationally; not having enough funds to attend the multiple meetings required for ALA / ACRL involvement; not having enough time.
- Of those who are unsatisfied with their level of engagement, 66% report being limited by funding; 28% by time. Two reported being limited by their supervisor's permission.
- 68% say the quantity of Library-sponsored PD programming is enough

- When asked what types of Library-sponsored activities they would like to see, 51% said talks related to strategies for participating in PD; 63% would like training on specific skills / technologies; 56% would like talks by guest speakers. Other suggested topics included hearing what colleagues are doing; learning about assessment techniques; diversity / inclusion programming.
- Constructive comments / wishes / suggestions: better reimbursement process; more predictable PD funding; returning unspent funds to the general pool for use by others more quickly; giving newer librarians more funding; prioritizing funding for presenters