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Strategic Planning Process

- Environmental scan
- External consultant
- Input from campus stakeholders
- Futuring exercise
- Total library staff involvement
Strategic Priority

Facilitated group discussions
Creating a culture of professional engagement and advancement
• Career Ladder/classification
• Library-wide Staff training / development
• External professional development opportunities

Task Force: 3 members: 1 Assistant Dean, 1 Department Head, 1 librarian
Guidelines

• Guidelines & procedures were reviewed and supported by the Provost, central HR and Ombudsman
• Rubrics were developed
• Program is two-pronged: Engagement and Rank Advancement (career progression)
• First formal review completed in 2014
Current Review Process

• Standing Review Committee
  - A new member each year, members serve for 3 years
  - New members identified by the committee; appointed by the dean
  - Membership represents demographics of staff
• Director/PAOE serves ex officio
• Committee conducts an annual review of process
Current Review Process

Professional Engagement (PE)

• Level of engagement based on established rubric
  • Not engaged
  • Emergent
  • Engaged
  • Highly engaged

• Summary of engagement submitted annually
• Portion of merit raise linked to PE levels
• Mandatory participation in annual review
Current Review Process

Rank and Advancement (Career Path)

• Rank assigned based on established rubric
  - Library Administrative Professional (LAP) I – IV

• Mandatory ranking for new hires
  - Voluntary participation for staff in place in 2013

• Bonus awarded when placed in a rank

• Appeal process in place
Program Assessment

Quantitative

• Compare levels of engagement
• Examine participation in ranking process
• Changes to financial commitments
Assessment: levels of engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Engaged</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Engaged</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Engagement Graph](chart.png)
### Participation in Ranking Process
(Library Administrative Professional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAP I (entry level)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAP 2</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAP 3</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAP 4</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25 (60%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Assessment: Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Travel Increase</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Travel</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall % increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53% (1% total expenditure)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment

Qualitative

• Survey of all participants
  - Separate survey for new staff
• Analysis of annual narratives (PE)
Assessment

Survey

• IRB approval
• Qualtrics
• Focus on staff perceptions
• Opportunities for comments
Assessment Survey

- 70% of program participants completed the survey
- 40% respondents perceived an increased level of engagement
- 80% feel better prepared to bring best practice to their work
- 70% feel the work of the libraries has been positively impacted
- 43% indicated they work with their supervisors to develop a professional development / engagement plan (100% of new hires)
Assessment Survey

Interesting discoveries

• Supervisors are more likely to work with new staff on developing an engagement plan

• Participants perceive little change, but our analysis indicates significant increases of engagement

• On a Likert scale, the majority rate funding support positively, at 4.7 out of 5
Assessment

Professional Engagement Progression

Number of Instances

- Scholarship
- Committee Service
- Officer Service
- Creative Endeavors
- Grants
- Professional Development
- Presentations
- Coursework
- Degree Completion
- Webinars

2013 2014 2015
Lessons Learned – First 3 years

• Adjusted timeline
• Clearer Distribution of Responsibilities
• Increased clarity on committee membership
• Revised process for new hires
Recommendations going forward

- Schedule periodic assessment of program
- Establish options for mentoring
- Increase involvement of supervisors
- Investigate alt-metric options
- Investigate advantages of electronic portfolios
Summary

• Strategic planning process
• Strategic initiative: professional engagement and advancement
• Task force
• Current status
• Goal met: develop a culture of professional engagement
Literature Review


Thank you!
Questions?

Eileen Theodore-Shusta
theodore@ohio.edu
(740) 593-2989