

Department for Culture Media and Sport

Public Library Standards Report 2004

Assessment Framework

This framework should be used for authorities that have chosen to submit a Public Library Standards report. Please go to page 7 for the assessment framework for authorities that chose to submit a commentary document.

Notes: Where the word “innovative” is used, it means that the aspect being assessed is innovative in a national context. Assessors should use section II by itself to assess those authorities that chose to provide the minimum requirements and not a Standards Report.

I. Corporate vision				
Section	1 -Weak	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent
I.i Vision and ambition for the public library service. The evidence for this should be assessed from the entire Standards report .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The authority's ambition and vision responds to less than 2 of the following ideas: i.e. that the library service intends to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ evolve, ▪ respond well to the authority's corporate agendas, ▪ focus on public value, ▪ identify and meet local needs ▪ The assessment of the authority's capability to meet the vision is not convincing, and there is insignificant evidence that the library service is a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The authority's ambition and vision responds to 2 to 3 of the following ideas: i.e. that the library service intends to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ evolve, ▪ respond well to the authority's corporate agendas, ▪ focus on public value, ▪ identify and meet local needs ▪ The assessment of the authority's capability to meet the vision is only fairly convincing, with limited evidence that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The authority's ambition and vision responds acceptably to all the following ideas: i.e. that the library service intends to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ evolve, ▪ respond well to the authority's corporate agendas, ▪ focus on public value, ▪ identify and meet local needs ▪ The assessment of the authority's capability to meet the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The authority's ambition and vision clearly shows the authority intends the library service to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ continually evolve, ▪ respond very well to the authority's corporate agendas, ▪ focus on public value with innovative policies, ▪ identify and meet local needs in an innovative fashion ▪ The assessment of the authority's capability to meet the vision is very convincing, with the library service clearly an

**Public Library Position Statement and Standards Report 2004
Assessment Framework**

	priority for the authority	the library service is a priority for the authority.	vision is convincing, with evidence that the library service is one of the authority's priorities.	important priority for the authority.
I.i Vision and ambition for the public library service. The evidence for this should be assessed from the entire Standards report .(cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is insignificant evidence from external reports that the library service is valued and has a positive impact on users or the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is fair evidence from external reports that the library service is valued and has a positive impact on users or the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is good evidence from external reports that the library service is valued and has a positive impact on users or the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is excellent evidence from external reports that the library service is valued and has a positive impact on users or the community.

**Public Library Position Statement and Standards Report 2004
Assessment Framework**

II. Public Library Standards: information relating to standards met or not met in the financial year to March 31st 2004				
Section	1 -Weak	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent
<p>II.i Public Library Standards - "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries" PLS 1 to 18. Standards met at March 31st 2004 <i>(To achieve an "Excellent" score in this section, an authority will need to achieve at least the upper quartile number of standards as proposed in the 2003 Public Library Position Statements. This figure was 24 standards.)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Up to 16 of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met. (below lower quartile) ▪ There is no convincing evidence that resources are adequate to meet the standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 17 to 20 of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met. (lower quartile to average) ▪ There is convincing evidence that some resources are adequate to meet some of the standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 21 to 23 of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met. (average to upper quartile) ▪ There is good and convincing evidence that most of the resources are adequate to meet the standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 24 to 26 of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met or exceeded. (upper quartile and above) ▪ There is excellent and very convincing evidence that the authority is committed to providing adequate resources to meet the standards.

**Public Library Position Statement and Standards Report 2004
Assessment Framework**

Section	1 -Weak	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent
<p>II.ii Public Library Standards - "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries" PLS 1 to 18. Progress in meeting standards since 2001.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Up to 25% more of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met in March 2004 than in March 2001. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 26% to 50% more of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met in March 2004 than in March 2001. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 51% to 75% more of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met in March 2004 than in March 2001. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 76% and more of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met in March 2004 than in March 2001.
<p>II.iii Public Library Standards, "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries" PLS 1 to 18. Standards not met at March 31st 2004</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Up to 25% of the standards not met at March 31st 2004 were within 5% of the standard level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 26%% to 50% of the standards not met at March 31st 2004 were within 5% of the standard level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 51% to 75% of the standards not met at March 31st 2004 were within 5% of the standard level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 76% and more of the standards not met at March 31st 2004 were within 5% of the standard level.

Public Library Position Statement and Standards Report 2004 Assessment Framework

Notes

Authorities which met all 26 of the standards and part standards at March 31st 2004 should be given a score of 4 (excellent) without any qualification in relation to the improvement in meeting standards since March 2001, or a score in relation to standards not met (which would be irrelevant to these authorities) or their local targets.

Assessors will take into account the percentage of standards that authorities met in March 2004 compared with March 2001. This will be calculated from the number of standards and part standards 1 –18 that were achieved in 2004 (minus PLS 1 (ii), 2 (i), 2 (ii), 3 (ii), 10 and 16, for which no standard measures were set in 2001) compared with the number of the same standards and part standards that were met at March 2001.

Section	1 -Weak	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent
II.iv Public Library Standards - Local targets identified in "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local targets were set for 1 or fewer sections in relation to "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries". ▪ Local targets were not met. ▪ Explanations why targets were not set are not convincing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local targets were set for 2 sections in relation to "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries". ▪ At least 25% of local targets were met. ▪ Explanations why targets were not set are fair.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local targets were set for at least 3 sections in relation to "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries". ▪ At least 50% of local targets were met. ▪ Explanations why targets were not set are convincing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local targets were set for all sections in relation to "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries". ▪ At least 75% of local targets were met. ▪ Explanations why targets were not set are very convincing.

Public Library Position Statement and Standards Report 2004 Assessment Framework

NOTE on PLS 1 to 18 assessment:

The Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, in *Comprehensive, Efficient and Modern Public Libraries*, said in 2001 that “we shall allow a generous period of three years for compliance with the standards”. The assessment of authorities’ performance in meeting the current standards by 2004 will be heavily emphasised in the overall score, and no account will be taken of authorities’ future intentions in relation to the national standards in the score for this assessment, as the Department is consulting about proposals to develop the public library standards. A weighting system is being used to calculate the score for authorities’ responses to the standards as a whole. This weighting is:

Section 3.1 (national standards met) – score given by the assessor is multiplied by 4

Section 3.2 (improvement since 2001) – score used as given by the assessor

Section 3.3 (standards not met at March 2004) – score given by the assessor is multiplied by 0.5

Section 3.4 (local targets) – score given by the assessor is multiplied by 0.5

The total of the weighted scores should lead to the following overall scores:-

- Weighted total: 6 to 7.5 gives overall score of 1.
- Weighted total: 8 to 12.5 gives overall score of 2
- Weighted total: 13 to 18 gives overall score of 3
- Weighted total: 18.5 and over gives overall score of 4

EXAMPLES

Authority A: 3.1 (1 x 4 =**4**), 3.2 (**1**), 3.3 (1 x 0.5 = **0.5**), 3.4 (2 x 0.5 = **1**), = 6.5 = overall score of 1 (weak)

Authority B: 3.1 (1 x 4 =**4**), 3.2 (**2**), 3.3 (2 x 0.5 = **1**), 3.4 (1 x 0.5 = **0.5**), = 7.5 = overall score of 1 (weak)

Authority C: 3.1 (1 x 4 =**4**), 3.2 (**3**), 3.3 (1 x 0.5 = **0.5**), 3.4 (2 x 0.5 = **1**) = 8.5 = overall score of 2 (fair)

Authority D: 3.1 (2 x 4 =**8**), 3.2 (**2**), 3.3 (1 x 0.5 = **0.5**), 3.4 (2 x 0.5 = **1**) = 11.5 = overall score of 2 (fair)

Authority E: 3.1 (2 x 4 =**8**), 3.2 (**3**), 3.3 (1 x 0.5 = **0.5**), 3.4 (2 x 0.5 = **1**) = 12.5 = overall score of 2 (fair)

Authority F: 3.1 (2 x 4 =**8**), 3.2 (**4**), 3.3 (1 x 0.5 = **0.5**), 3.4 (2 x 0.5 = **1**) = 13.5 = overall score of 3 (good)

Authority G: 3.1 (3 x 4 =**12**), 3.2 (**2**), 3.3 (1 x 0.5 = **0.5**), 3.4 (4 x 0.5 = **2**) = 16.5 = overall score of 3 (good)

Authority H: 3.1 (3 x 4 =**12**), 3.2 (**3**), 3.3 (1 x 0.5 = **0.5**), 3.4 (3 x 0.5 = **1.5**) = 17 = overall score of 3 (good)

Authority J: 3.1 (4 x 4 =**16**), 3.2 (**1**), 3.3 (1 x 0.5 = **0.5**), 3.4 (1 x 0.5 = **0.5**) = 18 = overall score of 3 (good)

Authority K: 3.1 (4 x 4 =**16**), 3.2 (**2**), 3.3 (1 x 0.5 = **0.5**), 3.4 (1 x 0.5 = **0.5**) = 19 = overall score of 4 (excellent)

Authority L: 3.1 (4 x 4 =**16**), 3.2 (**3**), 3.3 (1 x 0.5 = **0.5**), 3.4 (4 x 0.5 = **2**) = 21.5 = overall score of 4 (excellent)

**Public Library Position Statement and Standards Report 2004
Assessment Framework**

III. Resources				
Section	1 -Weak	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent
<p>The points listed should occur in each of the sections in this chapter:</p> <p>III.i Spaces, III.ii Stock, III.iii Staffing, III.iv ICT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The analyses of key strengths, constraints and challenges are weak and inconsistent. ▪ There is weak evidence that the resources are adequate. ▪ There is no convincing evidence that the authority is committed to providing adequate resources to deliver the library service's priorities. ▪ Very few timescales for responding to constraints and challenges are stated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The analyses of key strengths, constraints and challenges are fair. ▪ There is some evidence that some of the resources available are adequate, but there are significant areas where resources are not adequate. ▪ There is some convincing evidence that the authority is committed to providing adequate resources to deliver some of the library service's priorities. ▪ Some timescales for responding to constraints and challenges are stated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The analyses of key strengths, constraints and challenges are good. ▪ There is evidence that most of the resources available are adequate, but there are a few areas where resources are not adequate. ▪ There is convincing evidence that the authority is committed to providing adequate resources to deliver many of the library service's priorities. ▪ Timescales for responding to constraints and challenges are stated for all development proposals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The analyses of key strengths, constraints and challenges are excellent. ▪ There is evidence that the resources available are adequate. ▪ There is convincing evidence that the authority is committed to providing adequate resources to deliver the library service's priorities. ▪ The timescales for responding to constraints and challenges are clearly stated and are challenging.

Public Library Position Statement and Standards Report 2004 Assessment Framework

This section should be used for authorities that have chosen to provide a commentary document.

II. Public Library Standards: information relating to standards met or not met in the financial year to March 31st 2004				
Section	1 -Weak	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent
<p>II.i Public Library Standards - "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries" PLS 1 to 18. Standards met at March 31st 2004 <i>(To achieve an "Excellent" score in this section, an authority will need to achieve at least the upper quartile number of standards as proposed in the 2003 Public Library Position Statements. This figure was 24 standards.)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Up to 16 of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met. (below lower quartile) ▪ Explanations about the reasons some standards were not met are not convincing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 17 to 20 of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met. (lower quartile to average) ▪ Explanations about the reasons some standards were not met are fair 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 21 to 23 of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met. (average to upper quartile) ▪ Explanations about the reasons some standards were not met are convincing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 24 to 26 of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met or exceeded. (upper quartile and above) ▪ Explanations about the reasons some standards were not met are very convincing
<p>II.ii Public Library Standards - "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries" PLS 1 to 18. Progress in meeting standards since 2001.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Up to 25% more of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met in March 2004 than in March 2001. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 26% to 50% more of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met in March 2004 than in March 2001. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 51% to 75% more of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met in March 2004 than in March 2001. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 76% and more of the individual parts of the public library standards for which there are measures were met in March 2004 than in March 2001.

**Public Library Position Statement and Standards Report 2004
Assessment Framework**

Section	1 -Weak	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent
<p>II.iii Public Library Standards, "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries" PLS 1 to 18. Standards not met at March 31st 2004</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Up to 25% of the standards not met at March 31st 2004 were within 5% of the standard level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 26%% to 50% of the standards not met at March 31st 2004 were within 5% of the standard level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 51% to 75% of the standards not met at March 31st 2004 were within 5% of the standard level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 76% and more of the standards not met at March 31st 2004 were within 5% of the standard level.
<p>II.iv Public Library Standards - Local targets identified in "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local targets were set for 1 or fewer sections in relation to "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries". ▪ Local targets were not met. ▪ Explanations why targets were not set are not convincing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local targets were set for 2 sections in relation to "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries". ▪ At least 25% of local targets were met. ▪ Explanations why targets were not set are fair. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local targets were set for at least 3 sections in relation to "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries". ▪ At least 50% of local targets were met. ▪ Explanations why targets were not set are convincing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local targets were set for all sections in relation to "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries". ▪ At least 75% of local targets were met. ▪ Explanations why targets were not set are very convincing

Public Library Position Statement and Standards Report 2004 Assessment Framework

Notes

Authorities which met all 26 of the standards and part standards at March 31st 2004 should be given a score of 4 (excellent) without any qualification in relation to the improvement in meeting standards since March 2001, or a score in relation to standards not met (which would be irrelevant to these authorities) or their local targets.

Assessors will take into account the percentage of standards that authorities met in March 2004 compared with March 2001. This will be calculated from the number of standards and part standards 1 –18 that were achieved in 2004 (minus PLS 1 (ii), 2 (i), 2 (ii), 3 (ii), 10 and 16, for which no standard measures were set in 2001) compared with the number of the same standards and part standards that were met at March 2001.

See the notes on page 5 explaining the operation of the scoring framework