

Department for Culture Media and Sport

Public Library Position Statement and Standards Report 2004

Assessment Framework

Note: Where the word “innovative” is used, it means that the aspect being assessed is innovative in a national context

1. Corporate vision				
Section	1 -Weak	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent
<p>1.1 Vision and ambition for the public library service. The evidence for this should be assessed from the entire Position Statement and Standards Report and not solely from the response to Chapter 1 in Section 3.</p>	<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 priority for the authority 	<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 the library service is a priority for the authority. 	<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 vision is convincing, with evidence that the library service is one of the authority’s priorities. 	<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 important priority for the authority.

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

Section	1 -Weak	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent
<p>1.1 Vision and ambition for the public library service. The evidence for this should be assessed from the entire Public Library Statement and Standards report .(cont.)</p>	<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.
<p>2. Response to <i>Framework for the Future</i></p>				
<p>2.1 General points which should be included in each of the sections in this chapter</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The analysis of key strengths, constraints and challenges is weak and inconsistent. ▪ The headlines of policies and practices are not challenging. ▪ There are weak or non-existent evaluation proposals, which are not built into the policy development proposals. ▪ Priorities and targets are weak, not challenging and do not relate to the identified constraints and challenges. ▪ The authority has not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The analysis of key strengths, constraints and challenges is fair. ▪ The headlines of policies and practices cover both adults and children. ▪ There are fair evaluation proposals, but these are not built in to the policy development proposals. ▪ Priorities and targets are reasonable, not challenging, and only partly relate to the identified constraints 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The analysis of key strengths, constraints and challenges is good. ▪ The headlines of policies and practices cover both adults and children well. ▪ The evaluation proposals are good, with some linkage to the development proposals. ▪ Priorities and targets are good, with some element of challenge, and show a clear relationship to some of the identified constraints and challenges. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The analysis of key strengths, constraints and challenges is succinct, focussed and concentrates on major issues. ▪ The headlines of policies and practices for adults and children are clearly stated, innovative, developmental, challenging and build firmly on the analysis. ▪ Evaluation is solidly built into the processes with feedback to policy development.

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

	<p>demonstrated that it is building on an open, neutral and self help culture.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Occasional timescales are stated. 	<p>and challenges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The authority has provided fair evidence that it is building on some aspects of an open, neutral and self help culture. ▪ Some timescales are stated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The authority has demonstrated that it is building on most aspects of an open, neutral and self help culture. ▪ Timescales are stated for all development proposals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Priorities and targets are challenging, and fully relate to the identified constraints and challenges. ▪ The authority has demonstrated that it is building on an open, neutral and self help culture. ▪ The timescales are clearly stated, are challenging, and achievable.
2.2 Points specific to each section in chapter 2	1 -Weak	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent
2.2.1 Books, reading and learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a weak linkage to the authority's Educational Development Plan ▪ There are weak statements about informal learning opportunities. ▪ There are no activities to support informal learning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reasonable linkage to the authority's Educational Development Plan ▪ Reasonable statements about informal learning opportunities but lacking focussed activities for informal learning opportunities. ▪ Informal learning opportunities are available in only 1 or 2 service points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good linkage to the authority's Educational Development Plan ▪ Good statements about informal learning opportunities, but with few focussed activities for informal learning. ▪ Informal learning opportunities are available in the majority of service points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excellent linkages to the authority's Educational Development Plan, with the library service's contribution to educational development clearly stated. ▪ Excellent statements about informal learning opportunities, with focussed activities across the full range of informal learning opportunities. ▪ Informal learning opportunities are

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

				available in most or all service points.
Section	1 -Weak	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent
2.2.2 Digital citizenship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very few library services may be accessed by users electronically, with remote access significantly less extensive than 'in library' access. ▪ Weak evidence of the library service's involvement in implementing the authority's e-government strategy, with no involvement by the library service in developing the e-government strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some of the possible library services may be accessed by users electronically 'in library' and remotely. ▪ There is evidence that the library service is involved in implementing some of the authority's e-government strategy, but with very little involvement by the library service in developing the e-government strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most possible library services may be accessed by users electronically 'in library' and remotely. ▪ Good evidence of the library service's involvement in developing and implementing the authority's e-government strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Users may access all possible library services electronically, 'in library' and remotely. ▪ Very convincing evidence of the library service's involvement in developing and implementing the authority's e-government strategy, with the library service responding innovatively to the authority's e-government strategy.
2.2.3 Community and civic values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very few actions to assist library users and non-users to develop citizenship and to encourage a community identity are identified. ▪ No library spaces are used to provide other facilities beyond the basic library service. ▪ There is very little linkage to the authority's plans to improve and develop customer services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some actions to assist library users and non-users to develop citizenship and to encourage a community identity are shown. ▪ A few library spaces are used to provide other facilities beyond the basic library service. ▪ There is some linkage to the authority's plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is evidence of a significant number of actions to assist library users and non-users to develop citizenship and to encourage a community identity. ▪ Some library spaces are used to provide other facilities beyond the basic library service. ▪ There is good evidence of linkages to the authority's plans to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is an extensive range of innovative actions to assist library users and non-users to develop citizenship and to encourage a community identity. ▪ Many library spaces are used to provide other facilities beyond the basic library service. ▪ The library service provides innovative proposals within the

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

		to improve and develop customer services.	improve and develop customer services.	authority's plans to improve and develop customer services.
Section	1 -Weak	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent
2.2.4 Building capacity to deliver transformation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is very little evidence of actions to improve leadership, staff capacity and skills. ▪ Few partnerships are either in place or proposed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is evidence of some actions to improve leadership, staff capacity and skills. ▪ Some partnerships are either in place or proposed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is evidence of many actions to improve leadership, staff capacity and skills. ▪ Many partnerships are either in place or proposed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is evidence of substantial and innovative action to improve leadership, staff capacity and skills. ▪ There is an extensive range of partnerships either in place or proposed, including innovative partnerships.

Public Library Position Statement and Standards Report 2004 Assessment Framework

3. 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>3.1 Public Library Standards - "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries" PLS 1 to 18. Standards met at March 31st 2004 (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.)</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.
<p>3.2 Public Library Standards - "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries" PLS 1 to 18. Progress in meeting standards since March 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>3.3 Public Library Standards, "Comprehensive, efficient and modern public libraries" PLS 1 to 18.</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**

Standards not met at March 31st 2004				
<p><u>Notes</u> <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>				
Section	1 -Weak	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent
3.4 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**

4. 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>4.1 Spaces, 4.2 Stock, 4.3 Staffing, 4.4 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.