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Acknowledgement of Country

We acknowledge the traditional owners of the land where we meet today - the Jagera, Yuggera and Ugarapul peoples of the Ipswich and Springfield regions.

We also pay respect to Elders – past, present and future.
Today’s agenda

1. Practitioner-research and what led to this research
2. The research process
3. Research outcomes and next steps

What is ‘practitioner-research’?  What is a ‘practitioner-researcher’?

A ‘practitioner-researcher’ is someone on the inside looking around…it is the practitioner being curious in a formalised way, and wanting to know more about practice in order to make that practice better’

(Wilson, 2013, p. 112)
Where we started

“A structured process of articulating questions or problems, collecting, interpreting and applying valid and reliable evidence to support decision making and continuous service improvement in professional practice.”
(Howlett & Thorpe 2018)

Our context

• 27,000+ FTE student load
• 75% of our students study online
• 3 campus libraries; 65 FTE library staff
• Coordinator (Evidence-Based Practice) role created in October 2016
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How does a library leader know that the library’s service and practice is evidence-based?

Maturity models as a potential framework

- Capability maturity models - a continuum of incremental improvements, evolving from a less to a more mature or effective level in a specific competency (Nelson et al 2015).
- Existing examples in academic and research libraries:
  - Learning Organisation Maturity Model (Hallam, Hiskens & Ong 2014)
  - Quality Maturity Model (Wilson 2015)
  - User Experience (UX) Maturity Model (MacDonald 2017)
  - Library Assessment Capability Model (Hart & Amos 2018)
**Practitioner-research: the stars align**

- Research mindset & skills
- Practice gap
- Literature gap

A practitioner-researcher perspective benefits practice at both local and professional levels.

---

**What we did**

Question: How does a university library leader know that the library’s service and practice is evidence-based?

- 16 semi-structured interviews with library professionals across Australia and New Zealand.
- Transcripts were thematically analysed to identify the dimensions and levels of the draft maturity model.
Our practitioner-research experience

A practitioner ‘lens’ on the research process sees insight that can be immediately applicable to professional practice.
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What we found

EBLIP experiences appeared to be on a continuum around three main themes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>how evidence-based practice was approached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>who was involved in evidence-based practice and how they were involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>the types of evidence involved in a library’s process and an awareness of its limitations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Research outcomes: three themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articulate</td>
<td>Shared understanding/Approach</td>
<td>Perceptions &amp; understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemble</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Role &amp; focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>Role of leaders (from Partridge, Edwards &amp; Thorpe, 2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply/Agree</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapt</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from Koufogiannakis &amp; Brettle, 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Koufogiannakis & Brettle, 2016*

---

### An initial EBLIP capability maturity model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AD HOC/SPORADIC</td>
<td>A lot of decisions were just made on people’s personal opinion. (I10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JUSTIFYING</td>
<td>I hear a lot of that justifying, “The evidence is telling us this, but that’s because blah &amp; blah”. Then we don’t have to do anything about it, because we can justify it. (I13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EMERGING</td>
<td>Having a process around the collection &amp; evaluation of the information that you’re going through making a business case for a change. (I2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EXPERIMENTING</td>
<td>You’re really thinking through all the ramifications of the decision and then what kind of example you can get, or evidence from other libraries or other businesses (I4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TRANSFORMING</td>
<td>I see it in terms of the library conducting itself, and being managed, and being driven forward, on the basis of evidence-based practice. (I11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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So what? What's next?

Done – not perfect
Conversation starter

Raised more questions
Make it useful & applicable to others

EBLIP capability is key to maturity

The capabilities and skills that reside and can be cultivated in staff, are significant indicators of organisational EBLIP maturity.
Find out more
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