CPD FRAMEWORK CASE STUDY: UNIVERSITY OF THE ARTS LONDON

This year London College of Communication (LCC) launched a pilot project to introduce a framework based on the AUA CPD framework. LCC is one of six colleges of the University of the Arts London (UAL). This project responded to the fact that there is currently no framework in place for professional and administrative staff to reflect on their own development needs, and the perceived need for stronger focus on soft skills which are more relevant in professional and administrative roles. The project aimed to provide a formal toolkit for staff and managers; promoting personal responsibility, recognition of strengths and identification of development needs, and opening up the space for conversation about employees' behavioural attributes as well as skills, while also providing insights to feed into an expanded staff development activity provision.

We had several desired outcomes:
1. To identify staff CPD needs and provide direction for the College's staff development provision.
2. To improve career development opportunities.
3. To provide opportunities to reward staff based on behaviours and soft-skills.
4. To promote job satisfaction through more clearly articulated objectives.

With the help of a small project group we made some amendments to the AUA framework: editing some of the language to align with UAL style, changing the colour scheme and renaming it the Professional and Personal development tool. In addition, we created a supporting booklet containing a menu of staff development opportunities with a particular focus on staff development opportunities that fell outside of the usual training and course offering (work-based development).

We piloted the new tool in this year's appraisal round for LCC professional and administrative staff on a voluntary basis. Positively, 56 out of total 79 professional and administrative staff attended a briefing/training session on using the tool with our AUA consultant. Following the appraisal round we surveyed staff to obtain feedback. 22 staff completed the survey of which 17 had used the tool. We suspect numbers using the tool was higher, but we stressed that the document was confidential between managers and staff, so do not know the exact take up. We also ran a focus group which gave valuable feedback to the project. Both this and the survey group indicated that the tool was a valuable and useful and had made a positive difference to those staff that had use it. We will also use this feedback to make further small changes for the coming year. These will include some changes to the language and exemplars. A key amendment recommended was to change the Wheel guidance from '*Where my organization needs me to be*' to '*Where I need to be for my role*'.

Following the pilot year, the project as business as usual within LCC this academic year, but we will expand the pilot to include the technical staff at LCC, and other professional

and administrative staff groups within other colleges and central services of the university in order to further evaluate the impact.

<u>What have we learned from the pilot?</u>

We placed significant emphasis on the ability of the tool to enable staff to identify their strengths as well as areas for development, and to speak to their managers about opportunities to build upon these. The role of the line manager was crucial to the success of the tool, both in encouraging use, but also to coach and develop staff and understand the opportunities available for staff development. We are looking at how we can increase our line managers' skills in this area, in order they are well placed to support staff in using the tool.

Senior level support for the tool, dedicated project management, and leadership in the local area during the pilot were all essential ingredients for successful roll-out. Ongoing support once a pilot has concluded should also be considered, and we are fortunate that this is being centrally led by our Organisational Development and Learning team.

One of the key challenges is how the success of the tool may be measured. Some of our measures were linked to the staff survey which only takes place every two years, making this a blunt tool. Additionally, the positive outcomes of development may only be realised over a long period and may not be immediately apparent. As the framework was not compulsory, and the document remained confidential between manager and staff, it was difficult to accurately assess engagement with the tool. Additionally, one of the intended outcomes – to identify staff CPD needs – was not possible.

We would welcome feedback from other HEIs who are using the tool to consider how we might better develop 'measures' for success, and also how they maintain engagement with the tool over a longer period.

October 2018