East Lancashire Hospitals **NHS**
NHS Trust

**ELHT Library
& Knowledge
Services**

Bringing evidence & practice together

ELHT Library & Knowledge Services Impact Survey June 2015

Contents	Page

Safe | Personal | Effective

ELHT LKS Impact Surveys, June 2015: Summary of combined results

Executive summary

In line with best practice in healthcare knowledge and library services, and to meet criteria within the NHS Library Quality Assurance Framework (LQAF), the library service recently conducted a three-part survey (via SurveyMonkey), to assess the impact of three areas of library activity:

- the literature search service
- library and information skills training
- the ELHT Evidence Hub portal.

The survey has been worthwhile in highlighting the impact that such services make on professional development (including academic study), research activity, and particularly patient care. All three services surveyed received positive replies from at least 50% of respondents in relation to:

- Supporting Trust objectives and improvement priorities
- Informing clinical decision making
- Helping staff to keep up to date
- Aiding professional development
- Informing service improvement.

There were also significant positive replies in relation to

- Contributing to guideline policy and procedure review
- Informing training and presentations.

Regular repetition of such surveys will help to monitor development of impact, and case studies from specific individuals and teams will provide further depth to the analysis of impact.

The response rate to the literature searching and training surveys was disappointingly low; we will therefore need to review the best means of gathering impact data for these services.

While marketing and promotional activity for the Evidence Hub has considerably increased awareness since a previous survey conducted in October 2014 (from 42% to 82% of respondents), usage – particularly of the Knowledge Centres designed to support specialties, professional groups and Trust-wide initiatives – was still disappointingly low. A key to increasing usage will be the library team working with and through departments, Educational Boards and other groups to raise awareness and develop content.

Graham Haldane
Library & Knowledge Services Manager
20 July 2015

ELHT LKS Impact SurveyJune 2015: Summary of combined results

1.   Strategic context

The ELHT Library & Knowledge Service (LKS) exists to support the staff, trainees and students of East Lancashire Hospitals NHS Trust, and ultimately the patients the Trust cares. The LKS works within the following Trust Strategic Framework:

ELHT Strategic Framework
Our Vision
• To be widely recognised for providing safe, personal and effective care
Our Objectives
• Put safety and quality at the heart of everything we do
• Invest in and develop our workforce
• Work with key stakeholders to develop effective partnerships
• Encourage innovation and pathway reform and deliver best practice
• Become a successful foundation trust
Our Improvement Priorities
• Reducing mortality
• Avoiding unnecessary admissions
• Enhancing communications and engagement
• Delivering reliable care
• Timeliness of care

To support this Framework, the LKS has developed a strategy for 2014-17, in which the key features are:

ELHT LKS Strategy 2014-17
Our Vision
• To enable all ELHT staff and students on placement to provide Safe, Personal and Effective care for every patient, every time through the provision of appropriate and timely evidence, resources and services
Our CORE Priorities
• Clinical
• Organisational
• Research & innovation
• Education & learning
• Trust-wide alignment and engagement
Our Improvement Priorities
• Enable   – delivery of reliable and timely care
• Engage   – with customers and stakeholders
• Enhance – quality
• Ensure   – appropriate learning environment

2. Rationale for survey

- The Library & Knowledge Service needs to ensure that it is responding to and anticipating user needs, supporting Trust priorities and providing value for money.
- It is good practice to gather feedback from users through various means, including measuring the impact of services. (NHS LKS 2015)
- There is a particular requirement within the Library Quality Assurance Framework (LQAF) for NHS Libraries that 'The positive impact of library/knowledge services can be demonstrated' (Criterion 1.3c). This is a criterion for which the ELHT service has only achieved 'Partial Compliance' in recent years, and we aim to increase this to 'Full Compliance' through impact surveys, gathering case studies and other means. (HEE LKSL 2015 & 2014, LIHNN 2015)

Prior to this survey, during 2014/15:
- Feedback forms from library and information skills training sessions have been gathered and input into SurveyMonkey to monitor responses and trends
- A survey of the ELHT Evidence Hub was conducted in October 2014, one of the key findings of which was that awareness needed to be raised considerably
- Work has begun on gathering case studies from a range of library users.

3. Methodology and response rate

On 12 and 15 June 2015, the following staff were invited to complete an impact questionnaire via SurveyMonkey:
- Those requesting one or more literature searches during 2014/15
- Those attending one or more library and information skills training sessions during 2014/15
- Those on the email alert lists for content within the ELHT Evidence Hub (most of these are by specialty)

There was a separate questionnaire for each of the above groups, but many questions overlapped to allow comparison. Staff were asked to respond by Friday 26 June, and entry to a draw for an Amazon voucher was offered as an incentive.

All results on SurveyMonkey were then analysed by the Library & Knowledge Services Manager, and summarised into this report.

Table 1: Survey response summary	Literature searches	Library training	Evidence Hub
No. invited to complete survey	64	108	Several thousand
No. starting the survey (excl. duplicate entries)	27	16	292
No. indicating active usage of the Evidence Hub	n/a	n/a	88
No. completing most sections	24	16	65-80
No. entering the prize draw	17	9	141

4. Benefits of the library services surveyed

All three service aspects (literature searching, library training and the Evidence Hub) provided considerable personal benefit to respondents.

> Invest in and develop our workforce

Table 2: Personal benefit to respondents *Respondents replying 'Yes' to* *'Has the [service] …'*	Literature searches	Library training	Evidence Hub
Saved you time?	**95.65% ***	**80.00% ***	**90.79% ***
Raised your awareness of evidence based resources?	**100.00% ***	**93.75% ***	**92.21% ***
Improved your ability to access resources?	**95.45% ***	**93.33% ***	**89.47% ***
Improved your own searching skills?	**80.95% ***	**87.50% ***	**79.73% ***
Made you aware that you need further training in the use of online/library resources?	**66.67% ***	**87.50% ***	**78.38% ***
Total respondents	**24**	**16**	**80**

Items in the tables within this report where questions have received a positive response from 50% or more of respondents are highlighted in bold with an asterisk (e.g. **95.65% ***)

> *The library services completing this search allowed me to concentrate on other things and significantly reduced my workload.*

> *[The Evidence Hub] saved me time for assignments or research work for projects.*

Respondents were asked to indicate whether the surveyed services had been used to support the following aspects of Safe Personal Effective care.

> Put safety and quality at the heart of everything we do

Table 3: Benefit to Safe Personal Effective care	Literature searches	Library training	Evidence Hub
SAFE care			
Audit	20.83%	37.50%	30.14%
Care pathway development	45.83%	25.00%	39.73%
Clinical decision making	**62.50% ***	**50.00% ***	**53.42% ***
Risk reduction	16.67%	6.25%	28.77%
Training & presentations (delivery of)	**62.50% ***	43.75%	**56.16% ***
None of the above	8.33%	6.25%	5.48%

PERSONAL care & development			
Direct patient care	**58.33% ***	37.50%	46.58%
Academic assignment	37.50%	**50.00% ***	41.10%
Keeping up to date	**58.33% ***	**50.00% ***	**72.60% ***
Personal development	**54.17% ***	**75.00% ***	**75.34% ***
Publication (writing of)	16.67%	6.25%	15.07%
None of the above	0.00%	0.00%	2.74%

	Literature searches	Library training	Evidence Hub
EFFECTIVE care			
Cost saving	16.67%	12.50%	20.55%
Guideline, policy or procedure review	**58.33% ***	43.75%	**54.79% ***
Research	29.17%	**56.25% ***	42.47%
Service improvement	**66.67% ***	**68.75% ***	**65.75% ***
Service planning & decision making	25.00%	43.75%	38.36%
Systematic review	20.83%	37.50%	20.55%
None of the above	8.33%	0.00%	9.59%
Total respondents	**24**	**16**	**73**

I have used the information gained … to help define a new multicentre research project.

The literature search carried out was invaluable, it enhance my knowledge and skills greatly and supported me when discussing issues in relation to service delivery.

5. Library service alignment with Trust objectives and priorities

Respondents were given four options:

- Not relevant to this search
- Marginally relevant
- Confirming direction
- Significant relevant new information

Encourage innovation & pathway reform, and deliver best practice

The following chart shows the percentage of respondents selecting either 'Confirming direction' or 'Significant relevant new information' (with the 'Significant …' % in brackets)

Table 4: Library service support for Trust objectives	Literature searches	Library training	Evidence Hub
Putting safety and quality at the heart of everything we do	**81.82% *** (31.82%)	**68.75% *** (12.50%)	**70.59% *** (20.59%)
Investing in and developing our workforce	**52.38% *** (28.57%)	**50.00% *** (18.75%)	**53.97% *** (17.46%)
Working with key stakeholders to develop effective partnerships	33.34% (16.67%)	43.75% (18.75%)	40.00% (12.31%)
Encouraging innovation and pathway reform, and delivering best practice	**82.61% *** (39.13%)	**62.50% *** (31.25%)	**68.12% *** (21.74%)
Becoming a successful Foundation Trust	21.05% (0.00%)	25.00% (12.50%)	37.09% (12.90%)

For 3 of the above **Trust objectives**, the evaluated services have helped 50% or more of respondents either to confirm direction or identify significant new information.

We are working to capacity but it is imperative that when representing the Division or the Trust at meetings the relevant information is discussed and presented and that the evidence has been reviewed to support practice.

Respondents were given the same answer options as above, related to improvement priorities.

	Deliver reliable care		
Table 5: Library service support for Trust improvement priorities	Literature searches	Library training	Evidence Hub
Reducing mortality	21.05%	18.75%	39.39%
	(5.26%)	(0.00%)	(15.15%)
Avoiding unnecessary admissions	25.00%	31.25%	32.82%
	(15.00%)	(6.25%)	(9.38%)
Enhancing communication and engagement with patients and public	**55.00% ***	43.75%	**58.21% ***
	(15.00%)	(25.00%)	(19.40%)
Delivering reliable care	**79.16% ***	**62.50% ***	**68.11% ***
	(33.33%)	(25.00%)	(15.94%)
Timeliness of care	**60.00% ***	31.25%	**56.72% ***
	(25.00%)	(18.75%)	(16.42%)

Literature searches and the Evidence Hub clearly assist over 50% of respondents for 3 of the above **improvement priorities**, while training in information skills makes a significant difference to 'Delivering reliable care'.

As a service improvement lead … it's an invaluable resource that enables me to look at evidence-based best practice.

Looking for information to update guidelines.

6.   Recommendation of Library & Knowledge services

When asked if they would recommend the surveyed aspects of library services to colleagues, there was overwhelming endorsement:

Enhance communication and engagement

Table 6: Recommendation of service to ELHT colleagues	Literature searches	Library training	Evidence Hub
Yes	**100.00% ***	**100.00% ***	**98.46% ***
No	0.00%	0.00%	1.54%

This will hopefully generate further use of the surveyed services, as word of mouth recommendation from colleagues within the same field is always likely to carry more weight than any amount of promotional and marketing activity from the library service.

7. Summary

The surveys have been worthwhile in highlighting the impact that such services make on professional development (including academic study), research activity, and particularly patient care. All three services surveyed received positive replies from at least 50% of respondents in relation to:

- Supporting Trust objectives and improvement priorities
- Informing clinical decision making
- Helping staff to keep up to date
- Aiding professional development
- Informing service improvement.

There were also significant positive replies in relation to

- Contributing to guideline policy and procedure review
- Informing training and presentations.

Regular repetition of such surveys will help to monitor development of impact, and case studies from specific individuals and teams will provide further depth to the analysis of impact.

The response rate to the literature searching and training surveys was disappointingly low; we will therefore need to review the best means of gathering impact data for these services.

While marketing and promotional activity for the Evidence Hub has considerably increased awareness since a previous survey conducted in October 2014 (from 42% to 80% of respondents), usage – particularly of the Knowledge Centres designed to support specialties, professional groups and Trust-wide initiatives – was still disappointingly low. A key to increasing usage will be the library team working with and through departments, Educational Boards and other groups to raise awareness and develop content.

Graham Haldane
Library & Knowledge Services Manager
1 July 2015

References

NHS LKS (2015) *Impact Toolkit*. NHS Library & Knowledge Services Available at:
http://www.libraryservices.nhs.uk/forlibrarystaff/impactassessment/impact_toolkit.html

HEE LKSL (2015) *NHS Library & Knowledge Services Wiki. 1.3 Operational Management*. Health Education England Library & Knowledge Service Leads. Available at:
http://www.libraryservices.nhs.uk/wiki/LQAF.1-3-Operational-Management.ashx

HEE LKSL (2014) *NHS Library Quality Assurance Framework (LQAF) England.* Version 2.3, May 2014. Health Education England Library & Knowledge Service Leads Available at:
http://www.libraryservices.nhs.uk/document_uploads/LQAF/LQAF_Version_2.3_May_2014.pdf

LIHNN (2015) *LIHNN wiki. 3.1.1.1 Library Quality Assurance Framework (LQAF) – Impact*. Library & Information for Healthcare Network NorthWest. Available at:
http://resources.lihnn.nhs.uk/wiki/QualityGroup.3-1-1-Impact.ashx?NoRedirect=1&NS=QualityGroup

APPENDIX 1: Respondent details

Table A1.1: Division or Directorate of respondents	Literature searches	Library training	Evidence Hub
D&CS	40.74%	50.00%	42.12%
Family Care	22.22%	0.00%	15.41%
Integrated Care Group	14.81%	25.00%	18.15%
Surgery & Anaesthetics	11.11%	18.75%	15.41%
Estates & Facilities	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Finance & Informatics	0.00%	0.00%	0.68%
HR&OD	3.70%	0.00%	3.42%
Other Corporate (incl. Executive, Governance)	7.41%	6.25%	4.79%
Total respondents	**27**	**16**	**292**

Table A1.2: Staff group of respondents	Literature searches	Library training	Evidence Hub
Administrative & Clerical	7.69%	6.25%	20.98%
Additional Clinical Services	0.00%	0.00%	3.15%
Additional Professional Scientific & Technical	0.00%	0.00%	2.45%
Allied Health Professionals	53.85%	43.75%	19.93%
Estates & Ancillary	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Healthcare Scientists	0.00%	0.00%	4.20%
Medical & Dental	11.54%	25.00%	12.24%
Nursing & Midwifery Registered	26.92%	25.00%	35.66%
Executive Director/Director/Non-Exec Director	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Senior Manager	0.00%	0.00%	1.05%
Students	0.00%	0.00%	0.35%
Total respondents	**26**	**14**	**286**

The relatively high level of responses from the D&CS Division and Allied Health Professionals reflects the level of engagement of the Division with the Clinical Outreach Librarian, who has been actively involved in the D&CS Education Board.

APPENDIX 2: Literature Search survey – unique questions

Table A2.1: Use of literature searches	Responses	%
I obtained some of the full text articles myself for further reading (either in electronic or print format)	15	**55.69% ***
I asked the library staff to obtain some of the full text articles on my behalf	11	42.31%
I shared the literature search results with colleagues within the organisation (e.g. email, word of mouth, team meeting, teaching session, presentation, journal club)	15	**57.69% ***
I shared the literature search results I received with colleagues outside the organisation	3	11.54%
I haven't done any of the above yet	3	11.54%
Total	**26**	

Table A2.2: How literature searches have helped respondents and their work areas Responses (9)
Already had the training, but it's a time issue. It's great to have this support from the library so I can continue spending most of my time on patient care. Thanks.
A fabulous service, my time and literature search knowledge is limited, as a service improvement lead in both my recent jobs, it's an invaluable resource that enables me to look at evidence-based best practice in other areas.
Literature searching is a skill that needs some practice to perform effectively and the training opportunities provided by ELHT Library staff is very much appreciated. I would just like to add that all staff have been very supportive whenever I have had to approach them for assistance.
Overall the help provided to obtain these articles was excellent.
I work in a busy job and do not get much time for reflective practice and CPD. Having support to locate up to date papers and journal articles is very important and appreciated. I also work in the community a lot and don't always have the resources to undertake literature searches, so it is very helpful to have this kind of support. As I am developing my clinical skills in new areas, the library's service is valuable in supporting my professional understanding or the research base. I hope it will inform future research projects if I have any students/trainees on placement with me.
The literature search carried out was invaluable, it enhanced my knowledge and skills greatly and supported me when discussing issues in relation to the service delivery during meeting, allowing me to have an objective outlook and contribute fully to the meeting.
It was supportive in understanding how to drill down. Assisted in time saving for searching for evidence.
The occupational therapy service has an online resource for therapists to access with regards to clinical conditions and appropriate therapeutic interventions. This resource is evidence based and is maintained throughout the year by carrying out relevant literature reviews. The library have been extremely useful during this process and have supported its development.
I have used the information gained from the search related to image blur to help define a new multicentre research project.
Invaluable as clinicians are encouraged to minimise time away from patients but provide a safe and responsive service. A small amount of input initially helped me to continue alone.

APPENDIX 3: Library & Information Skills Training survey – unique questions

Table A3.1: Training benefit	Responses	%
I learnt a lot	15	**93.75% ***
I knew most of the session content already	0	0.00%
I already knew quite a lot, but learnt a little	2	12.5%
I didn't know much, but didn't learn much either	0	0.00%
Total respondents	**16**	

These findings substantiate the responses from evaluation forms distributed at the end of training sessions. During 2014/15, 43 respondents returned completed forms, with 97.67% indicating 'I learnt a lot'.

Table A3.2: How library & information skills training has helped respondents and their work areas Responses (11)
Excellent training session that made me look differently as to how I search for research.
In training other pharmacy staff in trials it has made me better at explaining the rationale for trial design.
It has help guide me on the best approach to use the resources available. This has been extremely valuable intellectual worth.
Not attended library training sessions [attended Critical Appraisal study day]
I've recently completed a post graduate course in mammography for the Trust and this course helped with my assignments.
Health and safety information.
I have used it to keep up to date with certain areas of clinical practice.
Very useful.
I have recently completed the BSc CSP degree course at UCLan, the library session was invaluable to me.
Good session – things have moved on since I last had to do a lit search.
Judy was extremely helpful on many occasions and v patient.

Table A3.3: Further training options	Responses	%
Group training within your department	8	**50.00% ***
Online learning (e-learning)	7	43.75%
Short updates at Grand Rounds	2	12.50%
Locating evidence for policy/procedure/pathway review	6	37.50%
Getting the best out of AnatomyTV	5	31.25%
Getting the best out of the Cochrane Library	4	25.00%
Getting the best out of UpToDate	5	31.25%
None of the above	1	6.25%
Respondents	**16**	

The Clinical Outreach Librarian is already planning to increase bespoke sessions within departments, and reduce the number of pre-planned group sessions offered in library training rooms (due to reduced uptake). Further uptake needs to be particularly targeted in the ICG and Surgery & Anaesthetics Divisions.

APPENDIX 4: ELHT Evidence Hub survey – unique questions

Table A4.1: Usage and awareness of the Evidence Hub	Responses	%
I used the ELHT Evidence Hub before Oct 2014, and continue to do so	43	16.54%
I have started using the ELHT Evidence Hub since Oct 2014	45	17.31%
I am aware of the ELHT Evidence Hub, but have still not used it	126	48.46%
I was unaware that the ELHT Evidence Hub existed	49	18.85%
Total respondents	**260**	
Respondents using the Evidence Hub in June 2015	88	33.85%
Respondents aware of the Evidence Hub in June 2015	214	**82.31% ***
Oct 2014 survey – respondents aware of the Evidence Hub		41.83%

It is pleasing to note that awareness of the Evidence Hub among survey respondents has increased from 41.83% in Oct 2014 to 82.31% in June 2015. This is likely to be due to a range of promotional activity, enhanced content, and the work of the Clinical Outreach Librarian in engaging with Divisions and departments.

The proportionally high number of responses from A&C staff, most of whom had not used the Evidence Hub, slightly distorts the usage figures. If A&C staff are excluded, usage increases to 37.91% and awareness to 84.83%.

Table A4.2: How the Evidence Hub has helped respondents and their work areas Responses (12)
Looking for information to update guidelines.
References for academic essays.
Helped when looking up information for courses.
Already aware of how to access resources, used it for convenience sometimes but not exclusively. Often needed to access resources that I did not appear to be able to locate from Evidence Hub.
As a newly qualified AP (Assistant Practitioner) a large part of information needed for my course was found using the Evidence Hub.
Helped get more information for relevant topics.
I can quickly find information relevant to my clinical area of dietetics.
I have recently applied to go to university. I used the Hub with assistance from library staff to do research for an essay.
One site for accessing literature and saved me time for assignments or research work for projects. Easy to use and very quick.
It is just another resource to those I would use anyway.
I feel that I can use the Evidence Hub but perhaps I am not getting the best from it. I am sure that there is a lot more information that I could gain access to and that some further training may help me to do this.
Lit search is an excellent service and saves me significant time. [Literature searches can be requested via the Evidence Hub using an online form]

Table A4.3: Use of specific sections of the Evidence Hub - Respondents (66)	Used	Aware of (but not used)	Not aware of
Core Resources link page	**62.90% ***	27.42%	9.68%
Core Journals link page	**57.14% ***	33.33%	9.52%
Knowledge Centres for specialties	33.90%	54.24%	11.86%
Knowledge Centres for professional groups	38.71%	46.77%	14.52%
Knowledge Centres for Trust-wide initiatives	28.33%	51.67%	20.00%
NHS Improvement Blog	13.56%	47.46%	38.98%
ELHT Staff Publications	41.67%	36.67%	21.67%
Library Services information	**50.85% ***	47.46%	1.69%
Library training information	42.37%	54.24%	3.39%

The Core Journals page was created in response to comments in the Oct 2014 survey. While over 60% of respondents are aware of all sections, usage of the Knowledge Centres (which were the original core of the Hub) is relatively disappointing. Further promotion is also needed of the relatively new NHS Improvement Blog (a related bulletin is planned).

For future surveys, we will want to use the above data as a baseline for measuring usage and awareness.

Safe | Personal | Effective