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1 Executive summary

1.1 In late 2018 Libraries Connected commissioned Shared Intelligence to undertake a review of the current impact and use of the Universal Offers and make recommendations about the sustainable future development, structure and role of the offers.

1.2 The Universal Offers were originally launched in 2013 in order to “demonstrate the power of public libraries to enrich the lives of individuals and their communities”. Since then the Universal Offers have been developed incrementally, each led by a working groups of public library practitioners. They now cover six areas which are considered essential for a library service to deliver and to ensure library users have access to a quality service. The six areas are: Culture, Digital, Health, Information, Learning, and Reading.

Continuing to develop the offers is central to the aims of Libraries Connected to help its members deliver and develop services. The content of each Universal Offers is described in more detail in Section 3 of this report. The offers were developed in partnership with stakeholders, such as The Reading Agency and Arts Council England, and informed by customer research and consultation. There is also a Children’s Promise and the public libraries ‘Six Steps’ for blind and partially sighted people. These are similar to the Universal Offers in terms of content and method of development, but we have not focused on them in any detail for this study.

1.3 We were set four research questions for this research:

1. What is the impact of the Universal Offers?
2. How effective is the articulation of the Universal Offers and their benefits, and how well are these understood?
3. What is the potential for the further development of the Universal Offers and how should they be developed in the future?
4. How can we streamline management and coordination to reduce burden, provide control and allow local flexibility?

1.4 The research was carried out using the following methods: desk research; surveys of library staff and heads of service; stakeholder interviews; and workshops with heads of service and a development group. Initial findings were tested with a reference group organised by Libraries Connected.

Summary of key findings

1.5 Reaction to the Universal Offers has been overwhelmingly positive, although we heard many ideas about how they can be improved. Both library staff and heads of service perceived the Digital and Reading offers to have the greatest impact on both the customer and the library service. However, library staff and heads of service differed in their rating of the perceived impact of the Health and Information offers. The Learning and Culture offers were perceived as having a lower impact by both. The extent that library practitioners make use of each individual offer is often linked with the impact they believe each offer to have.
1.6 Heads of service reported using the offers strategically to plan services and build partnerships. Library staff reported using the Universal Offers in more practical ways, particularly through group activities and events, and many described the offers as being engrained in what they do. Despite positive views about the offers generally, all those we heard from saw challenges, notably confusion over purpose and intended audience, overlap, and lack of simplicity. Some also highlighted confusion over the relationship between the offers and the Libraries Taskforce outcomes.

1.7 While the tick-box answers to our survey indicated the offers are well understood, survey comments and interviews suggest confusion caused by several issues. This is particularly the case around the purpose of the Universal Offers, their intended audience (external or internal), their consistency and their articulation as either activities or outcomes.

1.8 Library staff and heads of service wanted to see the Universal Offers develop in two ways simultaneously:

- Firstly, as a practical tool which focuses on programming materials and events
- Secondly, as a strategic tool for advocacy and partnership building regionally and nationally.

1.9 Our findings suggest that in developing the offers further two big questions must be considered:

- Are they a firm commitment or a looser framework?
- What are the problems we are trying to solve, and who is the intended audience?

**Conclusions and recommendations**

We have suggested a framework around which to base future development of the offers (with a new working title of ‘Universal Library Offers’) and we believe this will help clarify their purpose.
1.10 We end our report with the following recommendations:

1. Libraries Connected adopt Figure A as a new overarching framework for the Universal Library Offers [Working Title]

2. Libraries Connected develop clear strategic statements describing each offer of around 100 words

3. Libraries Connected use the Universal Library Offers as a platform for proactive partnership building and advocacy at a national, regional and local level:
   - At a local level, by individual services
   - At a regional level, collaboratively, using the existing structures
   - At a national level, as a distinct responsibility within the Libraries Connected national team

4. Libraries Connected use the new Universal Library Offers to develop additional materials using project-based and grant funding/income from national partners

5. Libraries Connected re-align the existing national groups that support the offers with the new framework

6. Libraries Connected review all existing resources produced under the current offers headings to identify which can be incorporated in the new Universal Libraries Offer framework

7. Libraries Connected develop an evaluation framework linked to the offers to enable them to demonstrate the impact of the offers, continue their development and improvement, and support the sector in evidence-gathering around the offers

8. Libraries Connected continue using the development group convened for this project as champions and advisors as the new framework is embedded into practice
9. Libraries Connected (in partnership with the other relevant national bodies) consider what leadership and frontline level professional development support would enable the sector to capitalise on the offers to increase public library impact.

10. Libraries Connected map the relationship between the new offers and the Six Steps and Children’s Promises.
2 Introduction

2.1 In late 2018 Libraries Connected commissioned Shared Intelligence to undertake a review of the current impact and use of the Universal Offers and make recommendations about the sustainable future development, structure and role of the offers.

2.2 The Universal Offers were originally launched in 2013 in order to “demonstrate the power of public libraries to enrich the lives of individuals and their communities”1. Since then the Universal Offers have been developed incrementally, each led by a working groups of public library practitioners. They now cover six areas which are considered essential for a library service to deliver and ensure customers have access to a quality service. The Universal Offers represent a commitment to quality provision across six core areas of public library services. These core areas are: Culture, Digital, Health, Information, Learning, and Reading.

The Universal Offers as they currently stand are discussed in more detail in Section 3 of the report. They are central to the aim of Libraries Connected to help its members deliver their core library offer and develop new services. The offers were developed in partnership with stakeholders, such as The Reading Agency and Arts Council England, and informed by customer research and consultation with stakeholders. There is also a Children’s Promise and the public libraries ‘Six Steps’ for blind and partially sighted people. These are similar to the Universal Offers both in terms of content, and how they were developed, but we have not focused on them in any detail for this study.

2.3 The purpose of this strategic review is to understand how the Universal Offers are now being used and how they can be developed further and continue to provide a positive articulation of what public libraries offer. This review comes a year after the Society of Chief Librarians (which oversaw the development of the offers) transformed from an unincorporated organisation into a new charity, Libraries Connected, with full time staff and increased capacity to deliver.

2.4 This review also comes at a time of continued financial pressures on local authorities (who provide the bulk of public funding for public libraries), with authorities having to decide on the future of their local public service ‘core offer’ in terms of what it provides and to whom, from road repairs to social care, how it is funded, and the underpinning rationale.

2.5 This report includes:

- A summary of the Universal Offers in their current form
- Our methodology
- The key findings of the research
- A discussion of the research findings
- Conclusions we draw from these findings
- Recommendations for the future development of the Universal Offers.

1 www.librariesconnected.org.uk
3 The current Universal Offers

3.1 There are six Universal Offers, each of which were developed individually between 2012 and 2017 by self-organised groups of public library practitioners, with Libraries Connected (then the Society of Chief Librarians) playing a light-touch co-ordinating role. This chapter provides a summary of the purpose of each Universal Offer and offers insight into the activities that have been developed.

Reading Offer

3.2 The Reading Offer was the first Universal Offer and aims to help create a more literate and confident society by developing, delivering and promoting reading activities in libraries. It seeks to formalise the many and varied ‘reader development’ activities which take place in public libraries. The Summer Reading Challenge for children and the Reading Ahead six book challenge for adults are two of the most visible Reading Offer activities, both developed jointly with The Reading Agency. The offer covers many other reader development activities such as World Book Night and rhyme times.

Information Offer

3.3 The goal of the Information Offer is that all library users are supported to access quality information and online services in areas such as careers, health, personal finance and benefits. The aim is to provide library users with access to good quality information plus help for those who lack the necessary skills, equipment, or confidence. The offer is delivered through library staff and volunteers supported by e-learning resources and a public-facing database of citizen information called Information4living. The Information Offer (launched in 2013) was one of the first to be produced. Since its launch the overlap between the Information and Digital offers has, understandably, grown.

Health Offer

3.4 The goal of the Health Offer, another of the first offers to be developed, is to improve the health and wellbeing of local communities by providing a range of services aimed at connecting people. The Reading Well, books on prescription programme helps people manage their own health and wellbeing forms an important part of the offer. It was developed jointly with The Reading Agency. The offer also includes the provision of creative and social activities based around reading and other library resources which support health and wellbeing.

Learning Offer

3.5 The goal of the Learning Offer (launched in 2015) is to ensure libraries are present throughout a person’s lifelong learning journey, to build confidence, support education, increase creativity and improve digital skills. The offer is wide-ranging, from family learning to digital creation activities for all ages. It also includes activities run in partnership with the BBC’s Make It Digital initiative. The offer includes access to online resources including free courses run by FutureLearn, and Access to Research which enables millions of academic journal articles to be accessed for free.
Digital Offer
3.6 The goal of the Digital Offer is for library services to have the resources and skills to deliver digital activities and training to the public, especially to individuals with limited digital capacity. The offer aims to ensure all public libraries offer public-access computers and WiFi, and that staff have the digital skills to support users who need help. The offer also aims to support libraries in keeping pace with the public’s digital needs.

Culture Offer
3.7 The goal of the Culture Offer, the most recent offer to be developed, is for more people to have access to quality and diverse cultural experiences and events through libraries, especially those less likely to access arts and culture. The offer is presented in a ‘core’ and ‘stretch’ format, suggesting that all libraries will deliver the ‘core’ Culture Offer while some will choose to go further. The core offer is to provide opportunities for ‘quality and diverse cultural experiences’ including reading, writing, music, and crafts. The stretch offer is to create cultural experiences around literature, performing arts, and visual arts, to co-create programmes with local communities and to support cultural leaders. The development of the Culture Offer coincided with the Arts Council funding for libraries moving from a libraries-specific development fund, to libraries competing with other arts organisations for development funding.

Children’s Promise and the Six Steps Promise for blind and partially sighted people
3.8 Alongside the six Universal Offers there is also a Children’s Promise and a Six Steps Promise for blind and partially sighted people. Libraries Connected do not generally describe these as forming part of the Universal Offers (and this study did not look at them in detail), but they are similar in nature and intent. The Children’s Promise was developed by The Association of Senior Children’s and Education Librarians (ASCEL) and maps the children’s library journey against each of the six offers. The Six Steps Promise was developed with RNIB and Share the Vision to ensure access to library services for people with visual impairments.
4 Methodology

4.1 The research into the impact, development and management of the Universal Offers was designed to address four research questions set by Libraries Connected:

1. What is the impact of the Universal Offers?
2. How effective is the articulation of the Universal Offers and their benefits, and how well are these understood?
3. What is the potential for the further development of the Universal Offers and how should they be developed in the future?
4. How can we streamline management and coordination to reduce burden, provide control and allow local flexibility?

4.2 The research adopted a mixed-methods approach, implementing both quantitative and qualitative methods. These methods are described in this section.

Desk research/literature review

4.3 At the beginning of the research process we undertook a review of the documentation associated with each offer including relevant literature produced by external stakeholders. This involved compiling the various versions of offer publications in order to get a better idea of the development of the Universal Offers over time.

Surveys of heads of services and other library staff

4.4 We designed and conducted two surveys, one for heads of library services and another for all members of library staff. We refer frequently in this report to the views of ‘Heads of Service’ and ‘Library Staff’ and this refers to the data from those two surveys. The surveys aimed to provide quantitative data on the use and perceived impact of the Universal Offers and also provided a means of collecting a diverse range of qualitative comments from across different services. There was a total of 82 responses to the Heads of Service survey and a total of 1276 responses from the all Staff survey. Within these surveys there were over 3500 qualitative comments in response to the questions asked; over 3000 from the all Staff survey and almost 500 from the Heads of Service survey. These responses were from Staff and Heads of Service from all nine English regions and Wales.

4.5 Due to the large volume comment text from the Library Staff survey, we adopted a sampling approach for our analysis of the comments. For questions where we explored comment text in detail, we took samples of 100 answers for that question. In some cases, we organised according to answers given in previous questions, e.g., we may have wanted to isolate the comments of those who felt that one particular offer had a high impact on library users. We then undertook a thematic analysis of sampled comments to develop themes to combine with the quantitative analysis in order to understand what might lie behind or explain some of the patterns in the quantitative data.
4.6 Stakeholder interviews

During the process of the research we carried out 19 stakeholder interviews with a range of individuals. This included colleagues from the devolved administrations in Wales and Northern Ireland. These interviews allowed us to engage with those who are strategic partners of Libraries Connected on a range of issues as well as those who have some direct connection to the Universal Offers. Our interviews included individuals from the Libraries Connected board, DCMS Libraries Taskforce, ASCEL, CILIP, NHS England, the BBC, The Book Trust, the Local Government Association, the British Library, Arts Council England, the Carnegie UK Trust, The Reading Agency, and the Welsh and Northern Irish governments.

4.7 Workshops

We held two series of workshops as opportunities both for data gathering and sense-making. This first series included three Heads of Service workshops held regionally in Manchester, Loughborough and Canning Town. An additional Heads of Service workshop was hosted by members of the Libraries Connected team in Bristol to give additional coverage. These sessions were designed primarily to explore how the Universal Offers are understood and to explore the potential areas for development.

4.8 The second series of three workshops brought together library practitioners of differing levels of seniority who have been actively engaged in delivering the Universal Offers. We called this the ‘development group’, and its membership remained the same across all three sessions. The group was recruited by Libraries Connected based on our advice and comprised around 25 individuals from across England. This provided a consistent group of individuals, with first-hand experience of using the Universal Offers, and whose understanding of this research and its emerging findings was able to develop alongside our own. We signified this development of understanding with sessions entitled scoping, synthesising and solution-finding.

4.9 Reference group

Libraries Connected also recruited a small group of stakeholders to form a reference group. This met in the closing stage of the research and enabled us to test our interpretation of the data, and emerging findings and conclusions, with a group who brought fresh eyes. Membership came from the Libraries Connected board of trustees, Arts Council England, and other key partners.

4.10 Analysis

We undertook qualitative thematic analysis on the text comment data from the surveys using the methods described above, and also with data from stakeholder interviews and workshops. The resulting themes formed the basis of the structure of our conclusions. Using the quantitative survey data, we undertook descriptive analysis to generate basic frequencies and percentages, but did not undertake any statistical tests (e.g., of relationships or correlations).
5 Findings

5.1 This section sets out the main findings deriving from the data collected, in its various forms, from the surveys, interviews and workshops for this strategic review. It follows the structure of the four key research questions listed in Paragraph 4.1.

What is the impact of the Universal Offers?

5.2 In looking at the impact of the Universal Offers we have only been able to do so through the perceptions of Library Staff, Heads of Service and stakeholders. Given the time and budget parameters, and overall requirement, we did not attempt any objective assessment of the impact of the offers themselves either on library services or end users. These findings therefore represent the general impressions about impact among those surveyed.

Digital and Reading offers perceived to have the greatest impact

5.3 The results of the two surveys show that both Library Staff and Heads of Service perceived the Digital and Reading offers to have the greatest impact. This is the case for perceived impact on both the customer and the library service. However, Library Staff and Heads of Service differed in their rating of the perceived impact of the Health and Information offers.

Figure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offer</th>
<th>High Impact</th>
<th>Medium Impact</th>
<th>Low Impact</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(LS) Digital Offer (n=1260)</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LS) Reading Offer (n=1267)</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HoS) Digital Offer (n=82)</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HoS) Reading Offer (n=82)</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HoS) Health Offer (n=82)</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LS) Information Offer (n=1262)</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LS) Health Offer (n=1263)</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HS) Information Offer (n=82)</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 In terms of impact evaluation, although not part of this study, impact evaluations have been carried out previously for Reading Well (part of the Health Offer) and several evaluations have been carried out for the Summer Reading Challenge (part of the Reading Offer).
5.4 As seen in Figure 1, above, a high number of Library Staff perceived the Digital and Reading offers to have a high impact on the customer, at 62 per cent and 60 per cent respectively. Likewise, many Heads of Service perceived the Digital and Reading offers to have a high impact on the customer, though to a lesser extent, at 52 per cent and 46 per cent respectively.

Figure 2

Please rate the impact you think each offer has on the library service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offer</th>
<th>High Impact</th>
<th>Medium Impact</th>
<th>Low Impact</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(LS) Reading Offer (n=1266)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LS) Digital Offer (n=1264)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HoS) Digital Offer (n=82)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HoS) Reading Offer (n=82)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LS) Information Offer (n=1262)</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HoS) Health Offer (n=82)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LS) Health Offer (n=1261)</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HS) Information Offer (n=82)</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 A high number of Library Staff rated the Reading Offer (66 per cent) and Digital Offer (63 per cent) as having a high impact on the library service in comparison to the other offers, as illustrated by Figure 2 above. Heads of Service rated the Digital and Reading offers as having the highest impact on the library service, at 49 per cent and 48 per cent respectively.

Difference in the perceived impact of the Health and Information offers

5.6 However, there are differences in the perceived impact of the Health Offer on both the customer and service between Library Staff and Heads of Service. Heads of Service rated the Health Offer as having a far higher impact on the customer, at 44 per cent compared with only 24 per cent of Library Staff. For impact on the library service the same holds true, with 40 per cent of Heads of Service rating the offer as having a high impact compared with only 28 per cent of Library Staff. The perceived impact of the Health Offer on the library service was rated as second lowest by Library Staff (just above the Culture Offer). For both the customer and the service, far more Library Staff rated the Health Offer as having a low impact compared with Heads of Service.

---

3 N.B. For simplicity we have not shown the results for Culture or Learning, which received the weakest (or among the weakest) reactions from both Heads of Service and Library Staff.

4 As before Learning and Culture are not shown but received low scores.
5.7 The opposite is true for the Information Offer. For the perceived impact on both customers and the library service, Library Staff rated the Information Offer as having a higher impact than the Health Offer. The Information Offer was rated by 41 per cent of respondents as having a high impact on the customer as well as 46 per cent on the library service. This contrasts with the Heads of Service survey, which shows far fewer Heads of Service rated the Information Offer as having a high impact compared to Library Staff. Only 23 per cent perceived the offer to have a high impact on customers and 26 per cent perceived the offer to have a high impact on the library service.

**Learning and Culture offers seen as “low impact”**

5.8 The Learning and Culture offers were perceived by both sets of survey respondents as having a low impact on the library service and on library users (this is shown in graphs I, II and III in Appendix I). Respondents also perceived the Learning and Culture offers to have low impact on the wider community and local partners.

**Variety in reported uses of the Universal Offers**

5.9 Heads of Service mentioned various uses of the offers in their responses, in particular their use at a strategic level. These various uses include as a framework for the development of local strategies, for regional partnerships and in funding bids. The Health Offer was often mentioned in relation to discussions with partners, particularly for “developing new partnerships with other agencies” and “partnership working with local health providers”. Heads of Service further mentioned that the offers were used as a “framework for articulating a strategic direction”. They also reported usage of the Universal Offers in staff development and as a national source of resources; such as the yearly calendar of events and the Access to Research website. The use of the offers in responding to community and local needs was also a major theme in the responses from Heads of Service.

5.10 Heads of Service also identified a number of difficulties when using the Universal Offers. Some found the Universal Offers confusing due to overlap between offers and a lack of simplicity in the way they are presented. They also suggested that some of the offers, such as the Learning Offer, are less well defined than others, while some such as the Information Offer are very light on content. Furthermore, some Heads of Service linked issues around use of the offers with the wider lack of resources and capacity to deliver currently experienced in the public library sector.

5.11 Library Staff reported using the Universal Offers in a more practical way, as opposed to the strategic uses reported by Heads of Service. Many described the Universal Offers as being used in their “day-to-day role” and “on a daily basis” and being engrained in their day-to-day activities. When respondents gave examples of practical usage, such as for “book displays and events”, to “provide Learn My Way courses” or “promoting access to library computers”, their answers suggested that the offers can be indistinguishable from daily frontline delivery. In other words, although Library Staff say they are aware of the offers, they cannot necessarily pinpoint what the offers look like in their daily work.

---

5 Access to Research gives free, walk-in access to over 15 million academic articles in participating public libraries across the UK. ([http://www.acesstoresearch.org.uk](http://www.acesstoresearch.org.uk))
Interaction with the Universal Offers

5.12 When ranking the offers by level of interaction, Library Staff reported interacting with the Reading and Digital offers the most. Heads of Service reported interacting most with the Reading and Health offers. For both Library Staff and Heads of Service, the level of interaction with the Reading Offer was highest of all by a wide margin.

5.13 As seen in Figure 3 below almost 70 per cent of Library Staff ranked the Reading Offer as their first or second most interacted with, and of this, 52 per cent ranked it first. This was a similar story with the Heads of Service, of whom over 70 per cent ranked the Reading Offer as their first or second most interacted with. Of these, 45 per cent ranked it as the offer they interacted with most often. For both the Library Staff and Heads of Service, this represented a far higher level of interaction than with all other offers. Fifty per cent of Library Staff ranked the Digital Offer as their first or second most interacted with offer. In contrast Heads of Service ranked Health as their second most interacted with offer, 45 per cent of them putting this offer in their top two. By contrast, Library Staff were more likely to rank the Health Offer in fifth or sixth place, with almost 50 per cent of them doing so.

5.14 The extent that library practitioners of all levels make use of the offers seems linked with their perception of impact. The offers which came across most strongly for perceived impact are also the offers respondents say they interact with most, which clearly indicates a degree of self-reinforcement.

Devolved administrations

5.15 Stakeholder interviews also suggest that interaction with the offers is quite different in the devolved administrations of Wales and Northern Ireland. Despite recognising the benefits of the offers for services in England, in Northern Ireland they have chosen not to use the Universal Offers format, while Welsh services have adapted them to their own specific targets and needs.

---

Figure 3

Please rank which of the Universal Offers you interact with the most, with 1 being the most and 6 being the least

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offer Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(LS) Reading Offer (n=1118)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HoS) Reading Offer (n=82)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HoS) Health Offer (n=82)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LS) Digital Offer (n=1148)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HoS) Digital Offer (n=82)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LS) Health Offer (n=1143)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responding to local need

5.16 Both Heads of Service and Library Staff recognise the impact that the offers have in responding to local need, this is shown in Graphs IV to VII in Appendix I. Around 71 per cent of Library Staff agree or strongly agree that the Universal Offers help their library services respond to local community need. Heads of Service echo this sentiment with 66 per cent of them agreeing or strongly agreeing that the Universal Offers help their services respond to local community need.

5.17 The qualitative evidence collected in the surveys highlight a number of reasons why this is the case as well as issues which cause difficulty. Heads of Service stress that local tailoring is an important way in which services can respond in their local communities. One stated that “having a national offer that can be tailored locally allows us to work with communities according to their differing needs”. Library Staff generally agree that the Universal Offers can be tailored on a local level. One member of Library Staff felt that “if there is a greater need for a particular service, we can use the Universal Offer to help create that service for our users”. They also felt that the offers are good for providing a focused framework for setting targets and planning. This idea is echoed in the Heads of Service survey in which there were a number of responses saying that the offers are used as a local service development tool.

5.18 However, even among those who felt that the offers helped respond to local need, both Library Staff and Heads of Service mentioned some challenges. These challenges included the challenge of the lack of specificity of the offers making demonstratable impacts and outcomes difficult. They also mentioned the lack of consistency between the offers and the varied amount of resources allocated towards their implementation from library to library. This variation meant that not all offers were at a point where they could be used effectively in responding to local need as some were more developed and able to be tailored than others. The need for tailoring also included the need for inclusion of regional and local partners, such as the NHS and third sector organisations.

5.19 Some Library Staff also disagreed or strongly disagreed that the Universal Offers help library services respond to local need, citing some of the same challenges as those noted by Heads of Service. These included the fact that some of the offers are too general, that they are regionally and locally inconsistent, and that they required clarity. There was also a number of comments which highlighted the lack of in-depth awareness of some staff about the offers. Some staff said that more training was needed, especially for volunteer staff, and that they did not know any more about the offers than the information in staff room posters.
A summary of the perceived impact of the offers

Below is a summary of the perceived impact of the offers among Library Staff and Heads of Service.

How effective is the articulation of the Universal Offers and their benefits, and how well are these understood?

The quantitative survey data suggests that the offers are well understood within library services. Most Heads of Service and Library Staff reported that the offers have been articulated effectively and their benefits are fully understood. Among Library Staff, 69 per cent agreed or strongly agreed that this is the case, and even higher at 84 per cent among Heads of Service.

However, while the check-box answers indicate strong agreement around effective articulation and understanding, the survey comments along with many of the interviews indicate confusion. This confusion is particularly around the purpose of the Universal Offers, their intended audience, their consistency and their articulation as either activities or outcomes.

We also heard a variety of perceived purposes and audiences mentioned. Some saw the purpose of the offers as being to help internal strategic planning, saying they “shaped our strategic direction and priorities”. Others pointed to the Universal Offers being for advocacy with external partners, particularly for use with funding bids and that they are “a good tool in which to market [activities and outcomes] and advocate to others” or to “strengthen their impact with regional partners”. This suggests an external audience for the offers.
5.24 Heads of Service said that there was “overlap between the offers which can practically cause confusion and difficulties with delivery” and that they needed to undergo simplification and “need to be amalgamated”. They also said that the offers needed to be flexible enough to allow for regional and local tailoring “to meet local needs” because of a “local lack of resources”. Some Heads of Service added that the content varied too much between offers in style, format, and level of detail and that “sometimes the information coming out about them isn't cohesive”.

5.25 Of the external stakeholders we interviewed most had limited knowledge of the offers, one saying that the offers were “better articulated within the business than outside it”. A number of stakeholder and Heads of Service commented that the Universal Offers had “not really been articulated to customers” and “do not translate well to the public”.

5.26 Both external stakeholders and Heads of Service voiced confusion over whether the Universal Offers should be articulated as activities or outcomes. Some stakeholders felt that the Universal Offers “should be more about outcome” and “written in the language of outcomes, not activity”. However, several stakeholders mentioned the confusion between the Universal Offers and DCMS Libraries Taskforce Seven Outcomes noting the lack of alignment between the two as being “problematic” and that there had to be a process to “sort out the confusion between the UOs and Ambition”.

5.27 The DCMS Taskforce Outcomes were first set out in the *Ambition for Public Libraries in England 2016-2021*. These Outcomes are: cultural and creative enrichment, increased reading and literacy, improved digital access and literacy, helping everyone achieve their full potential, healthier and happier lives, greater prosperity and stronger, more resilient communities (shown in Figure 5 below). There is a degree of overlap here with the Universal Offers in terms of areas which cover Digital, Culture, Reading, Literacy and Health. The major difference lies in the inclusion of prosperity and resilient communities as an outcome of what libraries do.
5.28 Staff who disagreed that the Universal Offers have been articulated effectively mentioned this was due to the lack of consistency, both regionally and locally, and the lack of clarity of the offers. Staff also said that the offers were perceived to be for management and not frontline staff, stating that they were “couched in management speak” and therefore unclear. There were also a number of individuals who were not sure of what the offers were or had never heard of them.

5.29 Finally, our own desk review of the Universal Offers confirmed many of the issues about confusion and clarity raised in the surveys, interviews, and workshops. We too found that the way the Universal Offers were expressed varied in tone, level of detail, and implied purpose. Perhaps the most noticeable difference was between the Reading Offer (the first to have been developed) and the Culture Offer (the most recent). Whereas the Reading Offer is presented as a statement of what libraries currently offer, the Culture Offer focuses more on setting goals for the future (more like a vision or strategy). Similarly, whereas the Reading Offer applies to all library services, the Culture Offer comes in two varieties, a ‘core’ offer and a ‘stretch’ offer. These differences highlight the fact that the incremental and pragmatic way in which the offers have been developed over the past seven years has brought positives (diversity of approach, making use of opportunities and partnerships), but has also created challenges (drift in purpose, lack of coherence across the offers).

---

What is the potential for further development of the Universal Offers and how should they be developed in the future?

5.30 Survey responses suggest a split in how different members of Library Staff and Heads of Service wanted to see the Universal Offers develop.

- Firstly, there were those who wanted to see the offers develop as a practical tool, which focuses on materials and events for them to use.
- Secondly, there were others who wanted the offers as a strategic tool.

5.31 However, among those who wanted a strategic tool, there was a split in what they wanted that to look like. Some wanted to make sure that this strategic tool was national but not prescriptive, and others who wanted it to be a strategic tool which delivers more consistency. This contradiction in the responses of Heads of Service is highlighted in Figure 6 which shows that while 93 per cent of them said that they wanted a national framework which was non-prescriptive, 55 per cent said that they wanted a more national consistency.

5.32 Figure 6, below, also shows that a larger number of Library Staff than Heads of Service wanted more materials and more events based around the offers. The request for more resources and practical tools from Library Staff is discussed further in Paragraph 5.35.

5.33 A final message coming from this data was that Library Staff and Heads of Service disagreed in the number of Universal Offers that there should be. Forty-three per cent of Heads of Service wanted to have fewer offers, while very few Library Staff, only 13 per cent, thought this should be the case. In terms of having more offers, this sentiment was overwhelmingly rejected amongst both groups with only 9 per cent of Library Staff thinking that this should be the case. Among Heads of Service this was even lower; only 1 per cent thought that there should be more offers.
5.34 When asked about the future development of the Universal Offers, both Heads of Service and Library Staff were clear that there needed to be greater clarity across the offers. Heads of Service said that this also had to be matched by a streamlining process in order to limit crossover and reduce the total number of offers. Both Library Staff and Heads of Service felt that some of the offers should be combined, such as Information, Digital and Learning. They also wanted greater consistency in order to avoid overlap; however, they presented a range of views in relation to the level of prescriptiveness of the offers.

5.35 Heads of Service raised the issue of regional and local challenges faced by services, particularly due to the capacity of library services to deliver the offers with the resources available to them. The level of prescriptiveness was raised as an issue as Heads of Service were clear that not all library services would have the capacity to do all the offers if they were prescriptive and inflexible. Many of those who raised this felt that greater clarity and streamlining could reduce the impact of a lack of resources on a library service’s ability deliver the offers.

5.36 Advocacy was an important strand to clarify in the future development of the offers for both Heads of Service and Library Staff. They said that the offers should be used as an advocacy tool both externally, to partners, government and the public, and internally to staff. Heads of Service said that the offers had to be able to demonstrate the value of their services, the local and national impact, the purpose and diversity of services, to both the local community and politicians.
Furthermore, Library Staff also agreed that the offers need to be a framework which is flexible regionally and nationally. They differ from Heads of Service, however, in that they said that more practical materials needed to be made available to all library services to help with the national consistency of offer implementation.

The above themes were also reflected in discussions from the workshops with Heads of Service concerning the development of the Universal Offers. The Heads of Service felt that the Universal Offers needed to be a framework which:

- Enables flexibility and can be a platform for local council priorities
- Offers an approach which can be tailored to the needs of a specific area with customers and local communities at heart
- Provides tools to help meet outcomes which are flexible, based in evidence and can be measured
- Does not promote a race to the bottom but is a foundation upon which to be built.

The workshops also raised a number of themes and questions around the future intended audience of the offers such as:

- Who needs to know about the Universal Offers: staff, stakeholders; or the general public.
- How they should be articulated to different audiences.
- Whether the offers should be about outreach and engaging new users.
- The general theme, also seen in the survey comments and stakeholder interviews, of the message of the Universal Offers not getting to the public.

These questions on the audience of the Universal Offers are addressed in more detail in Sections 6 and 7 of this report.

**How can we streamline management and coordination to reduce burden, provide control and allow local flexibility?**

Currently, there is a large degree of variation, regionally, nationally and between offers, in terms of the current structures of offer management. In addition to the national leads for each of the Universal Offers, most regions have also identified a lead for each offer. In some regions, certain offers have their own leads within local authorities. Generally, the regional offer leads go to the regional Libraries Connected meetings and attend the national meeting to represent their region, feeding back to the local authorities what has been discussed. One or two of the offers have only one national meeting each year, with other meetings taking place virtually. However, the leads of most offers have meetings three to four times each year on a national level.

The workshops produced a number of themes relating to streamlining the coordination and management of the Universal Offers. The Heads of Service in the workshops said that the
national grouping was working well as it ensured that all the regions were represented in discussions surrounding the offers. They agreed that there were some points on which to build, including better sharing of best practice, ensuring clarity and consistency of the offers, and streamlining through Libraries Connected. They also felt that there were a number of areas on which improvement was needed such as crisp articulation and quality management.

5.42 Crisp articulation of both the offers’ content and purpose would be a basis for rapid responses to local and national agendas and events and is particularly important in the context of the economic and wider societal challenges currently facing the sector. Quality management would allow a clear vision of when something is a rigorous offer and would be a way of ensuring that the ‘bare minimum’ is not the focus for library services.

5.43 The development group convened for this research expressed their willingness in the final development group meeting to be involved in future development of the offers. Many of these Heads of Service suggested ways in which they could continue their involvement such as through their mailing group for the review of the offers.
6 Discussion of the findings: A new model for the Universal Offers

6.1 As one might expect, we found that the offers which Library Staff and Heads of Service say they engage with most, are also the offers they perceive to have a high impact on their library service and its users. This points to a degree of self-reinforcement, in other words what individuals use most are the things they believe have most impact, and vice versa.

6.2 We also saw a link between the offers seen by survey respondents as having lower impact and those described as confusing, less well-defined, or having overlap. We ourselves found some of the published materials about the offers confusing. With the Learning and Culture offers for example, it is not immediately clear which documents are current, and which are previous incarnations or simply background information. Taken together this suggests that those offers perceived to have the highest impact are not just those which are used the most, but also those which are most clearly set out. Those perceived as higher impact are also the offers for which there are more tangible programmes, specifically; the Reading Offer with the Summer Reading Challenge; the Digital Offer with publicly accessible computers; and the Health Offer with Reading Well Books on Prescription.

6.3 We found that with the Health Offer there was a difference between Library Staff perceptions of impact (lower) compared to Heads of Service perceptions (higher). We also found that when asked about their use of the health offer, Library Staff and Heads of Service ranked their interaction with the Health Offer differently. When probed, this seemed to be because Heads of Service use the Health Offer at a strategic level, for example to develop partnerships and working with health providers.

For many Library Staff (but not all) the health offer is simply part of the lending stock and not something they actively ‘use’. We also noted that weak reaction to the Culture Offer in terms of perception, contrasts with the important role stakeholder interviewees felt the offer played in seven library services achieving Arts Council England ‘National Portfolio Organisation’ status (the first ever libraries to do this) and securing the funding that comes with that.

6.4 Despite these differences, overall the findings suggest the Universal Offers are widely used and valued and seen to make a difference nationally and locally. At the national level they provide consistency of message about what libraries do. Locally, they help respond to the needs of the local community. However, there is a real lack of clarity on two important questions which are explored next:

- What problems are the Universal Offers designed to solve and who is the audience?
- Are the Universal Offers ‘universal commitments’ or a ‘framework’ of core activities?
What are the problems we are trying to solve, and who is the intended audience?

6.5 Despite the survey responses indicating that a vast majority of those working in public libraries understand the offers, we found confusion over purpose and intended audience. This is clearly a fundamental issue. Within this was confusion over whether the offers are an internal tool or externally facing for use in advocacy. There was also confusion around whether library services or Libraries Connected should even attempt explaining the offers to the public. More broadly there was difficulty explaining what the problems are, to which the offers are the answer.

6.6 While the Universal Offers can, of course, meet multiple purposes and be geared towards more than one audience, both Library Staff and Heads of Service sought clarity over their purpose. We suggest part of the solution is to address two central problems the offers help solve:

1. **Heads of Service want a strategic framework for advocacy** which describes what libraries offer, particularly given the fact individual library leaders have very limited time and capacity to develop this kind of strategic narrative locally.

2. **Library Staff want good quality programming and materials.** The offers have ended up providing a valuable stock of professionally produced materials, a calendar of programming sates and lots of ideas which staff can easily pick up and use because, like senior staff, they have very limited time and capacity.

6.7 These two roles are not mutually exclusive; both can be achieved with no detriment to the other.

Are they firm commitments or more of a framework?

6.8 Strong opinions were expressed during the research about how prescriptive or not the offers should be, and discussion tended to focus on two different views of the offers.

- Some saw them as ‘Universal’ implying something akin to a commitment that certain things will be available throughout the country, similar to a customer charter.
- Others saw them as a ‘Framework’ meaning a coherent set of necessary components, which together amount to an ideal library service, but which do not detail what will be available.

6.9 While we heard compelling arguments on both sides the weight of opinion among those we spoke to and among survey respondents was clearly for the offers to be seen and used as a framework and not commitments. When we probed for reasons why ‘framework’ was preferred to ‘commitment’, many individuals (especially those in more senior positions) felt it would be irresponsible to make additional commitments when budgets are under such intense pressure. Some countered by arguing libraries will only achieve their true potential and be sustainable if library leaders have the boldness to offer more, and to be more categorical, but this perspective was outweighed by those urging caution.
6.10 Furthermore, some also feared that anything interpreted as ‘basic standards’ could inadvertently trigger a ‘race to the bottom’. For example, if the Digital Offer became a detailed commitment to provide publicly accessible computers and free WiFi, then some local budget-holders might use that ‘basic standard’ as an acceptable minimum beyond which they would not fund.

6.11 Unlike the first duality (between strategic and practical uses) these two directions – commitment versus framework – are mutually exclusive; it has to be one or the other. It is not possible for the offers to be simultaneously both prescriptive but also non-committal.

**Clearer and more consistent language**

6.12 Finally, the issue of some of the Universal Offers being more clearly expressed than others does seem to impact the extent that each offer is used and seen to have impact. It therefore seems obvious that the way the offers are expressed – at least in headline terms – should be reviewed and levelled up.
7 Conclusions

7.1 Our findings suggest that the Universal Offers need to be re-framed to provide a clearer sense of their purpose, and streamlined so overlap is reduced, and individually they need to be clearer and more consistent. If this is achieved, we believe they can go from being a well-respected and useful platform with potential, to an even more powerful framework for increasing public library impact.

Outcomes and alignment with Ambition Outcomes

7.2 The evidence highlights, repeatedly, that part of the confusion comes from having Universal Offers alongside the Ambition Outcomes. Many see it as a weakness of the Universal Offers that they do not make clear whether they are statements of what libraries do, or statements of the outcomes they achieve. We heard many suggestions of how to align the offers with the Ambition Outcomes. Figure 7.1 below, illustrates a model envisaged by the development group which we believe provides a practical way forward. (This refers to the Universal Offers as “Universal Library Offers” reflecting comments we heard about their title).

7.3

Figure 7.1

7.4 The left-hand block in Figure 7.1 explains the overall societal need which libraries meet, i.e., the mission that libraries aim to achieve. For the purpose of this report we have placed learning in this box, one of the original Universal Offers, because the all-encompassing nature of learning seems likely to explain why the Learning Offer received weak feedback. We have also referred to literacy, economic opportunity, and inspiration as part of the
societal need public libraries were established to meet – because these are commonly used themes when articulating the purpose of libraries.

7.5 The middle blocks explain what libraries do. These are the Universal Library Offers: Reading; Information and Digital; Culture and Creativity; and Health and Wellbeing.

7.6 The right-hand block describes what libraries deliver, and here we have put the seven Ambition Outcomes. In practice, the model could be adapted, and these right-hand outcomes could be replaced with local-level outcomes such as those in a council’s (or city-region’s) strategic plan.

**Being clear on how the offers are used and the problems they help solve**

7.7 There is also a need to clarify what problems the offers are meant to solve and how they can be used in practice both nationally and locally. Figure 8, below, shows how the offers can be used both as a framework for national and local strategic advocacy and also as a source of practical resources (e.g., materials, focal calendar events, curated collections, marketing).

7.8 This shows how the offers can be used by individual library services locally, whilst being co-ordinated and further developed nationally and regionally by Libraries Connected assisted by the network of national and regional lead individuals that already exists.

---

**Figure 8**

- **STRATEGIC – Delivered by Heads of Service**
  - Framework for strategic advocacy, nationally and locally.
  - Aligned to/flowing from the grand societal challenges
  - Headlines – defined locally
  - Locally – re-asserts / gives shape to ‘more than books’
  - Nationally – framework / process for policy influence
  - All levels- tool for alliance-building
  - Internally – for staff training and development
  - To promote innovation in the Libraries Sector

- **Universal Library Offers [Working Title]**

- **PRACTICAL – Delivered by Library Staff**
  - Practical resources
  - Resourced via external funding
  - Develop and improve existing programmes
  - Create new programmes
  - Produce a national ‘stock-room’ of quality resources
Learning and evaluation

7.9 Using the offers in this way should also of course, be accompanied by a simple national system for ongoing learning and evaluation with appropriate collecting of evidence. This already happens for some of the offers some of the time, but with Libraries Connected’s increased national capacity, this can be formalised.

Both responsive and proactive

7.10 If the framework set out in these conclusions is adopted, then the Universal Offers will begin to serve library impact in two ways nationally and locally:

- As a framework for responsive action to address community need and respond to national policy events
- As a framework for planned proactive action to make the case for libraries amongst national and local stakeholders through strategy development, programme development, and systematic demonstration of impact.
8 Recommendations

8.1 In considering the findings of our research from which the conclusions have been drawn, we make the following recommendations:

1. Libraries Connected adopt Figure 7.1 as their new overarching framework for the Universal Library Offers [working title]

2. Libraries Connected develop clear strategic statements describing each offer of around 100 words

3. Libraries Connected use the Universal Library Offers as a platform for proactive partnership building and advocacy at a national, regional and local level:
   - Locally, by individual services;
   - Regionally, collaboratively, using the existing structures, and;
   - Nationally, as a distinct responsibility within the Libraries Connected national team

4. Libraries Connected use the new Universal Library Offers to develop additional materials using project-based and grant funding/income from national partners

5. Libraries Connected re-align the existing national groups that support the offers with the new framework

6. Libraries Connected review all existing resources produced under the current offers headings to identify which can be incorporated into the new Universal Libraries Offer framework

7. Libraries Connected develop an evaluation framework linked to the offers to enable it to demonstrate the impact of the offers, continue their development and improvement, and support the sector in evidence-gathering around the offers

8. Libraries Connected continue using the development group convened for this project as champions and advisors as the new framework is embedded into practice

9. Libraries Connected (in partnership with the other relevant national bodies) consider what leadership and frontline level professional development support would enable the sector to capitalise on the offers to increase public library impact

10. Libraries Connected map the relationship between the new offers and the Six Steps and Children’s Promises.

---

7 Revised post 19 May 2019 discussion with Libraries Connected board
8 New recommendation added post 19 May 2019 discussion with Libraries Connected Board
Appendix I

Graphs from Library Staff and Heads of Service survey data

Impact of the Information, Learning and Culture offers by Heads of Service

Graph I:

Please rate the impact you think the Information Offer has on the following (n=82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Offer</th>
<th>High Impact</th>
<th>Medium Impact</th>
<th>Low Impact</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Offer - Local partners</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Offer - The library service</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Offer - Your wider community</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Offer - Your library users</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph II:

Please rate the impact you think the Learning Offer has on the following (n=82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Offer</th>
<th>High Impact</th>
<th>Medium Impact</th>
<th>Low Impact</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Offer - Local partners</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Offer - The library service</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Offer - Your wider community</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Offer - Your library users</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph III:

Please rate the impact you think the Culture Offer has on the following (n=82)

| Culture Offer - Local partners | 15% | 38% | 54% | 5% |
| Culture Offer - The library service | 23% | 49% | 29% | 9% |
| Culture Offer - Your wider community | 12% | 30% | 50% | 7% |
| Culture Offer - Your library users | 17% | 49% | 32% | 3% |

- High Impact
- Medium Impact
- Low Impact
- Don't know

Responding to community need

Graph IV:
Library staff: ‘The universal offers helps my library service respond to local community need’ (n=1267)

- Strongly agree: 20.1%
- Agree: 51.1%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 21.4%
- Disagree: 6.6%

Graph V:
Heads of Service: ‘The Universal Offers helps my library service respond to local community need” (n=82)

- Strongly agree: 22%
- Agree: 43%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 23%
- Disagree: 12%
Articulation and benefits of the Universal Offers

Graph VI:

‘The Universal Offers have been articulated effectively to me and I fully understand their benefits’ (n=1272)

Graph VII:

‘The Universal Offers have been articulated effectively to me and I fully understand their benefits’ (n=82)