



Annual Report for 2010/2011

Service/Unit name: James Hardiman Library

Part 1: About the Service

Please summarise in less than about 100 words the purpose of your unit:

The Library proactively supports and enhances the learning, teaching and research activities of the University by providing access for all its users to quality information resources and services. We add value by creating an environment which ignites curiosity, encourages scholarship and leverages all resources optimally. Our goals are centred on agency, partnership, skills and inclusivity.

- *Agency*: to open up seamless access to scholarly information in a timely and appropriate manner
- *Partnership*: to pursue partnership through an informed understanding of our communities, achieved through active dialogue
- *Skills*: to empower our communities' life-long scholarship through their information skills development
- *Inclusivity*: to provide excellent service for all our communities, mindful of individual experience and requirements

Please describe the service(s) provided by your unit:

The main services are:

- Acquiring, organising, presenting and publishing information resources
- Advising and supporting users in finding and using information to create knowledge
- Training users in the development of information skills
- Ensuring an appropriate, secure and well organised environment for users
- Communicating our services and resources to University and external communities
- Planning and managing service delivery and development

Please indicate to whom you provide your service and to whom you are accountable for providing it

- University staff and students are the primary audience, but services are also available to external members (for a fee), visitors and members of other universities.
- Members of the public can view exhibitions and the ARAN service, which publishes University research outputs online, is freely and openly accessible.
- The Library is accountable for its service provision to a range of parties:
 - the University Management Team, specifically the Registrar and Deputy President
 - University committees, notably the Library Policy Committee, Support Services Committee, Disability Liaison Committee and the Archives Group
 - all service users

Part 2: Service Inputs, Outputs, KPIs

Inputs

Staff Resources

Please show how your available effort is distributed by service or service group. Where there are seasonal variations please average over the year.

Service or Service Group	FTE Allocated	Staff Costs €K
Organisational Development and Performance	2.0	116
Staff Development and Service Environment	21.6	903
Customer Focus and Research Services	19.5	1037
Information Access and Learning Services	22.4	1215
Management & Overheads: Senior Management Team	5.0	542
Management & Overheads: Librarian's Office	1.5	66
TOTAL FTEs	72.0	3879

Non-Staff Resources

Please provide (in round terms) your allocation of non-staff expenditure by service or service group.

Service or Service Group	Cost €K
Organisational Development and Performance	177
Staff Development and Service Environment	217
Customer Focus and Research Services	95
Information Access and Learning Services	108
Information Resources	1851
Overheads	94
TOTAL	2542

Outputs

How did you assess your unit's output(s)?

- Primarily through the collection of statistical data but also, as further elaborated in Part 4, through user surveys.
- The Library participated in the SCONUL statistics database for UK and Irish academic and national libraries for the first time in a number of years in 2010/11.
- In addition to a survey of researchers in April-May 2011 as part of its annual survey cycle, the Library conducted the international LibQual survey in November 2010.

Where possible, please outline quantitatively your unit's level of output

A selection of headline measures is cited below; the normal annual reporting period is Oct-Sept so this has been adjusted in some cases as this report is dated September 2011.

Measure	Output	Period
Loans/Renewals	372,452	1 July 2010-30 June 2011
Hours open: Main Library	3,893	1 Oct 2010-30 Sept 2011
Hours open: Medical Library	2,744.75	1 Oct 2010-30 Sept 2011
Study places	1,954	1 Oct 2010- 30 Sept 2011
Stock utilization: books reshelved*	400,232	1 Sept 2010-31 May 2011
Total catalogued book stock	476,387	At 30 June 2011
Books acquired	12,253	1 July 2010- 30 June 2011
Information skills: user training hours received	6,536	1 Aug 2010-31 July 2011
Research papers published in ARAN	523	1 June 2010-15 June 2011

*Includes repeat use of same book

How did your level of output vary this year from that of 2009/10?

Patterns varied across the headline outputs reported here:

- Loans/Renewals were down by 8.7% from 2009/10 (Oct-Sept); three possible factors are discontinuation of Desk Reserve collection which had shorter loan periods, increased use of online resources, and some over-estimation of figures for 2009/10 which had to be extrapolated due to loss of data between January and June 2010.
- Main Library opening hours increased by 23 as the Library was open on Good Friday and Easter Monday for the first time in 2010/11 to support examination study, and was open on an additional Saturday during the Summer.
- Medical Library opening hours declined by 136 due to the cessation of Saturday morning opening.
- The number of Library study places remained the same.
- A count of books reshelfed only commenced in 2010/11 so there are no comparative data for 2010/11.
- The total catalogued book stock stood at 476,387, an increase of 17,181 (3.7%).
- There was a decline of 25% in the number of books acquired, primarily because of a series of staff illnesses in May and June 2011 which continued until August. The number of books acquired increased the book collection size by 2.7%.
- Hours of information skills training increased by 17% due to greater collaboration with academic staff, embedding of information skills sessions within programme modules and stronger promotion of drop-in sessions provided by the Library. A change in recording practices to include 1:1 advisory sessions was also a factor.
- Research papers added to ARAN fell slightly from 543 to 523, impacted by the resignation of a Research Support Librarian in February 2011.

To what extent have you, in the last year, compared your unit's performance with that of similar units in (a) other Irish universities, (b) international universities, (c) other relevant public or private sector organisations?

- Participation in the SCONUL statistics database enabled comparison with data from 148 UK and Irish universities submitting returns in 2009/10.
- By conducting the LibQual service evaluation survey we were able to compare our ratings with aggregated data for participating Irish universities, UK universities and, individually, with international institutions who participated.
- The Library participated in a benchmarking study, along with the University of Ulster, Edinburgh University, Queensland University of Technology and University College Cork itself, to support the external review of the Library and Information Service at UCC.
- We also followed up a benchmarking visit by archives and special collections staff in August 2010 to Edinburgh and Glasgow Universities with an ongoing review of policies and procedures, incorporating best practice at those and other institutions.
- Benchmarking has focused on the university sector in the past year rather than with other relevant public or private sector organisations.
- Comparison of LibQual data with University College Cork has instilled a more competitive culture and mobilised a concerted effort by Library staff to equal or surpass UCC service ratings.

Part 3: Service Performance in 2010/2011

Please summarise below the extent to which you achieved your goals for 2010/11. We expect that these would be outlined in your unit's **2010/11 Operational Plan**. You should include both operational and development goals. Please consolidate where necessary and keep to a **maximum** of 6 goals. Please comment on the extent to which each goal was achieved.

Goal no. 1: Systematically improve access to course reading list material		
Please outline below the extent to which the above goal was achieved:		
<i>Please tick (✓) on one of the following:</i>		<i>Please elaborate on your response:</i>
Not at all		The target for this goal was to obtain 100% of reading lists, but despite persistent publicity and communication, reading lists were received from academic staff for only 12% of active modules in 2010/11. Where reading lists were received, availability of this material was significantly improved, through the purchase of additional copies and e-book versions where available, assignment of shorter loan periods to maximise circulation and digitisation of assigned chapters for provision through Blackboard. Efforts will continue in 2011/12 to encourage academic staff to submit reading lists to the Library.
Somewhat	✓	
Mostly		
Fully		

Goal no. 2: Maximise uptake of new information skills module for PhD students in all disciplines		
Please outline below the extent to which the above goal was achieved:		
<i>Please tick (✓) on one of the following:</i>		<i>Please elaborate on your response:</i>
Not at all		The Graduate Information Skills module was offered to PhDs as one of 10 Generic Skills Modules. 38 of a total figure of 210 1 st year PhDs chose the module and all who returned evaluations expressed satisfaction with their choice. Students from all colleges, except for Business, Public Policy and Law, choose the module. The module was offered with online and face-to-face components
Somewhat	✓	
Mostly		
Fully		

Goal no. 3: Publish University's research output on open access, contributing to higher citation counts		
Please outline below the extent to which the above goal was achieved:		
<i>Please tick (✓) on one of the following:</i>		<i>Please elaborate on your response:</i>
Not at all		Of 1,148 research items loaded on ARAN, 838 are peer-reviewed. There is a large variety of publication types, and theses are increasingly included. All Colleges and Schools are represented, albeit to varying degrees and stronger coverage of total University research output is proving difficult to achieve. A process for effective measurement of open access publishing's contribution to higher citation counts is being investigated.
Somewhat	✓	
Mostly		
Fully		

Goal no. 4: Systematically extend access to archival collections		
Please outline below the extent to which the above goal was achieved:		
<i>Please tick (✓) on one of the following:</i>		<i>Please elaborate on your response:</i>
Not at all		The Theatre Archives Listing Project has delivered most of its objectives, including the securing and cataloguing of significant additional deposits to the Druid Theatre Archive. The process of converting 89 archival collections to full EAD presentation has commenced but is at an early stage. Providing collection level descriptions within PRIMO is still delayed and will need to be referenced as part of the Research Services 2011/2012 plan. Publication of a new Archives Brochure has given greater exposure to the collections.
Somewhat	✓	
Mostly		
Fully		

Goal no. 5: Maximise existing space deployment and functionality		
Please outline below the extent to which the above goal was achieved:		
<i>Please tick (✓) on one of the following:</i>		<i>Please elaborate on your response:</i>
Not at all		An additional 500 study places were power-enabled, bringing our total number of study spaces with power to 1,196 or 62% of all seats. Sixty new wireless access points were installed, thereby ensuring 100% wireless capacity for simultaneous use in the Library and in the Basement Reading Rooms. Participation in the national CONUL Distributed Print Archive Pilot Project and significant deduplication of print holdings of journals held electronically had the advantage of freeing up some shelving in open access and storage areas with potential for the re-purposing of these spaces.
Somewhat		
Mostly	✓	
Fully		

Goal no. 6: Broaden and deepen collaborations to support regional and national development and resource sharing		
Please outline below the extent to which the above goal was achieved:		
<i>Please tick (✓) on one of the following:</i>		<i>Please elaborate on your response:</i>
Not at all		A meeting of the two Library management teams has provided a good platform for ongoing collaboration with University of Limerick. The IReL service has been sustained in 2011 and negotiations are in progress to secure its longer-term continuation. Other important national initiatives include scoping studies for collaborate storage of printed stock and sharing of IT systems. A series of exhibitions (some virtual) and archival launches has promoted external engagement.
Somewhat		
Mostly	✓	
Fully		

Please elaborate on what else your unit achieved during 2010/11 which might not have been in your planned goals:

- Installation of a book sorter to assist faster reshelving of returned stock
- RFID tagging of all open access stock to support book sorter and other projects
- Compact shelving of half of Library Basement storage area
- Library opening on Good Friday and Easter Monday to support exam study
- Establishment of Library Policy Committee to advise on Library strategy
- University policy on electronic submission of PhD theses to ARAN service
- Successful bid for project officer to enable integration of Library and ISS helpdesks
- Leadership of IUA scoping report on sharing of Library IT Systems
- Integration of Academic Writing Centre into the Library's learning support services
- Start of term forum for all Library staff on theme: *Delivering Excellent Quality Service*

Please indicate what setbacks and unplanned difficulties you encountered, if any, in achieving your goals in 2010/11:

- Cessation of construction of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences Research Building
- The progressive decline of the Main Library building as an adequate environment to support the University's Teaching, Learning and Assessment Strategy or to provide expected levels of comfort.
- Staff illnesses
- Slow progress towards the development of University PMDS and competency framework
- Legal complications in relation to two major archival collections
- Difficulties in ensuring that resource discovery tools met user expectations
- Course reading lists for only 12% of active modules available to the Library

Part 4: Customer Focus in 2010/2011

How did you know that your unit was meeting the service needs of its customers/users?

- The LibQual survey in late 2010 provided user ratings of 27 areas of service by 3,123 staff and student respondents. The methodology employed delivered ratings of Library performance as respondents perceived it relative to minimum and desired expectations. It emerged that the Library exceeded minimum expectations in the categories for Affect of Service and Information Control but failed to do so for Library as Place. Desired levels of service were higher than perceived service in all three categories.
- The Library Policy Committee and the Archives Group provided fora for engagement with representative users regarding needs in terms of service delivery and development.
- Ongoing feedback resulted from meetings with users, attendance at committees or working groups, liaison by Subject Librarians and other staff, discussion with front-line staff and informal communication through email, LiveChat, Facebook and other channels.

Did you make available agreed performance standards and SLAs for your service(s)? Please elaborate.

- This has been identified as an area for development, particularly through a Customer Charter which has been developed and will be published in the coming year.

How did you assess customer satisfaction?

- The LibQual survey, already mentioned, proved a key tool in this regard. It was supplemented by a research support survey with 459 respondents in April-May 2011, the fourth in a series running since 2003 and therefore delivering a longitudinal perspective.
- A series of focus groups was convened by three Task and Finish Groups to gain a deeper understanding of LibQual data and comments, supplemented by meetings with Deans and Schools. These channels generated frank discussion of areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction which were documented, analysed and fed into the operational planning process for 2011/12.

What mechanisms did you provide to enable your customers/service users to complain if they were not satisfied with your services?

- All of the channels mentioned in the preceding sections enabled users to complain in person or online.
- Surveys included comment boxes to encourage feedback
- The Library website has a suggestion box as part of a Contact section which also includes a Help Centre with a range of forms which can also be used to identify problems in using services.
- The SFX facility for linking to electronic resources includes a "Report a Problem" prompt.

Part 5: Service Development in 2010/2011

[Responses should be specific to 2010/11]

Project 1 Book Returns/Sorter System & RFID tagging of open access stock		
This project involved the procurement and installation of an automated Book Returns/Sorter System and the related RFID tagging of the Library's 272,072 volumes on open access		
Current Status of Project		
Completed: The Book Returns/Sorter System has been procured and installed and is now operational. Most of the open access stock has been RFID-tagged and converted and we are currently capturing any items that were in circulation while the tagging project was underway.		
Please identify to what extent your project had the following objectives:		
<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Please tick (✓) on one of the following:</i>	<i>Please show how the project aims to fulfil this objective</i>
Enhance Academic Performance	<i>Not at all</i>	Faster re-shelving time for returned items, and more efficient circulation of essential reading materials required to support learning and research.
	<i>Somewhat</i>	
	<i>Mostly</i> ✓	
	<i>Fully</i>	
Customer Service	<i>Not at all</i>	Speedier re-shelving times have allowed us to offer users more timely access to circulating stock. Staff losses in the shelving team, with potential negative impact on customer service, may be mitigated
	<i>Somewhat</i>	
	<i>Mostly</i> ✓	
	<i>Fully</i>	
Process Simplification	<i>Not at all</i>	Streamlining of re-shelving processes and the replacement of labour and time-intensive manual sorting with automated sorting of circulating stock.
	<i>Somewhat</i>	
	<i>Mostly</i>	
	<i>Fully</i> ✓	
Cost reduction & value for money	<i>Not at all</i>	The tendering process for procurement resulted in substantial savings on the list price of the equipment.
	<i>Somewhat</i>	
	<i>Mostly</i>	
	<i>Fully</i> ✓	
Innovation	<i>Not at all</i>	NUIG is only the second academic Library in Ireland to install a Book Returns/Sorter System, and the first to install the model selected. RFID tagging of items allows us to exploit the possibilities offered by this technology including more efficient stock taking and the speedier location of missing items.
	<i>Somewhat</i>	
	<i>Mostly</i>	
	<i>Fully</i> ✓	
Compliance	<i>Not at all</i>	
	<i>Somewhat</i>	
	<i>Mostly</i>	
	<i>Fully</i> ✓	

Project 2 E-Theses publication
This project seeks to make PhD theses accessible online through the ARAN (Access to Research at NUI Galway) service managed by the Library. Previously theses have only been published in printed format
Current Status of Project
Ongoing; publishing infrastructure is in place and revised PhD regulations requiring online publication have been agreed and published; there is regular liaison with a range of parties, including the Graduate Studies Office, the Examinations Office, Colleges and Schools to embed the new processes.

Project 2 E-Theses publication			
Please identify to what extent your project had the following objectives:			
Objectives	Please tick (✓) on one of the following:	Please show how the project aims to fulfil this objective	
Enhance Academic Performance	Not at all	Wider availability, easier access and fuller exposure of University research, with potential for more citation of our research.	
	Somewhat		
	Mostly		✓
	Fully		
Customer Service	Not at all	24 x 7 access to published theses from any location	
	Somewhat		
	Mostly		✓
	Fully		
Process Simplification	Not at all	Ultimate aim would be to publish online only, bringing efficiencies relative to the current print-based model; there are opportunities to integrate and streamline workflows across a range of units.	
	Somewhat		✓
	Mostly		
	Fully		
Cost reduction & value for money	Not at all	Students initially will only need to bear the costs of one hardbound thesis and ultimately it may be possible to eliminate printed publication	
	Somewhat		✓
	Mostly		
	Fully		
Innovation	Not at all	An online-only workflow may emerge, benefiting a range of parties	
	Somewhat		✓
	Mostly		
	Fully		
Compliance	Not at all		
	Somewhat		✓
	Mostly		
	Fully		

Project 3 Easter Opening			
This project aimed to extend the opening hours of the Library at Easter 2011.			
Current Status of Project Completed: The Library was open for the first time on Good Friday and Easter Monday in 2011 when the examinations timetable spanned both sides of the Easter break.			
Please identify to what extent your project had the following objectives:			
Objectives	Please tick (✓) on one of the following:	Please show how the project aims to fulfil this objective	
Enhance Academic Performance	Not at all	By providing students with access to learning resources and quiet study spaces in support of their examination preparations during part of the University's Easter closure.	
	Somewhat		
	Mostly		
	Fully		✓
Customer Service	Not at all	Delivered 16 extra opening hours at a time of high demand for Library access.	
	Somewhat		
	Mostly		
	Fully		✓
Process Simplification	Not at all		
	Somewhat		✓
	Mostly		
	Fully		
Cost reduction & value for money	Not at all	Students would expect a reasonable level of access to Library and other University facilities during exam time and might view the additional opening as representing value for money, although the University had to pay an overtime premium to remain open.	
	Somewhat		✓
	Mostly		
	Fully		

Innovation	Not at all		This was the first time the Library was open on Good Friday and Easter Monday.
	Somewhat	√	
	Mostly		
	Fully		
Compliance	Not at all	√	
	Somewhat		
	Mostly		
	Fully		

Project 4 Integrated Helpdesk Project

This project aims to establish and deliver an integrated helpdesk for a range of currently separate student-facing services, delivering an improved customer experience, stronger service uptake, streamlining of effort, more efficient deployment of staffing resources and more versatile provider skill sets.

Current Status of Project

Just started: the Establishment Control Group has approved a post of Integrated Helpdesk Service Manager and discussions have commenced, between the Library and ISS initially, regarding a number of practicalities, including accommodation, position description and timing.

Please identify to what extent your project had the following objectives:

Objectives	Please tick (√) on one of the following:		Please show how the project aims to fulfil this objective
Enhance Academic Performance	Not at all		An integrated helpdesk, initially for Library, ISS and Writing Centre services, should enable users to get their business done more quickly, enabling them to focus more on their academic work
	Somewhat	√	
	Mostly		
	Fully		
Customer Service	Not at all		A key objective is to enhance convenience for customers by collocating cognate services, with potential for extended hours of service.
	Somewhat		
	Mostly		
	Fully	√	
Process Simplification	Not at all		The new service should enable simpler processes, promoting service repeatability, knowledge capture and mutual learning
	Somewhat		
	Mostly	√	
	Fully		
Cost reduction & value for money	Not at all		Staff multiskilling and increased versatility are aims of the envisaged service, along with shared infrastructure and possible consolidation of staffing numbers.
	Somewhat	√	
	Mostly		
	Fully		
Innovation	Not at all		This will be a pathfinder project for the University in terms of front-of-house service integration; it should also promote greater use of online technologies for customer interaction and service management.
	Somewhat	√	
	Mostly		
	Fully		
Compliance	Not at all	√	
	Somewhat		
	Mostly		
	Fully		

Project 5 IUA Shared Library Systems feasibility and scoping.

This project aims to identify possible shared delivery of functions currently performed by Library Management Systems (LMS) and Electronic Resource Management Systems (ERMS) in Irish Higher Educational institutions.

Current Status of Project

Ongoing: So far this project has examined the nature and extent of the existing installed base of library systems technology within the eight institutions under consideration and identified significant potential for cost saving through the shared delivery of Library Management Systems and associated technology. A requirements gathering exercise will commence in late September 2011 parallel to the commencement of the research, analysis, and consultation required for development of policies and strategy.

Please identify to what extent your project had the following objectives:

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Please tick (✓) on one of the following:</i>	<i>Please show how the project aims to fulfil this objective</i>
Enhance Academic Performance	<i>Not at all</i>	National in scope and cooperative in nature this project aims to maintain the highest standards in library systems provision to promote access to academic content at a time of budgetary contraction.
	<i>Somewhat</i> ✓	
	<i>Mostly</i>	
	<i>Fully</i>	
Customer Service	<i>Not at all</i>	This project seeks to improve existing services and develop new ones through increased inter-institutional cooperation by exploiting existing library collections more fully via an integrated national document delivery service and shared electronic content.
	<i>Somewhat</i>	
	<i>Mostly</i> ✓	
	<i>Fully</i>	
Process Simplification	<i>Not at all</i>	The envisaged common library system will pave the way for the introduction of new simplified inter-institutional processes and further sharing of services. Existing process will be redesigned and simplified.
	<i>Somewhat</i>	
	<i>Mostly</i>	
	<i>Fully</i> ✓	
Cost reduction & value for money	<i>Not at all</i>	The project seeks to remove duplicated effort and facilities and simplify library systems administration across the IUA libraries.
	<i>Somewhat</i>	
	<i>Mostly</i>	
	<i>Fully</i> ✓	
Innovation	<i>Not at all</i>	Where feasible and appropriate radical and innovative solutions will be employed.
	<i>Somewhat</i> ✓	
	<i>Mostly</i>	
	<i>Fully</i>	
Compliance	<i>Not at all</i>	This project anticipates possible future compliance requirements.
	<i>Somewhat</i> ✓	
	<i>Mostly</i>	
	<i>Fully</i>	

Part 6: Staff Development in 2010/2011

[Responses should be specific to 2010/11]

Total posts in your unit at 31 Dec 2010, according to the staffing plan agreed with the EDO	101
Total FTEs in your unit at 31 Dec 2010, according to the staffing plan agreed with the EDO	73.87
Total number of staff in your unit who completed PMDS	0
Total person days of internally or externally provided formal training courses.	220.63
Total person days attending Continuing Professional Development events (Conferences, Seminars etc)	73

Skills Strategy

Please describe your strategy (formally documented or informal) for ensuring that the skills needed to deliver the services which you provide are available within your unit.

- The Library has a Staff Development and Training Policy framework document, developed by its Staff Development and Training Group, which clarifies responsibilities for development and training and includes sections on identifying needs, budget, study leave, follow-up and evaluation.

Training Needs Assessment

Please outline how you decided on the training needs of your staff? How did you fund relevant training?

- PMDS would normally have been the key tool for individual training needs assessment but the University's system has been in abeyance for the past year.
- In its absence a somewhat *ad hoc* approach obtained, reliant on identification of relevant development opportunities by managers and staff. These were funded from an allocation of €15K in the Library's Operations budget.
- Locally, the Library Staff Development and Training Group coordinated a series of training events throughout the year targeted at priority needs, often using internal or campus-wide expertise and cascaded training.

Continuing Professional Development (CPD)

Please outline how you encouraged and supported your professionally qualified staff to engage in CPD?

- An allocation of €6K in the Library's Operations budget was available for attendance at conferences.
- Staff had access to a wide range of professional journals online and to related current awareness services.
- The Library is a member of the Academic and National Libraries Training Cooperative (www.anltc.ie) whose member libraries devise an annual programme of seminars, one of which is hosted by each member, with attendees from staff at each institution.

PMDS

Please outline what approach you adopted to managing PMDS and how you ensured that your unit fully participated in it?

- In the absence of an operational PMDS system in the University, the Library embraced the opportunity offered by the BEST programme to provide a range of inputs into the development of a new performance management system, including a proposal for a competency framework.
- Further discussion with the Executive Director of Operations and the Deputy Director, Human Resources, resulted in agreement to engage external expertise to develop and implement a competency framework in the University.
- The Head of Staff Development and Service Environment won funding through the Consortium of National and University Libraries (CONUL) to conduct further research into competency frameworks.

Flexibility and Mobility

Please outline the initiatives, if any, taken by you to offer staff in your unit a wider range of experience, enabling them to successfully develop their careers?

- A significant investment of 88 days in total was made in four leadership and management development programmes:
 - Two members of the Senior Management Team participated in the Future Leaders Programme developed by the UK Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (13 days collectively).
 - The whole Senior Management Team and 11 middle managers engaged in the University's BEST programme (40 days collectively).
 - Four middle managers completed the FETAC Team Leadership Course (32 days collectively).
 - The Senior Management Team participated in "The People Process", a teamwork development initiative (3 days collectively)