

**CPDWL Workshop: *Continuing Professional Development: Building Quality***  
**IFLA WLIC 2016, 13-19 August 2016, Columbus, Ohio, United States**

Session 109 Monday, 15 August 2016, 13.45 to 15.45, Room C220-222

**Summary of feedback at conclusion of workshop:**

Participants were given 3" by 5" index cards and were asked to write a sentence on the lined side of the card about what was the most valuable thing learned at the workshop. On the blank side of the card, they were asked to write about what was missing or disappointing.

A total of 67 cards were returned by attendees as they left the workshop hall. Of these, 26 cards had only positive comments, while 41 had both positive and negative. All of the feedback cards had at least one comment expressing satisfaction with the workshop.

The most frequent responses had to do with the workshop format. Participants liked the interactive, participatory nature of the event. They enjoyed meeting colleagues from other countries and hearing about similarities in their situations as well as learning about the differences. They valued the sharing of ideas and information, and appreciated knowing that guidelines were now available that they could use in their professional association and workplace responsibilities. There was recognition of the importance of "homework:" taking actions over the next several months that would lead to implementation of what was learned at the workshop.

The greatest number of comments expressing dissatisfaction had to do with wanting more time for discussion and the desire to hear more about what groups at other tables had to say. There also was a problem with poor WiFi access in the meeting room. The room turned out to be cramped, as more people kept arriving than anticipated, and there also was a shortage of handouts. The use of Padlet to capture the discussions electronically had an equal number of fans and detractors. From the point of view of the organizers, Padlet was highly effective.

The most serious criticisms were leveled at the lack of overview of the guidelines and the impossibility of reading the entire summary prior to the table discussions. These could not be provided in the available time frame, even though two of the five roles addressed in the guidelines were omitted.

Negative reactions that were anticipated but were barely noted on the feedback cards revolved around the issues of funding continuing learning, and implementing the guidelines, particularly in developing countries. There is clearly much more work for IFLA's CPDWL to do!

Jana Varlejs  
[varlejs@rutgers.edu](mailto:varlejs@rutgers.edu)  
8 august 2016