12-1-2014

Investing in the Student Staff Development Process

Jeremy McGinniss
Baptist Bible College and Seminary

Joshua B. Michael
Cedarville University, jmichael@cedarville.edu

Recommended Citation

McGinniss, Jeremy and Michael, Joshua B., "Investing in the Student Staff Development Process" (2014). *Library Faculty Publications*. 61.
http://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/library_publications/61

CENTENNIAL LIBRARY
CEDARVILLE UNIVERSITY

Investing in the Student Staff Development Process

✠

Jeremy McGinniss, Library Director
Baptist Bible College and Seminary

Joshua B. Michael, Information Services Librarian
Cedarville University

A version of this paper was presented at the 2013 Brick and Click Conference, Maryville, MO.

ABSTRACT

This paper argues for the need for librarians to invest in the student staff development process, particularly in the context of biblical higher education. The foundational pieces of hiring, training, development and assessment which inform the student staff development process are defined and explored to see how they should fit into the library context. Examples from the library literature coupled with practical experience provide a framework that encompasses theoretical and pragmatic application. This paper narrates how a particular library worked through this process while providing principles from which libraries of varying sizes of collections and staff can benefit.

Introduction

Libraries across higher education are grappling with a variety of challenges, such as reductions in staffing levels, redefinition of librarian roles, competing information resources, and declines in institutional budgeting; these challenges affect basic library services. Significant time and effort must be invested in maintaining previous tasks and responsibilities while exploring, testing, and adopting new methods of reaching patrons. Additionally, librarians must demonstrate the library's value while continuing to work interdepartmentally and to integrate across the campus and the curriculums. We believe there is an underutilized resource that academic libraries can harness to enhance their basic services; namely, the student staff.

Literature Review

In the 1950s, professional librarians comprised 50 to 90 percent of the staff in college and university libraries. By the late 1980s, support staff members were outnumbering librarians by a ratio of two to one (Stanfield & Palmer, 2011, p. 635). During the 1990s, libraries passed the point where students were viewed merely as a "labor reserve for the monotonous and repetitive tasks that are necessary for successful library operation" (Clark, 1995, p. 87). In many libraries, student workers are now an essential element in providing basic services.

Historically there have been three particular areas that student training resources have identified as being essential to student worker success: hiring, training, and developing. A fourth area, assessment, has been added in recent years in keeping with the focus of higher education (see Chouteau & Heinzman, 2007; Lemery, 2008). When development is mentioned in these resources, it is often referenced with the goal of training student staff members to take on additional responsibility (Baldwin & Barkley, 2007). Much of the development focus in the literature has been on the area of customer service. For example, a 2008 study by Vilelle and Peters examines a particular group of student staff, namely shelvers, who received a high amount of directional and item-location questions from the library's patrons. Douglas Hasty (2000) suggests that "employment of students, more common in the library profession than in many business environments, allows library student assistants to become invaluable public relations assets" (p. 32). This focus on customer service training and perspective not only provides impetus for students working with library customers but also lays a foundation for students to develop other transferable skills within the arc of their library employment.

The shift to become less library-oriented and more customer-oriented as a profession has directly affected how student workers are trained or even perceived. Student development articles written in the mid-1990s do not share the same stress or focus on customer service with articles from the early 2000s. It is doubtful that this was due to a sudden rise in the importance of customer service for the library profession or because student workers were suddenly unfriendly. Rather, the rise of outside forces competing with library services, in conjunction with the overall growth of general service industries, brought customer service to the forefront as an essential attitude for people working with people. Libraries were no longer guaranteed traffic as the gatekeepers of information. If patrons now had a bad experience, they could go to other sources for their information needs (Kathman & Kathman, 2000).

While there has been a noticeable increase in the focus on customer service in the library literature, there is also an increased focus on "data and feedback from students and supervisors" (O'Neil & Comely, 2010, p. 100). While formal assessment methods are largely absent in articles from the 1990s, they are not devoid of suggestions for evaluation. Gail Oltmanns' 1995 article "The Student Perspective" references an ARL SPEC Kit survey which contained three separate evaluation forms of student workers. Oltmanns also cites a 1992 study by Kathman and Kathman calling for "the use of performance measures to communicate expectations…." Based on this study, Oltmanns notes that "supervisors should analyze tasks, write and review job descriptions for student assistants and decide what results are expected from the work. They should then write performance measure to address those results" (Oltmanns, 1995, p. 73). However, there is less specific emphasis on performance measures, evaluation, or feedback. The end of Oltmanns' article does not revisit

performance measures explicitly: "[S]tudents must know that there are policies and procedures to manage student assistants, just as there are policies and procedures for full-time employees" (Oltmanns, 1995, p. 75).

While there may seem to be a certain lack of weight or focus on formalized measures in the older professional literature, there is a definite sense that the standards and expectations for student staff are the ones librarians and para-professionals should also follow: "To fulfill the library's service needs, the student assistants should receive the same type of customer-service skills training and supervision that would be provided for full-time and career service staff" (Hasty, 2000, p. 34).

For librarians to enhance the impact of their student staff, the value of the work student staff are doing needs to be recognized. If student staff are valuable to the library then they should be treated as such. It seems that this is not always the case. Too often "libraries employ students not because they are good or even okay employees, but because it has somehow become our responsibility as librarians to hire college students" (Gerlich, 2002, p. 147).

Librarians demonstrate their value of the student staff by maintaining clear expectations and clearly communicating those expectations to the student staff: "As student employees constantly test boundaries, supervisors need to state expectations clearly. Plan to provide a lot of direct supervision because student employees frequently have little to no job experience" (Slagell & Langendorfer, 2003, p. 280). Establishing this approach from the outset makes an obvious statement about the library's attitude toward the student staff. For some it may be their introduction to employment in general. Clear communication with students is foundational to their success as library workers. Consider that "many (students) are working in a professional environment for the first time and need guidance about behavior and attire" (Clark, 1995, p. 87). Recognizing the value of the student staff and empowering them in their roles then helps to create library ambassadors that are able to represent the library outside of their scheduled shifts:

> By guiding students who are assisting other students, librarians create an environment where an informal learning community can grow, encouraging students to realize that the library offers more than just a computer station for working on assignments and checking e-mail (Stanfield & Palmer, 2011, p. 636).

While the bulk of training will cover the specific steps and details involved in a variety of library tasks, training in more abstract areas can also occur:

> Training does not end with instructions. It must include the supervisor's setting an example of the work ethic encouraged by the library culture, and of the sense of fair play, encompassing both positive and negative feedback that each library promotes for its employees (Burrows, 1995, p. 83).

It is possible, and desirable, to set the stage for training before it even begins. The hiring process serves as a preparatory action linking to training and assessment. "The training process really begins with a well-written job description. Based on this job description, clear performance measures should be established for the position" (Kathman & Kathman, 2000, p. 178). The context of the job description determines the area in which training occurs. The assessment of how well the student has been trained as well as their demonstrated understanding of their tasks link back to the job description.

Student staff should not be held to an arbitrary list of standards. All staff members are held to the same standard: "If the time, effort and money which we spend on student training is to be worthwhile, it needs to serve not only routine patron needs, but also must in concert with staff supervision, provide librarians with some level of opportunity to exercise academic leadership on their campus" (Burrows, 1995, p. 85).

Biblical Higher Education

Wanting the library to function at its best is only part of the reason for investing time and effort in training and developing a library's student staff. The concept of development is particularly apt in the context of biblical higher education. The idea of student staff development seeks to help students, in the context of their library employment, connect the spiritual, academic and theological truths they are learning with the "why" and "how" they are working. Christian institutions of higher learning suppose an additional element in person-to-person relationships among the campus community, that of a shared Christian identity, which underlies all other elements of such relationships. This means that workplace relationships are invested in with a spiritual significance beyond the purely pecuniary or academic.

For Christian institutions of higher learning, the concept of spiritual growth or discipleship is not typically limited to formal processes alone, but is understood to occur also in student residential contexts, in extra-curricular participation, and in relationships outside of class or chapel settings. Librarians at Christian institutions have the opportunity to see student staff as opportunities for participating in the process of spiritual growth that is occurring comprehensively across campus. To engage in this process of development requires deliberate and time-consuming effort. Such effort does supplant the normal obligations of library employment but adds the additional dimension of library employment as part of the full growth of the student at his or her institution.

These areas and principles cannot succeed, we believe, without caring for and about the student staff. Applying these principles of hiring, training, developing, and assessing without care for the student as a person will result in an artificial process that will eventually fail. While these processes are important to library success, the

focus on library success does not sustain these practices in the long-term. A central element is the mission, and perception of mission, of the library. If the purpose of the library is to care about how people find and access information and actively work to remove hurdles, real or imagined, then that caring extends to the individuals, student or (para)professional, who work in the library. The library exists to serve students and to exclude the nurture, growth, and care for student staff is to fail to realize the full mission of the library. In order to succeed in these areas the library staff must care about its students, particularly in the setting of biblical higher education.

Student library staff are not an easy, reliable pool for cheap labor but are rather individuals who need to be exhorted, encouraged and built into. This is a different dynamic than the classroom and takes time, deliberate effort and trust-building. It takes time and effort on our behalf to ask students, "How are you doing?" with the possibility that they may not be doing very well and need to chat. Perhaps during their shift is not the exact time for a prolonged conversation but immediately after would be and has been appropriate. Caring for students recognizes that they are not coming to the library perfectly formed. Engaging in a meaningful hiring process identifies potential and existing skill in future student staff. Training and developing refine and hone that potential and skill which then connect to the assessment process in order to identify areas of growth. All of these processes point to the end goal of encouraging and spurring the student staff on to "love and good deeds" in the library context.

Expectations and Communication

We suggest that there are two basic areas that need to be addressed at the very beginning of the student staff training process:

1. Clear expectations for student staff behavior, work, and attitudes.

2. Consistent communication of those expectations.

These may seem like needlessly obvious principles. However, as we planned changes for our own approach to student staff development, these two areas continued to reassert themselves as essential building blocks for how the other areas were developed. We were cognizant of the outcomes we wanted from our students, how the ideal student worker would look, and tried to create an approach that would help our student staff achieve those ends. Instead of providing irregular or inconsistent standards of practice, we sought to provide highly visible and easy-to-remember measures by which the student could be successful.

Failing to determine clear and measurable expectations or to communicate clearly and consistently is to set up student staff and supervisors for disappointment and potential failure. However, in many cases the clarity of communication is limited to

particular areas such as training and not abstracted out to include the student's general approach to their job. If it is acknowledged that customer service is important, how should the "customer service-ness" of student staff be measured? How does one set the clear, consistent expectations for customer service or staff behaviors and attitudes towards customers for the library's student staff?

To improve in the four areas of hiring, training, developing and assessing, we identified the values and goals we believed were necessary for our student workers to succeed in accordance with the library's values, goals, and mission. We determined to improve our communication of expectations to them in quality, quantity and type. We sought to communicate our expectations often through various means so that the student workers would clearly understand the goals and values of the library. Our goal was not to give student workers more things to remember or a list of guidelines to ensnare them. Rather, our goal was to distill what we wanted the qualities of our student workers to be so that the students would succeed in their tasks at the library.

This initiative in student staff development was undertaken at a small academic library in Pennsylvania during one academic year. The campus consists of about 700 FTE students including a substation distance-learning population. The school offers undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate degrees. The library staff consists of several part-time paraprofessionals, two full-time professional librarians, and twelve student staff employees who work an average of eight to ten hours each per week. The professional librarians jointly supervise the student staff.

Hiring

Hiring students can be an intimidating process for both the interviewee and the interviewer. In a 15 to 20 minute interview, how can a supervisor determine if this student is going to be a good fit in the library? Will she get along with the other library staff and the library users, be a dependable employee, and understand library values and principles?

There are ways to use the interview to develop the student staff. This is the opening opportunity for shaping a student's perception about working in the library and for communicating the expectations of supervisors. Our first step was to provide interested students with a small set of documents that constitutes an information packet. It includes a job description, a letter describing the interview process, and an application form.

The job description provides clarity regarding responsibilities and standards of performance, which may prove beneficial to students who are not entirely sure what library work involves. The interview letter describes the process so that the student

clearly understands what they must do and what steps are involved in the hiring process. It also reminds students to treat the interview as a formal job interview. The application form requests basic information about the student including past employment, relevant skills, etc.

Utilizing the information packet, the hiring supervisors have the opportunity to gauge how the candidate treats those expectations. This may involve how an applicant presents herself for the interview, how familiar she seems to be with the job requirements, or her engagement with the process. This may have the happy result of allowing a better assessment of a student's qualities for library employment. And even if a candidate is not hired, participating in an interview, reviewing a job description, or thinking about what a job entails may better prepare her for future opportunities.

We established that when students are hired it would be for a period of one year. This provided both the library and the student opportunity to continue or end the employment at the conclusion of that period. A final individual meeting at the end of the year discussed each student's performance during the year. We reviewed the starting goals and asked each student to evaluate his or her performance. While not every student invested themselves in meeting their goals to the same degree, several students made it clear that they deliberately sought to improve in the areas we had previously identified for them.

Training

For us, training provided a chance to communicate the value of the student staff. We believe that we fail student staff by applying unrealistic expectations or poorly communicating our expectations without investing the proper time and training into those staff. While the attitudes of librarians towards student staff is usually positive, the distinction in position, education, age, and other categories can easily lead to attitudes that devalue student staff. But these distinctions matter less in the practical objective of assisting patrons. Librarians have multiple incentives to work, from salary and benefits to the philosophical underpinnings of the vocation of being a librarian. Student staff do not necessarily have those same incentives or motivations for why they are working at the library but, "like permanent staff, students take pride in their jobs and they want to feel that they contributing to the success of the organization" (Clark 1995, p. 87).

It is no secret that much of the work student workers perform is monotonous and repetitive. But it is also essential in meeting the needs of patrons. In keeping with the priority of library customer service, training can be shaped to emphasize the importance of even the most mundane tasks. We believe that it is essential to impress upon the student the value of the job they are doing.

Much of our approach to training overlaps heavily with our approach to development and assessment. It is our belief that if training is being done well, it is directly linked with both of these areas. It is very easy to walk a first-time student through a tour and basic training of duties. However, as laid out in the literature review and in our experience, this is not sufficient. Development and assessment augment ongoing training and support to help student staff be equipped. We sought to follow Hasty's advice in providing our student with "instruction in basic customer service principles and specific library-service practices. Each student assistant must realize that his or her role…is crucial and is not overlooked" (Hasty, 2000, p. 35). Student staff who cannot answer questions adequately or perform tasks well do not feel equipped and subsequently will not see themselves as valued contributors to the library.

In order to communicate this to our students, training was not constructed as a one-time event but an ongoing process, encouraged by the soliciting of questions and feedback from student staff. Additionally, we paired first-time student workers with a more experienced and careful student staff member so that the new student staff member could benefit from the mentoring approach. By monitoring and tracking particular student staff processes, such as shelving, reference transactions, and book processing, the library staff was able to pinpoint particular areas with individual students so that issues could be addressed quickly and directly.

Developing

Student development is a recognition that training is not a one-time occurrence, but an ongoing program of measurement and feedback that organically links training and assessment of the student staff contributions to the library. Consider that "no efforts are complete unless the skill and knowledge obtained during training are used and enacted" (Hasty, 2000, p. 38). Library employment is then viewed as an integral component of a student's academic experience and career arc, rather than a discrete, isolated event. Making this connection requires tangible feedback and clear communication.

Chouteau and Heinzman's 2007 article "Gone Fishing" is an excellent example of a library taking a business philosophical narrative, specifically the "Fish!" philosophy and creatively improvising on a key aspect of that narrative to create a unique motivational and assessment tool for the library. We wanted to motivate and assess our students as part of our plan for development. We met individually with each student staff member and identified their positive contributions to the library and their strengths. This provided definition about what qualities we valued and let the students know that we appreciated their service. We also identified areas that we believed they could improve upon (such as accuracy, problem-solving skills, or initiative). We asked them to then identify goals that they wished to set for themselves and provided some specific goals we had for them. This collaborative

process involved the student staff in setting the standards for their own success and gave them a greater stake in their work in the library. At the end of the year, we met again individually with each student and reviewed the collaborative goals. We provided our assessment of their performance and identified, as specifically as possible, the things we appreciated about their work in the library.

In addition to individual development, we also attempted development as a group. In revising our student development, we wanted something that would help the student staff cohere as a team so we sought to encourage significant shared experiences. To foster communication we arranged to meet every three weeks for an hour as a team. In order to build a stronger sense of team in a fun, informal way, we dedicated half of every meeting to playing a game. We wanted a cooperative and competitive game to help us become more familiar with each other and more accustomed to collaborating and working together. We divided the staff into three teams and adapted the cards from the game Cranium to suit our purposes. Team points were tracked throughout the year and simple prizes were awarded to each member of the winning team. During our end of year interviews, several students identified the team building game as the reason why they felt so connected to other student staff members. Students also remarked that these game times gave them the opportunity to get to know other students better and to better cohere as a staff. Since not all students get to work with the other students, there is limited interaction between the student workers. The game time created shared experiences which in turn created a more relaxed atmosphere. If students are more comfortable around each other, tasks are more easily shared, cooperation is more natural, and investment in one another's success, as well as the success of the library, is more likely.

The other half of each meeting was used for announcements, changes in policies or procedures, scheduling issues, and other information. We also encouraged student questions and comments which has been a very valuable way of identifying items needing our attention or resolving problems. It was not always easy to get students to ask questions or make comments so there were times where we did not proceed until at least a minimum number of questions had been asked. Finally, we periodically had a group discussion centered on an aspect of library philosophy or work objectives to encourage student staff to think about library goals and objectives in a deeper sense.

These group and individual elements were combined at our final staff meeting of the year. In front of the student staff group, the library director addressed each student by name and identified one particular aspect that we as library staff appreciated about that individual. These qualities were pulled from the observations the library staff had made about the individual. This provided an opportunity for the entire staff to see the contribution that the particular member had made to the library, as well as to see the variety of qualities that we as the library staff found valuable. Singling out

individual students also gives the opportunity to demonstrate that the library staff pays attention to student staff performance, cares about them as individuals, and values their service.

Assessing

We developed a rubric that established measurable standards for poor, good, and superior performance across six aspects of behavior and attitude (see Table 1). Each of the six aspects had three specific categories for a total of eighteen measureable items. Each student received a copy of the rubric and it was reviewed at that time in a group meeting. The rubric helped us as supervisors be very explicit about our expectations for student work performance in the library. It forced us also to establish more measurable standards for assessing student performance.

Table 1
Student Staff Rubric

Area of Assessment	Needs Improvement	Good	Superior
Quality of Work	Does not follow directions, policies or guidelines given. May require additional retraining.	Typically follows directions, policies and/or guidelines. May require a retraining in a particular area.	Follows all directions, policies and/or guidelines. No additional retraining required.
	Work that is claimed to be complete is typically not or missing substantial pieces. Overlooks or forgets details. Work is characterized by frequent inaccuracy.	Work that is claimed to be complete is usually completed satisfactorily. Most details are addressed. Work is characterized by a good level of accuracy.	Work that is claimed to be complete is excellently done. No details are missed. Work is characterized by extreme accuracy.
	Does not stay on task. Does not complete work without prompting. Often distracted by non–work related matters.	Typically stays on task well. Completes most work without prompting. Occasionally distracted by non–work related matters.	Always stays on task. Completes all work without prompting. Not distracted by non–work related matters.

Area of Assessment	Needs Improvement	Good	Superior
Communication – Interaction	Provides directions of instructions that patrons have difficulty following. Treats patron questions as an inconvenience or interruption.	Provides directions/instructions that patrons can follow. Most patron questions are welcomed.	Provides excellent directions/instructions that patrons can follow. Follows up with patrons to ensure needs were met.
	Does not communicate with other student staff members when working in the library or shift changes. Fails to notify staff in a timely fashion for covering shift(s).	Communicates clearly with other student staff members when working in the library or shift changes. Typically gives adequate time/notification to cover shift.	Communicates clearly with other student staff members when working in the library or shift changes. Typically gives adequate time/notification to cover shift. Instructions leave no doubt or confusion; help to clarify/shed light on particulate situation.
	Fails to notify or inform library staff of issues related to library operations.	Leaves notes/emails for other staff/librarians. May require follow up for clarification.	Leaves detailed notes/emails for staff/librarians. Requires no follow-up for clarification.
Dependability	Is often late or leaves early for unnecessary reasons. Calls out on a regular basis w/ no one lined up to take their spot. Forgets to come in when taking another student's shift.	Arrives on time. Rarely calls out of work. Schedules replacements in advance of absence. Does not abandon post.	Arrives five minutes prior to starting. Never calls out (sans legit. emergencies). Schedules replacements well in advance and communicates such to librarians.
	Rarely covers shifts for others.	Covers shifts for others when convenient	Covers shifts for other student staff as they need
	Frequently works on own reading/homework/projects when on the library clock. Does not accomplish much library work during shift.	Rarely works on own reading/homework / projects when on the library clock. Typically accomplishes most to all library work during shift.	Avoids working on own reading/homework/projects when on the library clock. Accomplishes all library work during shift

Area of Assessment	Needs Improvement	Good	Superior
Initiative	Occasionally follows through with assigned tasks. Occasionally follows suggested improvements.	Typically follows through w/ assigned tasks. Typically follows suggested improvements.	Always follows through w/ assigned tasks. Always follows suggested improvements.
	When asked, with adequate time to think/prepare, unable to contribute ideas for library growth, adjustment or improvement.	When asked, with adequate time to prepare/think, contributes ideas to staff for library growth, adjustment or improvement.	Contributes unsolicited ideas to staff for library growth, adjustment or improvement.
	Rarely asks questions to clarify difficult or unclear job assignments.	Usually asks good questions to clarify difficult or unclear job assignments	Always asks intelligent questions to clarify difficult or unclear job assignments
	Does not take any initiative in looking for additional work/tasks.	Generally takes initiative in finding work to do when required tasks are completed. Occasionally will ask librarian for additional tasks	Actively keeps oneself involved with library tasks. Is able to locate needed and necessary things to do. Asks librarians for additional tasks.

Area of Assessment	Needs Improvement	Good	Superior
Attitude	Treats patron interactions as an interruption	Treats patron interactions as part of the job routine.	Treats patron interactions as an opportunity to be useful.
	Some interactions with co–workers, patrons are characterized by disrespect and lack of courtesy.	Interactions with co–workers, patrons are typically characterized by respect and courtesy.	Interactions with co–workers, patrons are characterized by respect and courtesy regardless of the individual or his/her attitude.
	Evidences a negative attitude towards assigned tasks. Personal issues or external circumstances consistently distract from work performance.	Exhibits a positive attitude towards assigned tasks. Personal issues or external circumstances rarely distract from work performance.	Exhibits a positive attitude towards assigned tasks. Personal issues or external circumstances do not distract from work performance.
Customer Service	Does not respond to patron requests in a prompt fashion. Sends users to areas rather than accompanying them.	Respond to patron requests in a prompt fashion. Takes users to their requested areas.	Seeks out patrons to assist in the library and ensures user's information need is satisfied.
	Rarely knows the answer. Struggles to remember where to locate information. Painful to watch when answering questions.	Has a good grasp of where things are located in the library. Can locate some things by memory. If unsure, knows where to look, knows who to ask.	Has an excellent grasp of where general areas are located in the library. Can locate many things by memory (i.e. pertinent db's). Knows exactly where or who to look for/contact when needed.
	Has very little confidence in answers due to lack of preparation.	Generally well–prepared and typically projects confidence in answering questions.	Excellently prepared. Answers questions correctly and w/o second-guessing.

The goal of the rubric is to provide an objective standard of performance that the student and supervisor understand, recognize, and share as a common point of understanding. It helps reduce the subjective element from the process of assessing student progress and work. We could have improved our use of the rubric by revisiting the rubric in subsequent student staff meetings or highlighting it in other helpful ways.

While our other development ideas above focused on qualitative measures, we wanted to use quantitative measures too, with the additional goal of providing tangible, clear feedback. This involved keeping track of how accurately students performed certain tasks, which in our library were reshelving books and processing books. We adapted Chouteau and Heinzman's (2007) take on the "Fish!" concept to create visual cues for student work. While we tracked processing accuracy without any special means, laminated, die-cut owls were used to help measure reshelving. When a student reshelved an item, she wrote her initials on the owl before placing it on the shelf to the left of the reshelved item. A supervisor collected the owls daily and kept track of how many were shelved accurately or inaccurately for each student.

Not only did this help us ensure that mis-shelved books were quickly corrected, it also communicated to students that we valued accurate work and that their performance was being measured. This improved our shelving accuracy and created a clear expectation in a non-confrontational way. This also allowed us to keep track of the total number of items reshelved and items processed, to which we also added a running total of reference questions answered by each student. We created a student staff bulletin board and kept track of how each student was ranked in terms of number of items shelved, processed, or answered. Since these numbers were arbitrary and dependent upon hours worked, shift circumstances, and available tasks, we did not use them for assessment, but as development. It provided a means of engaging students with their tasks and at the end of the year we handed out simple prizes for the student who had the most in each category. While not all of the students were motivated by competition, for some it was a noticeable positive factor.

Conclusion

The development of any library's student staff is an ongoing process that requires dedicated time, energy, creativity and commitment. Moreover, this process must be strongly linked to clearly communicated expectations along with basic assessment measures to provide the student staff with constructive criticism and meaningful feedback. We strongly believe that librarians responsible for the hiring, training, developing and assessing of the student staff should view library employment of their institution's students as a unique part of their students' overall growth. Revising our own approach to student staff development has provided us with valuable insights and points to ponder, a strong core of student staff and, we believe, a stronger and more service-oriented library. Above all, the process of reworking our student staff approach has emphasized for us that the opportunities and rewards for investing in students are truly significant and well-worth the time spent. ✠

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Jeremy McGinnis is the Library Director at Baptist Bible College and Seminary. He can be contacted at jemcginniss@bbc.edu. Joshua B. Michael is the Information Services Librarian at Cedarville University. He can be contacted at jmichael@cedarville.edu.

WORKS CITED

Baldwin, D. A., & Barkley, D. C. (2007).Baldwin, D. A. & Barkley, D. C. *Complete guide for supervisors of student employees in today's academic libraries*. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimted.

Burrows, J. H. (1995). Training student workers in academic libraries: How and why. *Journal of Library Administration, 21*(3), 77-86.

Clark, C. K. (1995). Motivating and rewarding student workers. *Journal of Library Administration, 21*(3), 87-93.

Chouteau, C. A., & Heinzman, M. (2007). Gone fishing; using the FISH! business model to motivate student workers. *Technical Services Quarterly, 24*(3), 41-49.

Gerlich, B. K. (2002). Rethinking the contributions of student employees to library services. *Library Administration & Management, 16*(3), 146-150.

Hasty, D. (2000). Student assistants as library ambassadors: An academic library's public relations initiative. *Technical Services Quarterly, 18*(2), 31-40.

Kathman, J. M., & Kathman, M. D. (2000). Training student employees for quality service. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 26*(3), 176-182.

Lemery, Linda D. "Student Assistant Management: Using an Evaluation Rubric". *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, Vol. 15 (4), 2008. Pp. 451-462. Print.

O'Neil, F., & Comely, J. (2010). Models and management of student employees in an Australian university library. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries, 41*(2), 100-112. Print.

Oltmanns, G. V. (1995). The student perspective. In K. William (Ed.), *Libraries and Student Assistants: Critical Links* (pp. 63-77). Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press, Inc.

Slagell, J., & Langendorfer, J. M. (2003). Don't tread on me: The art of supervising student assistants. *The Serials Librarian, 44*(3-4), 279-284.

Stanfield, A. G., & Palmer, R. L. (2011). Peer-ing into the information commons: Making the most of student assistants in new library spaces. *Reference Services Review, 38*(4), 634-636.

Vilelle, L, & Peters, C. (2008). Don't shelve the questions: Defining good customer service for shelvers. *Reference & User Services Quarterly, 48*(1), 60-66.