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Abstract
Professional development (PD) of professionals is an activity required by regulating authorities; however, the value that enterprises obtain from PD is often unknown particularly when PD involves knowledge development. The paper discusses measurement alternatives and provides a review of established evaluation techniques highlighting deficiencies in these methods for evaluating the on-going long term impact of PD. Enterprises need to understand the risks associated with PD as well as the impact of policies, processes and practices. The paper sets out the factors which affect the value added to the enterprise by PD (EPD) and provides details of the how this may be measured by developing an EPD Profile for a professional enterprise.
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Introduction
Professional development (PD) within enterprises is difficult to evaluate as it is an activity which has many stakeholders - each of whom will have diverse aims, e.g. Friedman, et al. (2000) identified the key stakeholders in the PD of professionals as: individuals, employers, professional associations and the public at large. The aims for PD which impacted:

- Individuals were reported as: career improvement; security/protection; and job satisfaction. Evaluation of PD is more likely to focus on the effectiveness of delivery and the perceived relevance of the material rather than proving the value to business (Savage, 2009);
- Both employers and professional associations, were combined and listed as: maintain/raise standards; improved job performance; and demonstrate commitment; and
- Three groups - individuals, professional associations and employers were: keeping up-to-date; improve/develop skills; and increased flexibility/adaptability.

The aims which each stakeholder group has for PD will change over time. Unless performance outcomes have been agreed with the provider, the value of CPD to individuals and to the enterprise is less likely to be assessed.

This paper is concerned specifically with PD within professional enterprises (EPD) and its evaluation. We will use the term enterprise to refer to a professional practice, professional organisation, professional business, institute, corporation or similar bodies. Enterprises, in this context, derive their income by applying the body of knowledge (BoK) of their profession as the basis of the provision of services to clients, rather than generating income from product knowledge (and sales) or through operational efficiency. Individual professionals
whether they are consultants, partners, managers, or owners will be referred to as **employees**. Professional associations or professional societies who accredit members and develop and define a BoK for their profession will be referred to as **associations**.

We argue that there is a need for enterprises to understand their approach to EPD and how this impacts on the outcomes. Critical issues are:

1. What is the entrepreneurial intensity of the enterprise;
2. What are the corporate goals and how is EPD seen as contributing to them;
3. what are the expectations for EPD and how is success defined;
4. What is the learning profile; and
5. What are the factors which facilitate EPD within the enterprise?

The paper will outline, and review the suitability of, various models of evaluation which may be used for PD generically and for the enterprise specifically. The paper sets out an instrument which enables an evaluation of the knowledge culture and of the policies and processes supporting EPD.

**Professional Development**

Continuing Professional Development is the term commonly used for PD involving professionals. The Professional Development Partnership (2008) defines this as “the systematic maintenance, improvement and broadening of knowledge and skills, and the development of personal qualities necessary for the execution of professional duties throughout working life”. CPD is seen as a personal activity which can be used by professionals to:

- Maintain professional status or credentials;
- Obtain new professional qualifications (typically specialist credentials);
- Broaden their knowledge base to integrate with other professions so that they can operate in multi-disciplinary teams and/or develop their management skills;
- Develop and enhance generic or soft skills.

The directions of PD undertaken and the outcomes resulting from PD will depend on the weight given to the various motivations and pressures which are.

1. PD is an **individual** responsibility, determined and controlled by the employee:
   - to enable career development and
   - to meet compliance requirements of regulatory authorities;
2. **enterprises** employing professionals:
   - sponsor and support EPD
   - need to ensure that EPD adds value to the enterprise; and
3. PD is an **ongoing or continuing** activity (**CPD** is used to denote this distinction from PD) which may include:
   - one-off or irregular activities;
   - or the broader and often longer term orientation of knowledge development. Its application is relevant for employees and enterprises concerned with delivery of professional services.
The BoK held by individual employees are aggregated to provide the enterprise with its own enterprise knowledge (EKn). For the enterprise, EPD may provide risk through potential loss of some of its BoK if employees are provided with new knowledge, skill and understanding enabling them to leave the enterprise, or it may enable maintenance of the status quo (sufficiency) or opportunities to satisfy the enterprise goals. Maintenance of the status quo may itself be a risk in the long term. The alternatives are represented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk (Employee leaves)</th>
<th>Sufficiency (Employee stays)</th>
<th>Opportunity (Employee stays)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BoK is lost to enterprise</td>
<td>Maintains and uses BoK</td>
<td>Maintains, extends and uses BoK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKn is diminished</td>
<td>EKn is not grown</td>
<td>EKn is grown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoK may be lost to profession</td>
<td>BoK is not passed on within enterprise</td>
<td>BoK is passed on within enterprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EPD therefore represents a gamble for an enterprise. Will EPD:

- provide the knowledge, skill, and opportunity to enable employees to leave;
- enable the enterprise to continue to provide existing services at a basic or current standard; and/or
- enable the firm to recognise and take advantage of new opportunities?

The CEO of an enterprise may ask “How do I know if my organisation is at risk because of the way I approach PD?” This leads to three propositions - the enterprise will:

1. be reluctant to invest in EPD beyond a sufficiency level for fear of loss to its EKn and to the investment required for EPD;
2. invest in EPD only for compliance of regulatory authorities and/or for sufficiency learning; and
3. invest in PD above a sufficiency level when it perceives that that EPD contributes value.

The way that the value of EPD is perceived within an enterprise will be dependent on organisational culture. This will influence the policies and processes used for PD.
Measures for PD
Measures currently available to evaluate PD include those predominantly originating from:

1. Education sources such as:
   - Kirkpatrick’s four levels (Chapman, 1995-2007; D. Kirkpatrick, 2009; D. Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006; J. Kirkpatrick, 2008)
   - Phillips’ fifth level (1996, 2007);
   - Return on Expectations (D. Kirkpatrick, 2009; D. Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006; J. Kirkpatrick, 2008); and
   - Competency assessments (Jones, Voorhees, & Paulson, 2002; PSC, 2006; Standards Australia, 2001);
2. Standard business practices evaluation techniques such as:
   - Breakeven Analysis, ROI and Net Present Value (Hunter & Allport, 1979);
   - Balanced Scorecard (Kaplan & Norton, 2007; Kaplan & Norton, 2005);
   - Gain Score Analysis (Breakwell & Millward, 1995); and
   - Value Added (Milost, 2007 p.8).

These measures are appropriate when the organisation is looking for benefits which are
directly measurable. They do not address the concerns mentioned earlier that a CEO may
have regarding EPD.

Directly measurable (financial) business benefits (e.g. reduced costs through a decrease in
complaints or returns, or increased revenue through new or improved customer service,) often are project based and require skills development e.g. training for the introduction of
new systems with results measurable against an existing system. EPD in these cases is
usually a necessity and when it has an immediate impact, measurement of benefits is
feasible. Intangible potential benefits e.g. increase in employee morale, improved work/life
balance are not measured.

EPD which aims to produce knowledge rather than skills is more difficult to evaluate as the
benefits may be long term and not easily associated with specific professional development
(Anderson, 2007; Taylor, 2007). This distinction is particularly relevant as the expertise of
professionals is demonstrated through their tacit knowledge which is the factor which
distinguishes them from less knowledgeable practitioners (Ericsson & Smith, 1991; Leonard
& Swap, 2005). Tacit knowledge is more often developed through learning that is practical
and implicit (Sternberg, 1999).

Suitable EPD will vary from one enterprise to another and may involve learning about:
planning; programs; policies; organisation; products and services; and/or individuals. The
benefits derived from EPD may be financial (cost reduction or revenue generation);
individual career development; and/or development of organisational capability. In
evaluating EPD; organisations should consider the contribution made to operational
performance; tactical directions and/or strategic planning. The outcomes resulting from EPD
may depend on the capabilities and attitudes of the employee. The motivations which
determine the level of support given within each enterprise may vary for each professional development activity and between individual employees; and change over time.

Enterprises have a vested interest in ensuring that EPD provides benefits which both contribute to employees in their career development and to an enterprise’s ability to function and to grow. The effectiveness of EPD will be greatest where the culture of the enterprise values learning and knowledge and where the policies and processes support EPD. Measuring the value added by EPD may be possible for enterprises in only some circumstances. No measures exist to enable the enterprise to gain an understanding of the value which it places on knowledge development and its role in facilitating learning and growth. Such an understanding may enable the enterprise to enhance their approach to EPD.

**PD Evaluation Models**

There are various models of PD evaluation including those predominantly originating from education sources such as: Kirkpatrick’s four levels and Phillips’ fifth level; Return on Expectations; and Competency assessments; together with evaluation techniques based on standard business practices such as: Breakeven Analysis, ROI and Net Present Value; Balanced Scorecard; Gain Score Analysis; and Value Added.

Perhaps the most widely recognised evaluation technique is Donald Kirkpatrick’s training evaluation model – the four levels of training was first proposed in 1959 and refined since then by him and together with his son (Chapman, 1995-2007; D. Kirkpatrick, 2009; D. Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006; J. Kirkpatrick, 2008). The four levels Kirkpatrick identified were:

- **Reaction (feelings)** – what have the participants thought and felt about the process they had undertaken? This is most likely to be undertaken through the use of forms completed at the end of an activity (happy sheets), or through feedback to and via supervisors on returning to work;
- **Learning (acquisition)** – has the knowledge or capability of the participants increased? This can be identified through assessment (often for competence) sometimes pre and post the activity or through interviews or observation. This level is much easier to assess for learning which is highly structured rather than for more complex professional development;
- **Behaviour (application)** – has the learning and training resulted in sustained changes in behaviour? This requires assessment over time through observation and/or interviews and requires the support of line management; and
- **Results (impact)** – what has been the impact on the individual or the enterprise? It is possible to measure changes in value within enterprises; however, it can be difficult to be sure that an increase in performance or value is attributable to PD activities alone and not other factors impacting the business. This level of training is difficult to assess for multiple PD activities across an organisation.
Phillips (1996, 2007) added a fifth level to Kirkpatrick’s model - Return on Investment (ROI) based on the need for PD to be assessed under the same criteria used for other business activity. The ROI is based on converting level 4 data to monetary values and comparing this return with the cost of PD. Once again this is easier to do for training based activities which are highly structured with defined measurable outcomes. Phillips uses a standard formula for calculating ROI:

\[
\text{ROI} = \frac{\text{Benefits} - \text{Costs}}{\text{Costs}} \times 100
\]

This provides a simplistic view of ROI which is appropriate for activities where there is an immediate return on investment. This cost-effectiveness strategy is based on valuing improved work practices. Benefits which relate to knowledge generation are more likely to be long term, difficult to measure and should be subject to discounted cash flow analysis.

Jim and Don Kirkpatrick (D. Kirkpatrick, 2009; D. Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006; J. Kirkpatrick, 2008) argue that ROI is part of level 4 – results. They further argue that Return on Expectations (ROE) is a more significant assessment. ROE involves the promoters of learning (or individual professional’s engaging in PD) and enterprise management negotiating prior to the EPD activity what a successful outcome will be and how it can be measured. ROE provides a means whereby EPD can be followed up after an activity has taken place with a view to maximising benefits to the organisations. These benefits are not confined to financial benefits. The technique is more appropriate when benefits are expected to be achieved in the short term.

Gain Score Analysis (Breakwell & Millward, 1995) is a technique which also attempts to measure the impact of an intervention. This model of before/after analysis can be used at both employee and enterprise levels but is most suited to EPD involving single activities with highly structured measurable results.

Competency is defined as a combination of skills, abilities, and knowledge needed to perform a specific task (Jones, et al., 2002, p. 8). Competency standards exist across many disciplines. These standards are seen as a means of protecting the public through risk minimisation policies (Jones, et al., 2002; PSC, 2006; Standards Australia, 2001). Standards appear to be less concerned with the development of new or deeper knowledge such as the acquisition of specialist knowledge or integration of knowledge (Smith, 2005; Standards Australia, 2007). Professional Standards legislation inaugurated in Australia has reinforced the competency focus of professional development.

Competencies provide a means of objectively measuring an individual’s knowledge and skills to assess their ability to perform predetermined tasks for which set solutions have been established. Assessment relates primarily to how one may perform a given task. It implies
that the person being measured or certified has knowledge, skill and experience in relevant technical and business areas. Thalheimer (2007) challenges conventional assessment methods and disputes that these methods test the learner’s ability to retrieve knowledge, skill and understanding after the assessment period and in different contexts.

Accounting techniques for evaluating projects and investments typically are break-even analysis (BEA) and ROI. Both are often used as planning tools to choose between alternatives. BEA attempts to estimate the time it will take to recoup the cost of the activity (professional development) based on the phasing in of the expected benefits. Both BEA and ROI are suitable for activities for which benefits will be achieved quickly. Both ignore the time value of money - when benefits occur over time and the value of dollars received in some future time are not the same as dollars spent now. Discounted cash flow analysis or Net Present Value (NPV) applies a discounting factor – the internal rate of return - to the ROI which is used to determine whether projects return a positive return. Discounted cash flow can be used to determine both NPV and a more realistic BEA (Hunter & Allport, 1979). These techniques are suitable in assessing whether or not an activity should be approved. They rely on accurate estimation of costs and (particularly in relation to this paper) benefits which are difficult to predict for knowledge based EPD.

An alternative method involves assessing the value added to an enterprise by PD. “Value added can be defined the increased value of the organisation a result of their increased quality” (Milost, 2007 p.8). As most professional enterprises are not listed companies this change in value may be difficult to obtain although there are formulas for valuing professional practices based on the net present value of its future cash flows (Jansen, 2006). Specifically identifying the impact of EPD in this process would be unrealistic.

The Balanced Scorecard (BSC) (Kaplan & Norton, 2007; Kaplan & Norton, 2005) includes not only financial perspectives in judging corporate performance, but also takes into account the customer; internal business processes; and learning and growth. It looks at:

- What does the enterprise want to be;
- How will it get there and what are the goals that need to be achieved; and
- What needs to be measured?

These questions are also critical in Benchmarking which is a management technique to allow an enterprise to measure itself against its peers. The goal is to improve the enterprise in defined areas through learning and development of individuals and the enterprise (Fernandez, McCarthy, & Rakotobe-Joel, 2001).

A BSC needs to be developed specifically for each enterprise and will take a long time to implement. It may be beyond the capacity of many small to medium enterprises (SMEs) to put into practice. BSC stresses the importance of developing strategic or organisational
learning and sharing knowledge within the organisation in order to produce a change in people assumptions about cause and effect relationships. Offering training to improve techniques is seen as a key step in the process of business improvement. BSC drills down from a starting point of corporate targets through business unit targets, to team and individual objectives and initiatives. It has a focus on corporate learning and while individual learning is valued it is arguable that EPD is unlikely to be specifically measured in a BSC.

Assessing an enterprise’s approach to PD (An Enterprise PD Profile)

We propose that the value added for enterprises by PD will depend on:

- the policies and practices which the enterprises uses to support EPD (*Supporting EPD Factors*). This measure relies on:
  - the *Enterprise Learning Profile* (DiBella & Nevis, 1998) which addresses the emphasis and value placed by the enterprise on knowledge and its acquisition (Appendix 1 Part A); this combines with
  - the *Facilitating Factors* (DiBella & Nevis, 1998) for PD which identify:  
    - the attitude which the enterprise has to PD and  
    - how the culture of the enterprise impacts the level, method and content of learning (Appendix 1 Part B);  
- the way the enterprise uses PD to satisfy *corporate goals* (Friedman, et al., 2000) (Appendix 1 Part C); and  
- the enterprise’s *Entrepreneurial Intensity* (Ireland, Kuratko, & Morris, 2006b) as this will drive corporate goals, the *expectations* that the organisation has for EPD and may influence EPD policies and practices to the extent that these are developed to satisfy corporate goals (Appendix 1 Part D); and  
- the risk that EPD poses to the BoK of the enterprise (Appendix 2);

The relationship of these influences in adding value to the enterprise through PD is shown in Figure 1.
The net value a professional enterprise gains from EPD depends on the expenses incurred and the benefits gained. Expenses include the direct costs of the EPD activity and should include other costs such as the cost of employees’ time which may include the opportunity cost and/or the charge-out lost because of PD. The benefits of EPD are comparatively easy to measure when they relate to discrete, directed training activities which have short term payback. CPD for professionals may involve career developing activities and may impact the long term viability and performance of enterprises. This impact is difficult to measure, as over time, other factors will also affect the enterprise and therefore the direct benefits of EPD may not be clear or identifiable. One way to obtain evidence of the value added by EPD is to ask individual professionals to provide examples of PD’s contribution - both positive and negative - to the individual/enterprise (Appendix Part 1 E).

The evaluation instrument consists of a survey discussed above and an interview with the CEO of each enterprise. The interview (Appendix 2) is designed to identify the expectations of the enterprise for PD and how the enterprise defines success. Within this overall theme CEOs will be asked for the enterprise:

- how the value of EPD is assessed;
- what benefit is gained through EPD;
- what corporate support for learning is provided;
- what models of informal learning are used; and
- how the costs of EPD are calculated?
Exercising the Evaluation Instrument

The evaluation instrument (Appendix 1 and 2) is appropriate to any enterprise providing professional services based on a BoK e.g. university departments, consulting organisations and professional practices. The methodology chosen for our study involves selection of SMEs within two professions. Selection criteria are:

- Professions are selected to provide possible differences in approach to regulation and knowledge development e.g.
  - Medical general practitioners are expected to undertake PD but the level of compliance is self-regulated and unspecified;
  - Accountants are required to undertake a minimum number of hours of PD – compliance is regulated.
- Enterprises will have between 3 – 20 partners/owners. They will provide first line professional contact and advice to the public at large. They will not be sufficiently large to provide the bulk of their EPD internally. Large enterprises have not been selected as the scale of their operations may provide them with opportunities for significant internal EPD arranged through formal Training and HR departments. Professionals operating as sole practitioners will not be used in the study as they may bring biases in their approach to PD.

The data collection phase of the study enables the enterprise through the CEO to identify what successful EPD means. Employees provide data to establish the EPD profile of the enterprise. The relationship (if any) between the EPD profile and success will be tested both as enterprise and profession case studies. Processing the data will involve analytic induction (Ratcliff, c2007) which will be sensitive to and analyse contextual variations within each setting and allow comparisons across enterprises (Cousin & Jenkins c2008).

The PD needs of employees vary over time as a professional moves through the stages of novice (beginner); apprentice (advanced beginner); intermediate; journeyman (advanced); master (virtuoso) (Leonard & Swap, 2005 p.9) by going through the process and stages of learning new knowledge, skills and understanding phases appropriate to the level of the professional. The conscious competence matrix:

- unconscious incompetence;
- conscious incompetence;
- conscious competence;
- unconscious competence) (Chapman, 2003-2009)
provides a way of looking at the at the processes and stages of new learning which reinforces the concept that the development of employees should be appropriate to their existing knowledge levels and their ability to develop their knowledge base.

An alternative way of representing the levels of development of employees was suggested by Taylor (2007 in Chapman, 2003-2009) as accidental, intentional, skilful, masterful, and enlightened. Learning content, models and methods are not a “one size fits all” solution for all of these levels.
PD activities can be plotted within a matrix which shows the aims of the activities and whether these are isolated activities or part of on-going PD:

**Table 2  Classification of PD Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-off</th>
<th>Continuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single activity may be recorded in multiple boxes e.g. a one-off training activity may meet the requirements for competency assessment and regulatory requirements; CPD activities such as participation in a special interest group may satisfy regulatory and developmental needs. Other activities will fit in only one box e.g. attending a short course on a new software tool (one-off/competency), or communications (one-off/developmental); or undertaking an MBA program (continuing/developmental).

The types of learning are relevant in examining the practices used and supported by the enterprise for PD. Eraut (2000) identified the categories of learning as: formal, non formal and informal. Table 3 defines three types of learning in relation to employees and enterprises.

**Table 3  Self-Directed Learning and Enterprise Facilitated Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of learning</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Enterprise facilitated learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal learning</td>
<td>Primarily self-directed learning; Provides integrative and/or specialist knowledge; Provides measurable learning (although the transferability of learning is debateable).</td>
<td>May support learning activities through allowing time or through payment of fees and other expenses; Possibly provide: • practical situations to integrate work and learning; • mentoring; and • communities of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non formal learning</td>
<td>May be self-directed learning; Extent of learning achieved is difficult to measure.</td>
<td>May be directed specifically by the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal learning</td>
<td>Primarily self-directed learning; Extent of learning achieved is difficult to measure.</td>
<td>Corporation can provide a learning community to enrich learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The degree of control that employees and enterprises have over the direction and practice is illustrated in Table 4 and can be examined in detail with the data obtained from the study.

Table 4: Control over Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of learning (Misko, Beddie, &amp; Smith, 2007)</th>
<th>Enterprise Controls: (Mocker &amp; Spear, 1982)</th>
<th>Employee Controls: (Mocker &amp; Spear, 1982)</th>
<th>Employee’s intention: (Eraut, 2000)</th>
<th>Enterprise’s intention:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>learning objectives and the means of learning (when enterprise nominates PD activity)</td>
<td>deliberate</td>
<td>Passive/supportive/deliberate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-formal learning</td>
<td>means of learning</td>
<td>learning objectives</td>
<td>deliberate</td>
<td>deliberate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal learning</td>
<td>learning objectives</td>
<td>means of learning</td>
<td>implicit</td>
<td>Implicit/explicit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The control that the enterprise has over learning and its intent for learning will depend on the direction and support that they give to EPD.

The instrument enables examination of the:

- drivers for EPD;
- policies, practices and processes;
- risks to the enterprise associated with EPD within the enterprise. Data obtained using the evaluation instrument represents a snapshot position for each enterprise and the EPD profile of an organisation will change over time.

**Summary and Actions**

In proposing the existence of an *Enterprise PD Profile*, we recognise that the study is exploratory in nature, rather than hypothesis testing, and will rely on interpretation of the data obtained. The policies, processes and practices of PD within enterprises, together with the awareness and attitude of the risks associated are examined to establish an EPD profile. The relevance of the key factors within this profile will be subject to analysis and interpretation.

The data gathered represents the experiences of employees within their enterprises and provides meaning to those experiences. The inductive process moves from individual cases to generalisations and may provide representation of the real world (Mocker & Spear, 1982). Knowledge about the factors influencing PD may enable an enterprise to gain an understanding of how EPD can add value to the enterprise and the associated risks minimised.
EPD is not a *one-size fits all* approach - the level and content focus of PD will vary over time both for the enterprise and for employees.

The evaluation instrument including both interview and survey, have been subject to testing with interested peers. Tentative selection of participating enterprises has taken place. Establishing an enterprise’s PD profile will involve:

- interview with the CEO to be followed by;
- release of the survey to employees. (If there is a low response to surveys within an enterprise, follow up to obtain encouragement for more responses will occur with the CEO);
- data will be coded and analysed; and
- reports written for and presented to individual enterprises giving specific details of their EPD profile and in comparison with their peer enterprises.
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Appendix 1

PD for Professional Organisations

A study of the impact of continuing professional development (CPD) on professional organisations and the way that organisational culture can influence CPD.

Dear Madam/Sir,

Your organisation has agreed to be part of a student PhD research project on behalf of Swinburne University of Technology. We seek your support in regard to completing this survey.

There are five parts to this questionnaire (A-E) which all "consultant level" staff within your professional organisation are asked to complete:

A. Assessing the Organisational Learning Profile
B. Determining the Facilitating Factors for CPD
C. What Corporate Goals are satisfied for the organisation by CPD
D. Measuring the organisation's entrepreneurial intensity
E. An example of CPD's positive contribution at an individual or corporate level and optionally, where there is one, an example where CPD's contribution has been negative.

There are no "correct" answers to any of the questions. Parts A - D require selection of a single response from a number of alternatives and so should be able to be answered quickly.

The only questions in the survey which must be answered are the initial questions which identify your organisation by its code and the profession of your organisation. Any other questions may be skipped. However, your responses to the entire survey will contribute to a deeper analysis of CPD within your organisation.

At the end of Parts A, B and C there is a final question which enables you to provide your understanding of the issues in that section in relation to your organisation.
In Part E, you are asked to provide an example of where CPD may have made a positive contribution, and if relevant, an example of where CPD may have made negative contributions. Each comment box will expand in size if required. However, in order to minimise your time commitment, we recommend that your comments are 50 words or less. Answers to these free text questions are optional but your replies will add to the relevance of the study.

**Outcomes**: From this questionnaire and an associated interview with the organisation's CEO, a profile of the organisation's CPD will be established; specifically the methods used, and the extent to which CPD is used to:

- Derive value to the organisation through increasing the effectiveness of professionals;
- Certify compliance of professionals to regulatory and professional standards; and
- Transfer knowledge to professionals.

It is expected that the results of the study will be of value to participants and the organisation in framing professional development policies and practices.

**Privacy Provisions**: Individual professionals and your organisation will not be identified in any work resulting from this research as pseudonyms will be used to protect confidentiality of the data supplied. Participants will be given access to the results of the research and will be able to discuss the findings.

Individuals and professional organisations are free to participate and may withdraw at any time without any obligation or explanation. Withdrawal can be either in relation to further participation; or the use of any data already provided.

Your organisation will already have completed an Informed Consent Form in which it has signified that your participation in this study is approved.


Every "consultant level" staff member/partner within the organisation is asked to complete all parts of the questionnaire. **Thank you** for your participation.
Part A: Assessing the Organisational Learning Profile

This part of the survey (based on research by DiBella and Nevis (1998)), attempts to assess how the organisation goes about acquiring and disseminating knowledge and its approach to learning within the organisation.

Two alternatives are provided in each question. You are asked to choose between the two alternatives on the scale provided, where the organisation uses:

1. Mostly the first alternative
2. More the first alternative
3. Evenly divided between the first and second alternatives
4. More the second alternative
5. Mostly the second alternative

The organisation prefers to develop new knowledge from sources which are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERNAL</th>
<th>EXTERNAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly INTERNAL</td>
<td>More INTERNAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Content-Process Focus:** The organisation prefers to gain knowledge which relates to the definition of the services (Content) offered as opposed to the processes which might underlie or support those services (Process):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly CONTENT</td>
<td>More CONTENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Knowledge Reserve:** This refers to variations in behaviours and attitudes to the repositories of knowledge. The term refers to the ownership/control/accessibility of the knowledge base held within the organisation which may be possessed by individuals (Personal) as compared with knowledge which is publicly available (within the organisation). Knowledge is seen as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL</th>
<th>PUBLIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly PERSONAL</td>
<td>More PERSONAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Dissemination mode:** This pertains to differences between establishing an atmosphere in which learning evolves informally and one in which a more structured,
controlled approach is taken to bring about learning (formal):
The mode of learning used is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMAL</th>
<th>INFORMAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly FORMAL</td>
<td>More FORMAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenly Divided</td>
<td>More INFORMAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly INFORMAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Knowledge Focus**: Learning is directed to obtaining knowledge to improve what is already known or being done (Incremental) as opposed to obtaining knowledge that challenges the assumptions about what is known or done (Transformative).
The focus for knowledge acquisition is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCREMENTAL</th>
<th>TRANSFORMATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly INCREMENTAL</td>
<td>More TRANSFORMATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenly Divided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More TRANSFORMATIVE</td>
<td>Mostly TRANSFORMATIVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Learning Timeframe**: Defines the emphasis on learning which responds to immediate needs, as compared with learning which may have long-term use.
Knowledge is gained for which the use is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMMEDIATE</th>
<th>LONG-TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly IMMEDIATE</td>
<td>More LONG-TERM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenly Divided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More LONG-TERM</td>
<td>Mostly LONG-TERM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Learning Focus**: This distinguishes between learning geared to individual skill development and learning which is focused on team or group development. Learning activities are directed at knowledge being obtained by an:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly INDIVIDUAL</td>
<td>More GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evenly Divided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More GROUP</td>
<td>Mostly GROUP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Learning Mode**: Where learning involves generating and sharing knowledge and skills through actions or practices (Experiential) as compared with generating and sharing knowledge and skills through reflective activities or thinking (Cognitive). The
mode of learning used is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENTIAL</th>
<th>COGNITIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENTIAL</td>
<td>EXPERIENTIAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Describe your understanding** of how the organisation goes about acquiring and disseminating knowledge and its approach to learning within the organisation (We recommend that you use 50 words or less).
Part B. Determining the facilitating factors for CPD

This section (based on research by DiBella and Nevis (1998)), looks at the Factors which may facilitate CPD within professional organisations. The survey attempts to determine the relevance of each of 13 factors which may impact CPD within your organisation.

A seven point scale is used for each of the factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little evidence to support this Factor</th>
<th>Some evidence to support this Factor</th>
<th>Extensive evidence to support this Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Performance Tensions**: Gaps in the knowledge, skill and understanding are recognised when that currently held either within the organisation or individually does not meet that which is desired or required.

2. **Trusting Relationships**: This occurs when there is trust and open communication between colleagues and when team members respect the need for mutual growth and development.

3. **Leadership**: Leaders are personally and actively involved in learning initiatives and in ensuring that a learning environment is maintained.

4. **Systems Perspective**: Realisation and appreciation of complexity in problem solving in professional practice. May be demonstrated by: recognition of interdependence among groups; awareness of time delay between actions and their outcomes etc.

5. **Multiple Advocates**: Staff at all levels are allowed/encouraged to look at and propose ways to develop new knowledge. Anyone can advocate change. Anyone can be a champion. Multiple advocates or champions exist.

6. **Learning Confidence**: This is defined as experience in learning from successes, mistakes, and specific events; experience in trying new things; belief that all groups can learn.

7. **Organisational Curiosity**: Curiosity about conditions and practices, interest in creative ideas and new technologies, support for experimentation.

8. **Appreciation for Measurement**: The importance of measuring learning is recognised. Considerable effort is spent defining and measuring key factors. Discourse over methods to measure learning is regarded as a learning activity.
9. **Learning Resources:** The organisation is committed to providing high quality resources for learning.

10. **Appreciation of differences in approach to professional practice:** Different methods, procedures, competencies, skills and knowledge are valued; diversity is appreciated.

11. **Scanning Imperative:** This is defined as people gathering information about conditions and practices outside an individual work area and seeking out information about the external environment.

12. **Shared Vision:** This occurs when values and vision are shared within a team or within the organisation.

13. **Learning Enjoyment:** This involves celebrating learning achievements and creating an atmosphere where humour and fun are part of the process of acquiring new knowledge.

14. **Describe your understanding** of the factors which may facilitate CPD within professional organisations. (Once again we recommend that you use 50 words or less):
Part C Benefits Claimed for CPD

This section looks at the benefits that various professional associations have claimed that CPD may achieve (Friedman, et al., 2000 p.93-100).

You are asked to indicate the level of significance to your organisation, of each potential benefit in contributing towards the corporate goals, based on a seven point scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The organisation relies on CPD to enable individuals and the organisation to keep up-to-date and to maintain knowledge and/or skills;

2. The organisation deliberately uses CPD to improve and/or develop the knowledge and/or skills necessary for professional performance by professionals;

3. Maintaining and/or raising standards are achieved through the way the organisation supports and/or conducts CPD;

4. The CPD policies and practices of the organisation actively support individual career improvement through CPD;

5. The CPD policies and practices of the organisation support the Security/protection of individuals' jobs or careers;

6. The CPD policies and practices of the organisation contribute to increased job satisfaction within the organisation;

7. The organisation uses CPD to improve job performance;

8. CPD is an important element in the empowerment of staff;

9. CPD enables individuals to demonstrate commitment to the organisation and/or the profession;

10. The flexibility/adaptability of the organisation and/or the individual is significantly increased by CPD;

11. Describe your views of the relevance of CPD in contributing to the organisation. (Once again we recommend that you use 50 words or less):
Part D. Measuring the organisation's entrepreneurial intensity

This section, based on research by Miller (1983), Morris and Kuratko (2002) and Ireland, Kuratko & Morris (2006a; 2006b) is designed to measure the entrepreneurial intensity of your organisation. The purpose of including this measure is to examine whether there is a relationship between entrepreneurial intensity and CPD within professional organisations.

For the following statements, please indicate the response that best corresponds to your level of agreement with each statement based on the scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Our organisation is characterised by:

1. A high rate of new product/service introductions, in comparison with other professional practices (including new features and improvements);

2. An emphasis on continuous improvement in methods of production and/or service delivery;

3. Risk-taking by key executives in seizing and exploring chancy (or risky) growth opportunities;

4. Seeking of unusual, novel solutions by senior executives to problems via the use of "idea people", brainstorming, etc.;

5. A top management philosophy that emphasises proven products and services, and the avoidance of heavy development costs;

6. In our organisation, top level decision-making is characterised by:

7. Cautious, pragmatic, step-at-a-time, adjustments to problems;

8. Active searching for big opportunities;

9. Rapid growth as the dominant goal;

10. Large, bold decisions despite uncertainties of the outcomes;

11. Compromises among the conflicting demands of owners, government, management,
customers, employees, suppliers, etc.;

12. Steady growth and stability as primary concerns.

**New Service Introduction:** This can be defined as "fee for service" operations which you offer to your clients.

13. What is the number of new services your organisation introduced during the past two years?

14. How many existing services did you significantly revise or improve during the past two years?

15. How does the number of new service introductions made by your organisation compare with those of the competitors?

16. To what degree did these new service introductions include services that did not previously exist in your markets:

17. Please estimate the number of significant new methods or operational processes your organisation implemented during the past two years? Examples of process innovations include: new systems for managing customer service, an improved process for collecting receivables, a major new sales or promotional approach, new web based information service provision, etc.
Part E: Example(s) of CPD's contribution at an Individual or Corporate Level:

Can you think of an example of a CPD activity which has made a significant positive contribution either to an individual or to the organisation?

NB If you are not aware of CPD causing a positive contribution please indicate this in the first box of this sub-section and then go to the section on negative impact below.

The following seven questions to this sub-section relate specifically to your example where CPD has made a positive contribution. Once again to minimise your time commitment, we recommend that answers be 50 words or less.

1. What was the type of the CPD activity e.g. formal award program, technical workshop, participation in a special interest group, workplace exchange etc.?

2. Who was the learning provider (e.g. university, TAFE, Professional Association, Internal to the organisation, private provider, the Web etc.)?

3. In broad terms when did it occur?

4. What was the motivation to undertake this CPD activity?

5. What were the expected outcomes?

6. Were there any additional or incidental outcomes achieved?

7. The outcomes (both specific and incidental) from this CPD activity resulted in me and/or the organisation ...

Can you think of an example of CPD activity which has made a significant negative contribution either to an individual or to the organisation?

n.b. This sub-section need not be answered if you are not aware of CPD causing negative contributions. If this is the case please enter NA in the next question following (Q8).

The following seven questions to this sub-section relate specifically to your example where CPD has made a negative contribution. (Once again to minimise your time commitment, we recommend that answers be 50 words or less.)

8. What was the type of the CPD activity e.g. formal award program, technical workshop, participation in a special interest group, workplace exchange etc.?

9. Who was the learning provider (e.g. university, TAFE, Professional Association, Internal to the organisation, private provider, the Web etc.)?
10. In broad terms when did it occur?

11. What was the motivation to undertake this activity?

12. What were the expected outcomes?

13. What were the detrimental or other adverse outcomes resulting?

14. The outcomes (both specific and incidental) from this CPD activity resulted in me and/or the organisation ...
Appendix 2

Interview Plan - Questions to CEO of Professional Enterprise

1) **Theme:** *What do you expect from CPD? and how would you define success* (adapted from D. Kirkpatrick, 2009)?

2) **How does the professional organisation value professional development?**
   a) Is the value of CPD to the organisation assessed using standard accounting techniques? If so, how
      - Breakeven analysis
      - ROI
   b) Is Balanced Scorecard used – if so how is the value of CPD incorporated into the balanced scorecard?
   c) Is the value added by staff each year assessed? How?

3) **What value does CPD bring to the organisation?**
   a) Have there been instances where CPD has resulted in noticeable tangible benefits?
   b) Overall would you see that CPD provides value for the organisation?

4) **How does the organisation demonstrate to professionals within the practice:**
   a) The organisation’s need for CPD; and
   b) The value the organisation places on CPD?

5) **What is the impact of compliance requirements and Professional Standards legislation on the organisation’s CPD policies and practices?**

6) **Does the organisation monitor and plan CPD or is it left to the individual?**

7) **What is the breakdown between CPD provided internally and externally?**

8) **What risks do you associate with CPD**
   a) Loss of body of knowledge through employee leaving
   b) Body of knowledge is not passed on within organisation
   c) Body of knowledge is not extended within the organisation.

9) **Give examples of how the organisation supports learning through recognising the need for CPD and developing learning cultures which enhance the potential of CPD - particular models such as:**
   a) Work-Integrated Learning (WIL): Situated learning provides more meaningful learning as it is seen to be relevant for, and by, the learner.
   b) Mentoring: supporting the growth and focus of their members in a caring and helpful environment.
c) Apprenticeship models: these models support a learning focus with steps undertaken by master and apprentice at varying levels as knowledge, skills and understanding.

d) Communities of practice/communities of interest: To enable the professional to engage in professional conversations through participation in specialist interest groups, exchanging war stories, interactive forums, accessing expert knowledge etc. – either internal or external to the organisation.

e) Other forms of non-formal professional learning e.g. authorship of technical papers (internal or external to the organisation); full or part-time teaching in a subject area related to profession etc.

How would you value these models in their contribution to the organisation?

Organisation’s profile:

10) Organisation/Practice background:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>No. of professionals in the Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Breakdown of professionals:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i)</th>
<th>No. of General practitioners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ii)</th>
<th>No. of recognised Specialists –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(1) what are the Specialist qualifications?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>iii)</th>
<th>No. of Integrated managers/multi-skilled professionals –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(1) what are the qualifications?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c)</th>
<th>Gender Breakdown of professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i)</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ii)</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d)</th>
<th>Breakdown by years in the major profession of the Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i)</th>
<th>No. of <strong>Qualified</strong> staff (i.e. degree or equivalent) but not eligible for full professional association membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ii)</th>
<th>No. of staff with &lt; five years full professional experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
iii) No. of staff with five – ten years full professional experience
iv) No. of staff with ten – twenty years full professional experience
v) No. of staff with > twenty years full professional experience
e) members of professions other than the major profession
i) No. of professionals in the Practice who are also members of other professions
ii) No. of professionals in the Practice who are not members of the Practice’s major profession(s) but are members of other professions
iii) No. of other professions represented in the Practice

11) Do years of experience, gender, ethnicity, holding of specialisations and/or being members of other professional associations create discernible differences in the attitude to, the use of, and support for, CPD?

12) Do you have a measurement of cost of CPD as a percentage of fees?
   a) As CPD can be used for compliance and/or the development of knowledge can you breakdown the costs into those for compliance; knowledge development and those where knowledge development is used as part of compliance?
   b) What items do you use in calculating costs e.g. time lost; and/or fees paid; any other costs
   c) In your costs of CPD do you include costs for formal learning, non formal learning or informal learning? Give examples.