University Libraries & Learning Sciences Faculty
Publications

Scholarly Communication - Departments

12-2-2009

Assessing Diversity Initiatives: The ARL Leadership and Career Development Program

Teresa Y. Neely

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalrepository.unm.edu/ulls_fsp

Assessing Diversity Initiatives: The ARL Leadership and Career Development Program

Teresa Y. Neely

Abstract

This research represents the results of a study of the participants in the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Leadership and Career Development Program (LCDP). The study was designed initially to determine the effectiveness of the initiative; however, secondary goals reveal data on program participants' perceptions of the success of the program in multiple areas of leadership as defined by program elements. In addition to demographic queries, participants were asked about positions held before and after program completion and the perceived impact of the program on their career paths. Participants were also queried on major program components including the mentoring relationship, research and publishing, and other leadership activities.

Findings on the key elements of the ARL LCDP—the mentoring relationship, research and publication, and other leadership activities—are not unlike findings from other available research on library leadership institutes. It is clear from the evidence presented that the majority of the researchers included here are aware of the difficulties of correlating the impact of participating in and attending library leadership institutes; however, candid comments from participants reveal assessing the impacts of these programs on individuals is much more easily done, and illuminating, than attempts to do so quantitatively.

Introduction

This research represents the results of a study of the participants in the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Leadership and Career Development Program (LCDP). The ARL LCDP was developed in 1997 and this study reports results from participants enrolled from program inception in 1997 up through 2004. This study was designed initially to determine the effectiveness of the initiative; however, secondary goals reveal data on program participants' perceptions of the success of the program in multiple areas of leadership as defined by program elements. In addition to demographic queries, participants were asked about positions held before and after program completion and the perceived impact of the program on their career paths. Participants were also queried on major program components including the mentoring relationship, research and publishing, and other leadership activities.

This study reveals findings relevant to the literature on leadership institutes where leadership is defined by the major program components. The published literature reveals a dearth of information on the effectiveness of programs such as this; and no published study has assessed the extent to which participants feel the design of the LCDP helped their career path to leadership positions. Study findings indicate participant perceptions may also influence the development of future leadership programs.

Background and Review of the Literature

In 1997, ARL established an 18-month program to prepare mid-career librarians from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups to take on increasingly demanding leadership roles in ARL libraries. There have been five cohorts since inception, the program was not offered

between 2005 and 2006, and the 2009-2010 program is currently underway. To date, the program has 'graduated' 100 participants in its nearly twelve years of existence (ARL, 2009).

Initially, this highly competitive program provided three primary benefits—"the expertise of an ARL director/dean as mentor; the opportunity to pursue a research project and publish and present the results; and the visibility of participating in a national program" (Neely, 1999, p. 137). A unique aspect of the program is the focus on building a community "with the potential for much growth, learning and professional development" fostered by two multi-day institutes held over the course of the program, and institutes at the annual and mid-winter meetings of the American Library Association (ALA) (Neely, 1999).

According to the 2009 ARL website, a study was conducted in 2005 to determine the effectiveness of the program. Feedback confirmed the need for this program and recommended that its instructional design be tied directly to ARL's recently articulated strategic directions (ARL, Background, 2009). According to the LCDP website, "The goal of the newly designed LCDP is two-fold: (1) to provide meaningful exposure to and experience with the strategic issues that are shaping the future of research libraries and (2) to prepare professionals of color for increasingly demanding leadership roles in ARL libraries" (ARL, 2009). Although the goals of this study were not developed to address the strategic directions of the ARL, some of the findings may provide more insight into the effectiveness of program components from the participants' perspective.

The ARL LCDP is but one of the diversity initiatives of the Association of Research Libraries. While several leadership development programs exist to advance people into upper management in academic libraries, the LCDP is one of a few programs specifically targeting diverse

individuals to expand the pool of potential future leaders. The University of Minnesota Technology and Leadership Training Institute (UMN Institute), "was based on the need to develop new professionals, where ALA's Spectrum Initiative helps recruit new people to librarianship, and ARL's LCD Program is for more seasoned professionals" (UMN Training Institute Participants, 1998).

There are several articles that review and discuss the details of a variety of library leadership institutes (Neely, 1999; Marcum, 2003; Turock, 2001; Wang & Chang, 2006). This article is concerned with the findings from research articles that report on the perceived impact and effectiveness of library leadership institutes from the perspective of attendees. There is a small but rich body of published evidence available about the perceptions of the effectiveness of library leadership programs, mostly from the perspective of program participants. An added bonus is that much of the research literature is comparable and can be generalized as researchers surveying the Northern Exposure to Leadership Institute (NELI) participants (Phelan, 2005), the Aurora Leadership Institute participants (Barney, 2003, 2004), and this study, used the survey instrument developed for the Snowbird Leadership Institute study (Neely & Winston, 1999; Neely & Winston, 1999a) as a basis for their survey instrumentation.

Table 1. Library Leadership Institute Programs

Program Name	Focus	Inception	Length	Status
ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute Cambridge, MA*	Senior managers and academic library directors. Increase the capacity to lead and manage	1999	6 days	Active
ALA Emerging Leaders ** Location varies, ALA conferences	New librarians – Fast track to ALA and professional leadership	2007	varies	Active
ALA Spectrum Scholars Institute Location varies, ALA conferences	Recruitment to profession, diversity, leadership	1998	3 day institute	Active
ARL LCDP Location varies, ARL libraries	Mid-career, diversity, leadership development, upward mobility	1997	18 months	Active
Aurora Leadership Institute Australia	Targets people in all types of libraries in Australia and New Zealand generally five to ten years into their library career	1995	6 days	Active
Emerging Leaders *** ALA pre-conference	Leadership, diversity	1996-1997	3 days	Inactive
Frye Leadership Institute **** Atlanta, GA	Next generation of higher education leaders emerging from IT and library backgrounds	2000	2 weeks	Active
Future Leaders Programme ***** UK	Individuals who aspire to a strategic role within information services—self exploration, leadership behavior, strategic leadership and organisational change	2006	1 year	Active
University of Minnesota Libraries Biennial Minnesota Institute for Early Career Librarians from Traditionally Underrepresented Groups	Technology and leadership skills for librarians. Recently graduated (early career) librarians from traditionally under-represented groups who are employed in libraries as interns or residents. First three years of professional career	1998	1 week	Active
Northern Exposure to Leadership Institute (NELI) Emerald Lake, BC	Library leadership, novice and professional librarians generally, 2 to 7 years out of library school, 2 years professional experience	1994	5 days	Active
Snowbird Leadership Institute Snowbird, UT	Library leadership development. Relatively early career individuals, normally 5 years or less	1990	5 days	Inactive
UCLA Senior Fellows Program UCLA, Los Angeles, CA	Senior-level academic librarians	1982	3 weeks	Active

* Harvard Graduate School of Education, 2009; see also Brennan, 1999; Garten, 2004; Gjelten & Fishel, 2006; Golian & Donlan, 2001; Hardesty, 2000; Kalin, 2008; Masselink & Jacobsma, 2005.
** ALA Emerging Leaders wiki, 2009; see also "ALA President Leslie Burger announces," 2006; Paul, 2007.
*** Somerville, 1996, 1997; see also Neely, 1999; Turock, 2001.
**** Frye Leadership Institute, 2009; see also Gjelten & Fishel, 2006; Marcum & Hawkins, 2000.
***** Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, 2009; see also Cox, Kilner & Young, 2006; Jolly, Chelin & Wilson; Stevenson, 2006; Wilkie, 2007.

The programs listed in table 1 are varied in their purpose, length, elements and group they target. Many do not have published surveys of participants; however, there is some literature that has been published by participants in the form of summaries and first-person accounts. Only a few leadership institutes have published program evaluations whereby feedback was gathered via interview methodology (Rumble & MacEwan, 2008) or by using surveys of program participants (Barney, 2003, 2004; Hartman, 2006; Neely & Winston, 1999; Neely & Winston, 1999a; Phelan, 2005; Roy, Johnson-Cooper, Tysick & Waters, 2006; Winston & Neely, 2001). Barney believes the lack of research may be attributed "to the difficulty in measuring the impact of programs" (2003). She cites Sirianni and Frey who define leadership qualities and characteristics as 'soft skills' that "are generally evaluated through anecdotal observations and/or perceptions" (2001).

Rumble and MacEwan report that "the UCLA (University of California, Los Angeles) Senior Fellows Program (Senior Fellows) is the oldest formal leadership development program for librarians in the United States" (2008), however, the authors acknowledge the lack of published reports about the participants' experiences. Given that gap in the literature, they provide their findings from interviewing eleven previous program participants. The article also discusses past participants' contributions to the published literature in the area of leadership beginning in the late 1980s through the 2000s (see also Anderson, 1984; Lynch, 1994; Woodsworth & von Wahlde 1988).

When Senior Fellows participants were asked about the aspects of the program they valued, interviewees reported professional networking opportunities, the residential nature of the program or the 'prospect of getting away,' and program content. The combination of these program elements was also considered valuable. Elements of the program considered important takeaways by study participants included the timing of the program with participants' career

goals and aspirations. "Unusually close knit" cohort groups, collegial mentoring, and lasting partnerships and networks were considered critical support elements for participants, during the program and well after. The role of the program in enhancing the professional development of participants' was evident when interviewees described the impact as "validating," enhanced "credibility," "confidence builder," and "a greater understanding of self and a broadened awareness of leadership issues." A unique aspect of note is the participants' perception of the role of the program facilitator, not as evident in published accounts of other leadership programs. The facilitator's abilities as a mentor, during the course of the three-week program and ongoing well after, and her "respect for the group's autonomy" were highly praised by program participants (Rumble & MacEwan, 1984).

Of the programs listed in table 1, the American Library Association (ALA) Spectrum Scholars program is the only national recruitment effort "designed to address the specific issue of under-representation of critically needed ethnic librarians within the profession while serving as a model for ways to bring attention to larger diversity issues in the future" (ALA, Spectrum Scholar wiki, 1999). The three-day ALA Spectrum Scholar Leadership Institutes are an integral part of the design of the program and are held at ALA national conferences. In 2006, ALA released a report surveying Spectrum scholarship recipients from 1998-2003. One hundred and sixty-four of the two hundred and fifty-seven scholars contacted responded to the survey. When asked about the strengths of the program, the leadership institute was noted along with funding, prestige and socialization, career support and fellow scholars they met in the program. Some participants cited the leadership institute's "relentless schedule" and the desire for "a few free hours to relax, see the sights and absorb" as a weakness of the program, along with marketing of

the program, mentoring, and communication after the program (Roy et al.; see also de la Peña McCook, 2000; Neely, 1999; Stone, 2007; Tsurutani, 2002).

Modeled on the Snowbird Leadership Institute and using the same facilitators, "the Aurora Leadership Institute is an annual six-day residential leadership training for people in all types of libraries in Australia and New Zealand" (Barney, 2004; see also Barney, 2003). In 2004, Kay Barney published the results of a study of the participants of the 2003 institute, also known as A6. Barney's research is unique in that in addition to demographic and other queries, she wanted to "determine individual's perceptions of its [A6] value to their work and career development." The researcher also asked about participants' interaction with their colleagues. Barney surveyed not only participants but mentors for that year as well. The survey was conducted six months after the completion of A6 as the researcher was interested in the short-term impact of learning acquired at the Institute. Barney found that "the majority of participants perceive a strong legacy from the Institute, which continues to influence their decisions about work and career." All of the respondents to the survey reported A6 was beneficial to their work and careers (2004).

A majority of respondents also reported they valued the interaction with other participants and the mentors. Barney reports respondents with less than eleven years experience reported a greater perceived value to their work and careers than those with more experience, a trend the researcher expected. Attendance at A6 and increased professional activity are proven to be strongly related in the study, with a focus on the "change in the *level* of activity" per individual. In Barney's study, professional activity is defined as joining or participating in a committee. Also, mentoring was found to be a strength of the program as perceived by participants. Although career progression was not a primary goal of this study, four of the respondents reported having already

moved on to higher positions, and an additional three were applying for other positions as a result of having attended the institute (Barney, 2004, p. 345).

In a published conference report, Lisa Hartman (2006) summarizes a presentation describing the findings of research on participants of the Northern Exposure to Leadership Institute (NELI), considered to be the Canadian equivalent to the Snowbird Leadership Institute. She writes about a presentation titled, 'Creating leaders: the impact of leadership training programs on the subsequent leadership behavior of librarians,' where Daniel Phelan presented the results of his research surveying participants of the NELI "to learn about their reactions to the Institute and whether they were influenced by the workshop in taking leadership roles in their current positions." Hartman reports that Phelan's findings were mixed in that some respondents felt the Institute "had little effect on their success," while others felt that other elements of the program had influenced their success like supervisors and the geographic location. Three key benefits cited by respondents were the encouragement they received from each other, the mentors they gained, and the networking connections they made (2006).

In a PowerPoint presentation posted on a blog, Phelan provides more insight into his research summarized above by Hartman, which he completed as a part of his master's degree requirements. Titled, "Creating leaders: a study of the Northern Exposure to Leadership participants—before and after," Phelan concluded that activities that take place within NELI may or may not help to create leaders; and also noted that "there seems to be no direct correlation" between the institute and the participants' becoming leaders; "however, the personal experiences of participants indicate that the encouragement and mentoring in institutes like NELI are very important in participants' decisions to assume leadership roles" (2005).

University of Minnesota Technology and Leadership Training Institute (UMN Institute) program participants were surveyed on eight questions addressing leadership training, multimedia training, personal and professional impact, and outcomes. Overall, participants responded positively when asked to describe their expectations before the institute (65%), and also their reactions after the leadership training (94.1%). The researcher concluded the survey findings "reveal that the institute was an extremely positive and profitable experience for participants" (University of Minnesota, Minnesota Institute, 2009). Now titled the Biennial Minnesota Institute for Early Career Librarians from Traditionally Underrepresented Groups (Early Career Librarians), the program is held every two years and the focus is two-fold: "combining development in leadership and organizational behavior with developing a practical skill set in key areas for academic librarians (Vilankulu, 2006).

In 1999, Neely and Winston surveyed the participants of the Snowbird Leadership Institute and disseminated their findings in three separate publications, one addressing the population as a whole (1999), one focusing on the academic librarians in the study (1999a), and one focusing on the public librarians in the study (Winston & Neely, 2001). Although the researchers acknowledged the difficulty in determining a direct correlation between participation in the Institute, career progression and increased productivity in leadership activities, "the respondents did report an increased level of leadership activity. In addition, their perceptions of the institute's value with regard to their career paths were largely positive and indicated that many of their career paths would have been different had they not had the Snowbird experience." Respondents rated collegial relationships as the most relevant post-institute activity, followed by mentoring (1999a).

General Methodology

This paper presents the findings of a research study of individuals who have participated in the ARL LCDP. The primary goal of this research was to determine the effectiveness of the program by gathering data from participants on their perceptions and experiences. Survey methodology was used and data was collected using the online survey company, Survey Monkey. E-mail invitations were sent to sixty-six LCDP program participants via SurveyMonkey.com in May 2007. Every effort was made by the researchers to contact all past participants of the program.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used in this study was adapted from the instrument used to collect data from the participants of the Snowbird Leadership Institute. That instrument was "designed to address issues related to demographics, educational background, work experience prior to entering librarianship, and professional experience before and after participating in the institute" (Neely & Winston, 1999a; see also Brewer, 1997; Winston, 1997). The instrument was adapted for this study to reflect the elements of the LCDP.

Forty-four of the sixty-six participants contacted responded, five submitted partial surveys, and three opted to not participate, resulting in a 59 percent return rate (39 surveys were completed). The total number of responses reported for each question will vary in the discussion of the results given that the survey mechanism used all responses in the percentages reported, whether the participant completed the entire survey or not.

Table 2 reveals the 2003 group had the most respondents with twelve indicating they participated that year, eight responded from 1997 and seven responded from 2001. Five participants or less reported participating in the program in each of the remaining years.

Table 2. Surveys by Year of Attendance

Year	#	%
1997	8	18.60
1998	4	9.30
1999	5	11.62
2000	2	4.65
2001	7	16.27
2002	3	6.97
2003	12	27.90
2004	2	4.65

n=45

Selected Findings and Discussion

Demographics

The majority of those responding to the survey identified as female (80%) and Black/African American (70%). Twelve and one-half percent identified as Asian/Asian American, 7.5 percent Hispanic/Latino and 5 percent each selected American Indian/Native American and Other. Table 3 shows the gender, ethnic background, and age distribution for this group where nearly half (45%) selected the 46 and older age range, followed by nearly 40 percent selecting the 40 to 45 year age group.

Table 3. ARL LCDP Population Demographics

Gender		Ethnic Background		Age Range	
Female	32	American Indian/Native American	2	21 – 25	0
Male	8	Asian/Asian American	5	26 – 30	0
		Black/African American	28	31 – 35	3
		Hispanic/Latino	3	36 – 39	3
		Other	2	40 – 45	15
		White	0	46 +	18

Academics

MLS/MLIS and other Graduate Degrees

As anticipated, one hundred percent of the participants reported they had earned the master's degree in library/information science. All degrees were earned between 1974 and 1998 and all were earned in the U.S. with the exception of one participant who reported a degree earned at an international university.

An educated group, more than 43 percent of those responding indicated they had earned a second master's degree, nearly ten percent had earned a doctorate, and almost 50 percent selected the other degree or discipline degree category. Twenty-three of the respondents skipped the question, indicating a flaw in the instrument design. There was no place to respond "I have not earned any other additional degrees." More than 50 percent indicated they had not completed additional graduate courses, but nearly 42 percent reported they had completed coursework in a variety of disciplines such as Middle Eastern studies, education, nutrition, sociology, Latin American & Iberian studies, management, and managerial leadership. Only a few respondents indicated they had completed additional graduate coursework in the library and information science discipline—rare books, information science, library studies, and medical informatics; and one participant reported additional graduate coursework in Latin American & Iberian Studies Spanish Literature Portuguese metadata.

Visibility/Knowledge of the Program

Participation in this program, and in some sense, program success, seems to be very much impacted by deans and directors with more than 35 percent of the participants indicating they found out about the program from a dean or director. Table 4 shows that category E-mail/Listservs was the second most popular method selected by more than 30 percent, trailed by Colleagues/Co-workers at nearly fourteen percent.

Table 4. Knowledge/Visibility of LCDP

	# Selecting	%
Colleague/Co-worker	6	13.6
Supervisor	3	6.8
Dean/Director	16	36.4
Professional Association Meeting	1	2.3
E-mail/Listservs	14	31.8
Past Participant/Mentor	1	2.3
Other	3	6.8
DeEtta Jones*	1	2.3
ARL Website	2	4.54

*Program Coordinator   n=44

Career Background and Progression

Given that the LCDP appears to be strongly supported, and to some extent, driven, by deans and directors, it is not surprising that the majority of those responding (90.9%) reported they were employed in an academic library at the time they participated in the program, and nearly 70 percent of those were ARL libraries. Participants were also asked about the type of library they were employed in at the time of the survey. Table 5 shows that although the number slipped slightly, overwhelmingly, the majority (86.4%) of those responding indicated they were employed in an academic library. The number of participants working in an ARL library at the time of the survey dropped nearly 10 percent. The number of those working at a community college and in a public library held constant from time of program attendance to the time of the survey, both at 2.3 percent. However, the 2.3 percent reported working at a government library at the time they participated in the program decreased to zero at the time of the survey, and 6.9 percent indicated they were "Not working in a library at this time" during the survey.

Table 5. Type of Employing Institution Currently and During ARL LCDP

Position Type	During LCDP	ARL	Currently	ARL

Academic	90.9%	Yes (68.3%)	86.4%	Yes (61.9%)
Community College	2.3%	No (31.7%)	2.3%	No (38.1%)
Public	2.3%		2.3%	
Special	0.0%		0.0%	
Government	2.3%		0.0%	
School	0.0%		0.0%	
Not working in a library	0.0%		4.6%	
Other (Library organization)	2.3%	Other (Research library) 4.6%		

Survey participants were asked about the type of position held during LCDP participation and currently in order to determine if there is evidence of a change in the number of individuals in higher level positions, or at least with higher level position titles. Table 6 shows a significant decrease in the number of positions with titles categorized by the researcher as 'librarian'(58%), and 'coordinator'(67%), and a marked increase in the number of position titles categorized as 'department or branch head' (83%),'assistant or associate dean/director' (200%) and 'dean/director' (500%). Without further more individualized inquiry, it is difficult to directly correlate participation in LCDP to these findings. We could assume that program participants would have attained higher position levels without program participation; however, this shift in the number of participants reporting higher level position titles is remarkable and should not be discounted. Particularly when coupled with the number of participants (approximately 42%) discussed below who report their career paths would have been different without LCDP participation.

Table 6. Type of Position Held Currently and During LCDP

Position Type	During LCDP	Current Job Title	+/-	% increase/decrease
Librarian (subject, technical, etc.)	26	11	- 15	58% decrease
Coordinator	9	3	- 6	67% decrease
Department or branch head	6	11	+ 5	83% increase

Asst. or assoc. dean/director	2	6	+ 4	200% increase
Dean/director	0	5	+ 5	500% increase
Other	1	3	+ 3	300% increase
No response/N/A	0	3	N/A	N/A

Participants were also asked about the number of years they have been in their current position.
Table 7 shows that the majority of those responding (54.54%) to the survey have been in their
current positions for five years or less, followed by 25 percent who report being in their current
position from six to ten years. Given that the first LCDP cohort began the program ten years
before the survey in 1997, along with the change in position titles, these findings fit nicely with
the assumption that new position titles with more (assumed) responsibility, most likely indicate
new positions at the same or a different institution since program participation.

Table 7. Length of time in current position

Years in Current	# of Years	
0-5 years	24	(54.54%)
6-10 years	11	(25%)
11-15 years	4	(9.09%)
16-20 years	1	(2.27%)
More than 21 years	0	(2.27%)
No response	4	(9.09%)
	n=44	

The LCDP was designed for mid-career librarians and participants were asked about the number
of years of professional library experience they had acquired prior to participating in the
program. The number of professional years of experience reported ranged from a low of two
years to a high of twenty-five years. Table 8 shows the years of professional experience acquired
by participants at the time of LCDP participation. The majority of those responding reported
between six and ten years (38.63%) of professional experience, followed by those reporting

between eleven and fifteen years (25%), and five years or less (22.72%) of professional

experience when they participated in the LCDP.

Table 8. Years of Professional Experience During LCDP

Years of Experience	During LCDP Attendance
0-5 years	10
6-10 years	17
11-15 years	11
16-20 years	4
More than 20 years	1
No response	1
	n=44

Attitudes About the Institute and Perceived Impact

LCDP respondents were asked to respond to a question about whether they felt their career path

would have been different without the ARL LCDP experience. Surprisingly, only 9.3 percent

selected yes, while more than 50 percent (53.5%) selected no. When asked to explain, more than

thirty-five percent (37.3%) of those responding to the survey provided written comments. Upon

analysis of the comments, the majority were found to be positive in nature. When these

comments were added to the number of folks who selected yes, the percentage of those who felt

their career paths would have been different without the program, increases significantly to

nearly 42 percent. Some positive comments included:

 "The ARL Program definitely gave me the confidence and practical information,

 mentorship experience, and professional contacts that have made it much more likely that

 I will aspire to more leadership positions."

"The LCDP came at a time that I was considering leaving the profession; it revitalized my interest in libraries and librarianship."

"Yes, I don't think I would have held as many offices at the State and National level. ARL LCDP allowed me to be honest with where I was in my career. I knew after completing the Institute that I was not ready for a management position."

"Not necessarily. Even though I have not changed positions, the ARL LCDP has helped me know myself better and I think I am able to make better decisions about my future and take the steps needed to attain the goals I have set for myself."

There were far fewer comments from LCDP participants who did not believe participation in the program impacted their career paths:

"I have been ten years at the same small institution. My ARL LCDP experience, while enriching and rewarding for me personally, did not in any way influence my career path."

"My work responsibilities did not change; there was a general upgrade in job titles at my institution."

Participants were also asked if there were additional comments they wanted to make about the impact of the LCDP on their careers and 19 respondents submitted comments. These comments were overwhelmingly positive and confirmed elements of the program that were significant for participants. One participant noted the program provided them "with role models and information to better mentor and support emerging library students some of who have gone on to work in ARL libraries."

Other respondents expressed wishes that the program continue, noting, "I referred my coworker to the program. However, the big increase in the financial obligation is a barrier. . . I hope that there can be some funding for this program in addition to the "bottomless" funding that IMLS gives to train new librarians."

Respondents submitted comments about the acquisition of "important leadership skills," the "confidence building" attendance provided, the acquisition of a great deal of information "in a little time," and the way they were perceived by their peers after participating in the program. Respondents also mentioned the "lasting relationships" they built with other LCDP participants, the "network of people [I] met through the LCDP," and the "informal mentoring and meeting my mentor." Words like "informative," "thought provoking," and "action-oriented," were also mentioned along with more hopes for program continuation.

One participant wrote about the connection between the program and career progression. "Although there is no direct connection between job advancement and LCDP, I do feel that having attended LCDP has influenced how I think about my work and how I approach certain professional problems." Another wrote, "I certainly would have made professional progress not doing ARL/LCDP. . . but the LCDP forced me to hone my skills, and to focus on the future, and a future in a library leadership and management career. It made a more complete 'networker' out of me. I use that well in my current job."

Researchers surveying participants of other leadership institutes report similar findings. When respondents to the UMN Institute were asked to elaborate on the professional and personal impact of the institute, they used words like "increased energy, confidence, self awareness," and

identified an "opportunity to focus on self-development." Interestingly, when asked to rank

factors regarding the Institute, they selected the following in descending order:

1. Increased self-knowledge/awareness

2. Relationship-building opportunities (networking with peers, colleagues)

3. Leadership skill/initiative

4. Future opportunities for leadership, community building

5. Direct involvement in high profile diversity initiative

6. Enhanced multimedia skills

7. Greater awareness of trends within LIS profession

8. Anticipated recognition of self and/or supporting institution

9. Chance to visit another ARL library (UNM Training Institute Participants, 2009)

In his 2005 study, Phelan reported comments from his survey of individuals attending NELI,

". . . leadership skills and self-esteem built during the short period of NELI have been the

bedrock of my work as a manager."

"I'm more confident and aware of what I can do."

"I am likely unconsciously using the methods we used during NELI."

"I came away from NELI with a tremendous desire to change."

"NELI is shaping my career seven years later"

Mentor/Participant Relationship

The LCDP pairs program participants with mentors, usually library deans and directors. Since program inception, this element has evolved and is currently described as "an ongoing relationship with a Career Coach and a personalized visit to an ARL library" (ARL, 2009). The mentor relationship worked well for some LCDP participants and not at all for others for a variety of reasons, generally related to individual mentors, with only nine (20%) of the forty-four responding that this relationship was "Essential to overall learning, long-term relationship established." Nearly 30 percent selected "Important knowledge shared, but no long-term connection," and the remaining 40 percent selected "Very limited contact or communication" (27.3%) or "Not at all" (13.6%). Reported comments of note included

"Awful, my mentor rarely emailed, phoned, and I never met her."

"I had little interaction with my assigned mentor."

"I was assigned a mentor who only attended ALA when there was an ARL meeting."

The mentoring component was rated a particular strength in most of the leadership programs discussed here. Although the mentoring component in the Snowbird Leadership Institute program is "more informal," and "not directly structured," more than fifty percent of those responding to the survey rated these "relationships as contributing 'to a great extent' or 'to some extent' to the quality of their Snowbird experience" (Neely & Winston, 1999, p. 9-10). Respondents to the Aurora Leadership Institute rated mentoring as a strength, as "nearly 90 per cent of respondents said the interaction with mentors contributed to the quality of A6 'to a great extent' and the remainder said 'to a moderate extent' " (Barney, 2004). UCLA Senior Fellows were asked about the mentoring aspect of the program and some reported the traditional mentor/mentee relationship "did not capture the nature of their interactions with cohorts or

program faculty" (Rumble & MacEwan, 2008, p. 282). Others described the mentoring relationship as taking place at the "advanced career change level;" further defined by James F. Williams as "more likely to be centered around encouragement to take professional risks, including competing for senior administrative positions" (1988).

Ernie Ingles, one of the cofounders of NELI, remarked, "the mentors are what make NELI"(2005)! Phelan reported that mentoring was an activity NELI participants saw as being crucial to their success, along with encouragement and networking. His presentation summarized comments on mentoring from program participants.

> "Many, however, spoke of . . . how the mentors helped them see their place in the profession" (2005).

ALA Spectrum Scholars rated mentoring as a strength and a weakness of the program. In the 2006 study, Roy et al. reported,

> "Not all respondents were involved in the mentoring program and those who were indicated that this was the area of the Spectrum Scholarship Program that needed the most improvement. Some mentors did not contact students. In other cases the match between mentor and mentee was not logical" (p. 27)

"The mentoring program should also provide some benefit for mentors" (Roy et al.) This is echoed in practice by Barney who surveyed not only Aurora Institute participants but mentors as well "because many of the mentors commented at the end of the 2003 Aurora Leadership Institute that they felt they had learned more than the participants (2004, p. 340).

Program Coordinators and Faculty

The LCDP does not place the same emphasis on the faculty as a major element of the program as does other programs. The program coordinator/faculty element was not included as an element in this study, however, a few respondents mentioned this as important in their responses, but not in the way UCLA Senior Fellows spoke of Beverly Lynch, Professor and Director, Senior Fellows Program. Senior Fellows were asked specifically "What role did Beverly Lynch play for you during the program and after?" Participants responded that "Lynch had served as a mentor to them both during and after the program." One respondent summed it up thusly, "Lynch has a "very unique ability" as a mentor and, if provided with the opportunity, would give "individualized attention and personal advice." Lynch knew how to deliver "straight talk" " (Rumble & MacEwan, 2008, p. 283).

There were many references to the faculty of the ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute program. Common themes reported include the quality of the faculty of the program, "We found the Harvard faculty high energy, provocative, insightful, well-read, and sometimes just downright entertaining. . . While their styles were very distinct, they were all very skilled at communicating content, then engaging a large group in discussion and interaction" (Hardesty, 2000, p. 806). In 2008, Kalin wrote about the "quality and stability of the faculty," and "the opportunity to watch master teachers at their craft rated the top spot on [her] list."

Collegial Relationships and Cohort Groups

When considering the impact of the collegial relationships formed with fellow program participants, there is some evidence this is a benefit of the LCDP. A number of respondents submitted positive comments about the importance of relationships with their colleagues,

although this was an area that was not represented in the survey. Neely and Winston identified collegial relationships "as an area for further analysis because the researchers recognize[d] the importance of collegiality in the profession of librarianship." In the Snowbird Leadership Institute, collegial relationships are fostered by the use of listservs, and informal meetings at library conferences. The listserv is still active and more recently, a Facebook group with 44 members has been formed. Overwhelmingly, Snowbird participants selected collegial relationships as a strong contribution to individual learning with nearly a quarter selecting "to a great extent," and more than 50 percent selecting "to some extent" (Neely & Winston, 1999. p. 9-10).

Spectrum Scholars defined their relationships with fellow scholars as a strength of the Institutes (Roy et al., 2006). Rumble and MacEwan reported that UCLA Senior Fellows "spoke of "sustaining" professional relationships, trusted colleagues who provided "honest, direct feedback," and a respected peer group that could be called upon to discuss an issue, share information or help troubleshoot problems" when they described the 'community of Senior Fellows' and what it meant to them (2008, p. 280). A 2004 participant in the University of Minnesota Institute for Early Career Librarians commented "You get a new support network to talk to, bounce ideas off of, share opportunities with, and, lean on when you need them. You don't always get that from your place of work, and even if you do, how often do you get that with 24 other people?" Another noted, "I would definitely recommend the investment of time and money to any early career librarian. Getting to know colleagues from other backgrounds, library programs and work settings is perhaps the most valuable thing about the Institute—in other words, the networking" (Vilankulu, 2006, p. 15, 17).

Continuing these relationships seems to be becoming the norm for these groups via social networking sites as most of them have either a fan page (ALA Spectrum Scholars with 371 fans) or a group page on Facebook—NELI Alum has 129 members, NELI10 has 25 members, the Aurora Leadership Institute has 67 members, the ARL LCDP has 11 members. At current, the ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute for Academic Librarians 2007 has a group page with 21 members, and the UCLA Senior Fellows of 1999 has 4 members.

Research and Publication

The ability to design, implement and disseminate a research project is essential to leaders in the library and information science profession and even more critical for those climbing the academic ladder. More than 55 percent (25) of those responding reported they did not finish their LCDP research project, and only 6.8 percent (3) individuals reported they had completed their research. However, sixteen respondents responded to "if yes, was your research published? Where?" indicating the number of participants who did complete their research projects is most likely higher than the quantitative data shows. The responses to the latter question include journal articles, conference proceedings and presented papers, an ARL diversity publication, and conference poster sessions. One individual reported their work was not published but the research was completed and some results had been used in an information management [academic] program, another reported they had not published their work but that it had led to other publications, and another reported their project culminated in the development of instruction modules used for course instruction.

In terms of an ongoing requirement or commitment to research and publication, participants were asked if they were "required to write, publish, and/or engage in research in order to obtain reappointment, promotion and/or tenure or a tenure equivalent" in their positions held at the time of the survey and more than 60 percent responded no. When asked the same question of the positions they had held since participating in the program, the responses were more equalized in that 47.6 percent responded yes, and 52.4 percent responded no. These responses indicate the range of requirements and expectations in this area for ARL libraries where the participants currently work and may potentially work as their careers progress.

A review of the other library leadership institutes reveals one stand out in terms of research and scholarship. Based on the published research available, evidence of a strong research and publishing record is most visibly evident amongst participants of the UCLA Senior Fellows program (Rumble & MacEwan, 2008, p. 273-274). Participants of this program appear to be more focused and productive in research and publication efforts than the participants of other leadership programs. This assumption is based solely on the inclusion of such information in articles about the program.

Snowbird Leadership Institute participants reported increased numbers of publications in all categories post-Institute (Neely & Winston, 1999, p. 8). Publishing was not an aspect of the Spectrum Leadership Institute and does not appear to be a program element in the research reported on Aurora Leadership Institute, NELI, or the UMN Training Institute, although participants of the 1998 event collaborated to write articles about the institute (UNM Training Institute Participants, 2009; Acree, Epps, Gilmore & Henriques, 2001).

Other Leadership Activities

LCDP participants were asked two questions about leadership activities. The first question asked about leadership activities other than ARL LCDP they might have participated in. This question appeared in the survey before a question which asked participants if they had participated in other library leadership programs. As a result, some respondents listed leadership programs in response to this question. The results include multiple responses from individual participants. Twenty-five of those responding reported participating in twenty other leadership institutes. Additionally, membership/leadership on committees and teams, national and faculty elected officers, ARL leadership/other initiatives, and faculty appointments were also listed, along with opportunities to present nationally and internationally, editorial board membership, and the pursuit of terminal degrees. Only five respondents reported no participation in other leadership activities.

Other Leadership Institutes

Table 9 shows the respondents replies when asked about participation in other library leadership programs. More than 60 percent reported they had not participated in any other library leadership programs. Responses to this item closely reflect the responses to a previous question on other leadership activities.

Table 9. Other Leadership Institutes Attended

Program	Number Participating	
None	24	(61.5%)

ALA Emerging Leaders Institute	1	(2.6%)
Snowbird Leadership Institute	3	(7.7%)
ALA Spectrum Leadership Institute	1	(2.6%)
Minnesota Institute	4	(10.3%)
UCLA Senior Fellows	1	(2.6%)
ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute	2	(5.1%)
Frye Leadership Institute	2	(5.1%)
Other	5	(15.4%)

North Carolina Libraries Leadership Program	1
Northern Exposure to Leadership	1
NLM/MBL Fellowship	1
ARL RLLF	
(Research Library Leadership	
Fellows Program)	1
The Getty Leadership Next Generation Program	1

n=43

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations for Future Research

Instrumentation

Several questions adapted from the Snowbird Leadership Institute survey did not transition well to the online environment and findings for professional association activity, and contributions to individual benefits and learning via the listserv and informal reunions are not presented here. Future research on these populations should contain a balanced mix of queries to solicit quantitative and qualitative data. A survey with follow up interviews is strongly recommended. Carefully and skillfully written questions and interview techniques should produce some solid evidence of the relationship between library leadership institutes, career progression and participants' on the job behavior.

Additionally, it is evident that although valuable insight and perceptions can be revealed using the survey methodology, the richness of the qualitative evidence, such as that gleaned from

comments submitted by LCDP participants and those of other leadership institutes, and findings published by Rumble and MacEwan, is much more revealing and appropriate for assessing and evaluating some aspects of library leadership programs (2008).

When LCDP participants were asked if there were additional comments they would like to make on the questionnaire overall, twelve participants submitted comments. Two respondents reported no additional comments and one wrote, "Looking forward to the results." Two questions on involvement in professional associations were identified as problem queries, and if used in future research, should be rewritten for clarity and specificity. One respondent submitted a recommendation for a change to the question on the "requirement" to publish, stating a possible "silent rule" "that you should publish in order to advance your career" at institutions with no requirements for publishing. In looking at the assessment tool as a whole, another respondent wrote,

> "My ARL LCDP paper "Canaries in the Mine: Developing effective assessment tools for programs like the LCDP" pointed to additional markers one should use in evaluating leadership programs. These additional markers [sic] not present in this current survey."

Neither the literature review for library leadership programs, nor a search on multiple internet search engines revealed any evidence, published or otherwise, of the paper recommended.

Another comment noted the survey method used was not;

> "an adequate way to measure the community aspect of the fellowship. Communicating with peers of color filled a true void for me and made me a part of a larger community—I continue to feel fueled and supported by my cohort even today—despite months between or connecting with each other. I feel they are an email or phone call away."

Another respondent reported the

> "success of ARL was in the mentor/mentee relationship. For most higher level positions, it is
> based mainly on "who you know" and if they are willing to give you a chance. Most
> participants I knew found it hard to move up based on the Catch 22. . .you don't have enough
> experience. . . but you can not [sic] get experience unless someone gives you the
> opportunity."

Speaking also to the mentor relationship, but from the perspective of the program coordinators,
similar to the way participants of the UCLA Senior Fellows and the ACRL/Harvard Leadership
Institute programs expressed their feelings about program coordinators and faculty, a respondent
wrote,

> "I found my experience with LCDP was life-changing! It set a course for me for my
> professional aspirations that I would never have set on my own. It opened up my horizons on
> so many fronts. Both DeEtta and Jerome have been wonderful teachers, guides, and
> collaborators."

The impact of the LCDP can be summed up with a final comment submitted in response to a
request for additional comments on the impact of the LCDP on career paths,

> "The LCDP program has created complex generations of community within the
> profession. [sic] It seems that previously existed for professionals of color who happened
> to have attended the same MLIS program at the same time. I don't think [its] impact on
> the profession will be fully realized for years to come. I still enjoy regular conversations
> with my mentor. It took a vision and a great deal of work, but LCDP is paying off in
> ways that [planting] rich seeds does. It's changing the professional environment."

Conclusion

Findings on the key elements of the ARL LCDP—the mentoring relationship, research and publication, and other leadership activities—are not unlike findings from other available research on library leadership institutes. It is clear from the evidence presented that the majority of the researchers included here are aware of the difficulties of correlating the impact of participating in and attending library leadership institutes with career progression; however, candid comments from participants reveal assessing the impacts of these programs on individuals is much more easily done, and illuminating, than attempts to do so quantitatively. The significant increase in the number of individuals reporting higher level position titles is noteworthy, and should be considered a step in the right direction in the efforts to prove this empirically.

The impact of leadership institutes on participants appears to be much more personal in the arenas of confidence gained and self awareness realized. Mentoring relationships are critically important for some, depending on the emphasis and effort placed on this element by program coordinators; and long-lasting relationships with cohorts, colleagues and fellow participants, provide long term, much needed and appreciated support. Success in post-institute activities, such as listservs and informal gatherings at conferences appears to be dependent on the efforts and initiative of the participants themselves. As individuals attend leadership institutes designed for senior library administrators with higher expectations, participants report more awareness with confidence in what they know and can do, as well as experience a sense of validation in their leadership abilities.

It seems, the participants get out of the institutes what they bring to them; and the more emphasis placed on program elements by program coordinators, the more successfully realized the impact

from that particular element. For example, the residential nature is a big plus for participants at

many of the institutes described in this article; mentoring is considered a key part of the Aurora

Leadership Institute; and the role of Beverly Lynch as coordinator, cheerleader and ultimate

collegial mentor in the UCLA Senior Fellows Program is unmatched among leadership institutes.

Ernie Ingles' insightful quote is relevant and sums it all up quite nicely,

> ". . . the ability to function in a leadership capacity is dependent upon personal characteristics
>
> including initiative. It is dependent upon the motivation of the individual, especially in terms
>
> of seeking out formal leadership development programming opportunities and acting
>
> independently of any employer-prescribed or underwritten initiative" (2005, p. 39).

References

(2006). ALA President Leslie Burger announces "Emerging Leaders" Initiative. *ALCTS Newsletter Online*, 17(4), 10.

Acree, E. K., Epps, S.K., Gilmore, Y., & Henriques, C. (2001). Using professional development as a retention tool for underrepresented academic librarians. *Journal of Library Administration*, 33(1/2), 45-61.

ACRL Residency Interest Group. Retrieved November 11, 2009, from http://libraryresidents.wordpress.com/2008/02/04/umn-institute-for-early-career-librarians/.

ALA Emerging Leaders. Retrieved August 19, 2009, from http://wikis.ala.org/emergingleaders/index.php/Main_Page.

American Library Association, Spectrum Scholar Wiki. About Spectrum. Retrieved August 10, 2009, from http://wikis.ala.org/spectrum/index.php/Main_Page.

Anderson, D. J. (1984). Comparative career profiles of academic librarians: are leaders different?" *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 10(6), 323-332

Association of Research Libraries. (2009). Diversity: Leadership Career Development Program. Retrieved August 9, 2009, from http://www.arl.org/diversity/lcdp/index.shtml.

Association of Research Libraries. (2009). Diversity: Leadership Career Development Program, Background. Retrieved August 9, 2009, from http://www.arl.org/diversity/lcdp/lcdpbackground.shtml.

Barney, K. (2003). Leadership development in the library and information profession: evaluating the 2003 Aurora Leadership Institute. Retrieved August 15, 2009, from http://www.alia.org.au/aurora/A6_Barney_Report.pdf.

Barney, K. (2004). Evaluation of the impact of the 2003 Aurora Leadership Institute-'the gift that keeps on giving.' *Australian Library Journal*, 53(4), 337-348. Retrieved August 13, 2009, from http://alia.org.au/publishing/alj/53.4/alj. Vol_53_No_04_2004.pdf.

Brennan, P. (1999). First ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute Held at Gutman Library. *Library Notes for Harvard Library Staff*, (1287), 1, 6. Retrieved August 10, 2009, from http://hul.harvard.edu/publications/hulnotes_pdfs/HULN_ 1287.pdf.

Brewer, J. A. (1997). Post-master's residency programs: enhancing the development of new professionals and minority recruitment in academic and research libraries. *College & Research Libraries*, 58(5), 528-537.

Cox, J., Kilner, A., & Young, D. (2006). Taking steps that make you feel dizzy: personal reflections on module 1 of the Future Leaders programme. *SCONUL Focus*, (38), 26-29. Retrieved August 9, 2009, from http://www.sconul.ac.uk/publications/ newsletter/ 38/7.pdf.

de la Peña McCook, K. (2000). Introduction. *Library Trends*, 49(1), 1.

Frye Leadership Institute. (2009). Retrieved August 11, 2009 from http://www.fryeinstitute.org.

Garten, E. (2004). The ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute: A five-year-old spreads its wings. *College & Research Libraries News*, 65(2), 81-83.

Gjelten, D., & Fishel, T. (2006). Developing leaders and transforming libraries. *College & Research Libraries News*, 67(7), 409-412.

Golian, L.M. & Donlan, R. (2001). The ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute: highlights from the third annual institute, *College & Research Libraries News*, 62(11), 1069-1072.

Hardesty, L. (2000). ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute. *College & Research Libraries News*, 61(9), 805.

Hartman, L.A. (2006). Conference report. Creating leaders: The impact of leadership training programs on the subsequent leadership behavior of librarians. *Against the Grain*, 18(1), 60.

Harvard Graduate School of Education. Programs in Professional Education. Higher Education. The Leadership Institute for Academic Librarian*s.* Retrieved August 19, 2009, from http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~ppe/highered/programs/acrl.html.

Ingles, E. (2005). Northern Exposure to Leadership Institute—some personal reflections. *Feliciter*, 51(1), 38-40.

Jolly, L., Chelin, J., & Wilson, N. (2008). Leadership—it's a habit of mind. *Library & Information Update*, 7(10), 36-38.

Kalin, S.W. (2008). Reframing leadership: The ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute for Academic Librarians. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, 13(3), 261-270.

Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. *Future Leaders Programme*. Retrieved August 19, 2009, from http://www.lfhe.ac.uk/support/flp/.

Lynch, B. P. (1994). Taking on the issues in a changing environment: The senior fellows program. *Journal of Library Administration*, 20(2), 5-15.

Marcum, D. (2003). Training programs for library leadership in the United States [Abstract]. Abstract obtained from *Joho Kanri. Journal of Information Processing and Management*, 46(1), 9-16. Retrieved August 11, 2009, from, http://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/johokanri/46/1/9/_pdf, abstract in English, article text in Japanese.

Marcum, D.B., & Hawkins, B.L. (2000). The Frye Leadership Institute: A unique opportunity for a unique problem. *Educause Review*, 35(6), 8-9. Retrieved August 11, 2009, from, http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ erm0066.pdf;

Masselink, L. & Jacobsma, K. (2005). Reframing our viewpoint. *College & Research Libraries News*, 66(2), 99-101.

Neely, T.Y. (1999). Diversity initiatives and programs: The national approach. *Journal of Library Administration*, 27(1/2), 137.

Neely, T.Y., & Winston, M. (1999). Snowbird Leadership Institute: A survey of the implications for leadership in the profession. In H.A. Thompson (Ed.) *Racing toward tomorrow–ACRL 9th*

National Conference Proceedings (pp. 313-324). Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries (includes survey instrument).

Neely, T.Y., & Winston, M. (1999a). Snowbird Leadership Institute: leadership development in the profession. *College and Research Libraries*, 60(5), 412-425. (includes a detailed discussion of survey development)

Paul, C. (2007). Emerging Leaders fire up the profession. *American Libraries*, 38(6), 120-121;

Phelan, D. (2005). Creating leaders: A study of the Northern Exposure to Leadership Participants—before and after. Retrieved August 12, 2009, from http://dearer.blogspot.com/2006_09_01_archive.html.

Roy, L., Johnson-Cooper, G., Tysick, C., & Waters, D. (2006). Bridging Boundaries to Create a New Workforce: A Survey of Spectrum Scholarship Recipients, 1998-2003. Chicago, American Library Association. Retrieved August 10, 2009, from http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/diversity/spectrum/spectrumsurveyreport/BridgingBound aries.pdf.

Rumble, J., & MacEwan, B. (2008). The UCLA Senior Fellows Program. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, 13(3), 272.

Sirianni, P.M., & Frey, B.A. (2001). Changing a culture: evaluation of a leadership development program at Mellon Financial Services. *International Journal of Training & Development*, 5(4), 290-301.

Somerville, M.R. (1996). Dipping into the fountain of youth. *American Libraries*, 27(7), 26.

Somerville, M.R. (1997). Want to be coached? *American Libraries*, 28(3), 27.

Stevenson, V. (2006). Future Leaders programme. *SCONUL Focus*, (37), 19-20. Retrieved

August 9, 2009, from http://www.sconul.ac.uk/publications/newsletter/37/5.pdf.

Stone, A. (2007). Spectrum turns 10. *American Libraries*, 38(2), 42-43.

Tsurutani, P. (2002). Getting a place at the table. *Association Management*, 54(12), 56.

Turock, B. J. (2001). Women and leadership. *Journal of Library Administration*, 32(3/4), 111-

132.

UMN Training Institute Participants. UMN Technology and Leadership Training Institute;

University of Minnesota. Minnesota Institute. Retrieved August 20, 2009, from

http://www.lib.umn.edu/sed/institute/.

UMN Training Institute Participants. (1998). UMN Technology and Leadership Training

Institute. *Leading Ideas*, (5). Retrieved August 19, 2009, from

http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/li5.pdf.

Vilankulu, L. (2006). Bright Stars. The Institute for Early Career Librarians changes the face of

librarianship. *continuum*, (3), 14, 17. Retrieved August 20, 2009 from

http://www.lib.umn.edu/sed/institute/brightstars.html and

http://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/45094.

Wang, X., & Chang, S. (2006). Develop future library leaders with global literacy in the context

of cultural intelligence. *Chinese Librarianship*, (22), 43-57. Retrieved August 9, 2009, from

http://www.iclc.us/cliej/cl22.htm.

Wilkie, S. (2007). A national programme for developing leadership. *Library & Information

Update*, 6(10), 38-40.

Williams, J. F., II. (1988). Development of leadership potential. In A Woodsworth & B. von Wahlde (Eds.), *Leadership for research libraries: A festschrift for Robert M. Hayes* (pp. 100-125). Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Winston, M. D. (1997). The recruitment, education and careers of academic business librarians. (Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1997).

Winston, M.D., & Neely, T.Y. (2001). Leadership development and public libraries. *Public Library Quarterly* 19(3), 15-32.

Woodsworth, A., & von Wahlde, B. (1988). *Leadership for research libraries. A festschrift for Robert M. Hayes*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, Inc. (Hayes was the first director of the Senior Fellows Program. This book includes contributions from UCLA Senior Fellows participants from the 1982, 1983, 1985, and 1987 classes.)