

Megan Z. Perez. *From New Graduate to Competent Practitioner: Rethinking the Architecture of Post-MLS Residency Programs in ARL Libraries*. A Master's Paper for the M.S. in L.S. degree. April, 2007. 69 pages. Advisor: Katherine M. Wisser

Library residency programs can be valuable recruitment, development, and retention strategies. This study describes supplemental design elements in the development, implementation, and management of post-MLS residency programs in ARL libraries. It compares workforce issues and student demographics in academic librarianship and in the nursing profession. To determine the current recruitment and development strategies of active library residency programs, a survey was sent to personnel officers of ARL libraries. The results of the survey are compared to the practices of five successful nursing residency programs. The survey findings offer valuable information for libraries who currently host a residency program or who are considering hosting one in the future. The study concludes with suggestions and recommendations for library residency program administrators, LIS faculty and practitioners, and professional library associations.

Headings:

Recruiting for librarianship

Residency programs

College and university librarians/Education

Education for librarianship

Association of Research Libraries/Surveys

FROM NEW GRADUATE TO COMPETENT PRACTITIONER: RETHINKING THE
ARCHITECTURE OF POST-MLS RESIDENCY PROGRAMS IN ARL LIBRARIES

by
Megan Z. Perez

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty
of the School of Information and Library Science
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

April 2007

Approved by

Katherine M. Wisser

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Kath, a special thank you for her never-ending support and tireless encouragement, especially during the difficult moments. Thank you to Jerome Offord, Jr. at ARL and to Julie Brewer for distributing the survey and soliciting participation. For all of the participating institutions. I hope you find this study worth your time. A second thank you to Julie for her previous research and for our conversations. For Gwendolyn at ALA's Office for Diversity. Help is on the way. For Raquel. Thank you for the book and for sending Gerald my way. I hope I can be of service. For Dr. Winston who first gave me the idea of looking at other models. For my mom who never lost her patience with me. And for Pickles, without which...

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Background and Review of the Literature.....	3
The Librarian Shortage.....	3
Library Workforce Demographics	6
Retirement, Recruitment, and Retention	7
The Nursing Shortage.....	10
Nursing Workforce Demographics	11
New Graduate Preparation.....	12
Nursing Residency Programs (NRPs).....	13
Casey, Fink, Krugman, and Propst.....	14
Owens, Turjanica, Scanion, Sandhusen, Williamson, and Hebert.....	16
Beecroft, Kunzman, and Krozek.....	18
University HealthSystem Consortium (UHC)	21
Herdrich and Lindsay	23
Residency Programs in ARL Libraries.....	27
Methodology.....	29
Results	30
Identifying A Candidate	31
Resident Development	33
The Program in Context	37
Findings and Discussion.....	41
Recommendations	46
For Library Residency Program Coordinators.....	47
For LIS Faculty and Practitioners	49
For ALA and Other Professional Organizations.....	50
Summary and Conclusion.....	51
Bibilography.....	53

Appendix A	55
Appendix B.....	63

List of Tables

Table 1: Number of Librarians Reaching Age 65.....	7
Table 2: A Comparison of Factors Contributing to Workforce Shortages.....	10
Table 3: Demographic Profiles of Nursing and Library and Information Science Students.....	11
Table 4: Program Objectives and Measures.....	21
Table 5: Curriculum Content.....	22
Table 6: Methods of Advertising.....	31
Table 7: Responses to the question “What is the staff’s perception of the program?”.....	37
Table 8: Responses to the question “How is the program promoted internally?”.....	38
Table 9: Responses to the question “Are subsequent employers of previous residents contacted to discuss the role of the program in the resident’s professional development?”.....	39
Table 10: Measures of Success.....	39
Table 11: Advantages of Residency Programs.....	41

INTRODUCTION

Library residency programs can be traced back to as early as 1938 and have occupied the interest of library educators, practitioners, and administrators ever since, particularly in the last two decades. Despite continued interest, these programs remain hampered by recurring obstacles. An absence of sustainable program funding, organizational buy-in, and objective data reporting their impact are examples of such obstacles. Other examples include divergent general information about residency programs and a lack of institutional records tracking the development of former residents. The prevalence of these problems impedes fulfillment of the objectives of individual programs as well as the development and maintenance of academic library residency programs nationwide.

Since 2001, there has been increased concern regarding an impending library job surplus due to projected retirements. Current research sustains this concern and reveals additional complications for new MLIS graduates, entry-level job seekers, and librarians from underrepresented populations. Academic library residency programs have been used to help resolve the problems associated with inexperienced applicant pools, depressed librarian salaries, and minority representation in an academic setting.

One purpose of this study is to demonstrate the impending surplus of jobs facing the library workforce. Other professions, specifically the nursing profession, have faced similar workforce issues and this paper will show how nursing has succeeded in resolving those issues through the use of post-graduate training programs. Demographic

similarities between the library and nursing workforces will be provided. Examples of successful uses of nursing residency programs in the areas of recruitment, training, and retention of competent and confident nurse practitioners are described and discussed.

The primary purpose of this work, however, is to describe an ideal model of a library residency program. In the spring of 2007, a survey of post-MLS residency programs in ARL libraries was conducted. The survey was used to identify the practices and structure of active programs. Its methodology and results are described; and a comparison of the design and structure of nursing and library residency programs follows. The paper concludes a series of recommendations for future action including the development of a standardized accredited national residency program in library science.

The research questions for this study, therefore, are:

1. *What are some of the issues facing the library workforce today, including its demographics, its minority representation, and prospects for the future.*
2. *What issues face the nursing workforce and how do they compare to library workforce issues?*
3. *How successful have nursing residency programs been in addressing these issues?*
 - a. *What models are available for study?*
4. *How do academic library residency models compare?*
5. *What can the academic library community do with its residency programs to help resolve its own workforce issues?*

It has been at least five years since an analysis of library residency programs has been conducted. Since that time, the library workforce has changed, library budgets have felt

the effect of a flat economy, and Universities have increased their internal analysis of diversity-related initiatives. One advantage of this study, therefore, is its timeliness.

Another advantage is its content. The survey used in this study captured data from newly implemented programs that could not have been researched previously. Purdue University and the University of New Mexico launched library residency programs in 2006, for example. The practices of these two programs are not accounted for in existing research conducted prior to this year.

The information presented in this paper may be of interest to those studying human resources, and administration and management of academic libraries. The inclusion of nursing models is relevant and valuable for library personnel administrators, residency program coordinators, and diversity program officers.

BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Librarian Shortage

In the 2001 winter issue of *Occupational Outlook Quarterly*, Crosby reported an expected 5% increase in the number of library jobs from 1998 to 2008. In January of that same year, the *Boston Globe* noted that the recent number of annual retirements has been double the number of graduates coming out of library and information science programs (ACRL Ad Hoc Task Force on Recruitment & Retention Issues, 2002). Six months later, then ALA president John W. Berry identified some reasons for this shortage of librarians during an interview for the *Indianapolis Star*. He noted an insufficient supply of new MLIS graduates, low salaries when compared to positions requiring comparable education, and increased competition from the private sector (ACRL).

In response to these developments, the Personnel Administrators & Staff Development Officers Discussion Group of the Association of College & Research Libraries created an Ad Hoc Task Force on Recruitment & Retention Issues. On May 20th of 2002, the Task Force produced a white paper addressing issues of recruitment to the profession in general and recruitment to academic libraries in particular. The paper identifies some primary factors causing the decreasing supply of qualified professional librarians including the aging of the library profession, one of the lowest unemployment rates in U.S. history, a stagnant number of MLIS graduates, increased competition from other sectors, less than competitive salaries, and a negative image of the profession (ACRL, 2002). “Given the relatively stable number of MLIS graduates and the predicted number of retirements,” the paper states, “our profession is likely to face a labor shortage that is caused by both increased demand and reduced supply” (ACRL, 2002, p. 11).

A May 2005 *Library Journal* article written by Holt and Strock identifies additional workforce complications, particularly for the recent graduate. Contrary to the labor shortage described by the ACRL white paper, Holt and Strock (2005) argue there will be a professional library job shortage through the year 2010. Using estimates from the American Library Association from the year 2000, Holt and Strock project there will be 41,000 job openings for the years 2000-2010. Using figures from the same report, the authors assume an estimated 5000 students graduate from MLIS programs and enter the job market each year. “This means that, at last count, there will be about 4100 jobs open each year until 2010 for the 5000 new librarians each year.” (Holt & Strock, 2005) They go on to note that, of the job opportunities they studied, only 11% were open to new librarians.

Holt and Strock's evidence strongly suggests two additional barriers for recent graduates: 1) recent graduates are not considered for entry-level positions and 2) positions offering new librarians the crucial experience they need to advance and succeed in the profession are the same jobs being liquidated and consolidated. The concern for Holt and Strock is less about a shortage of library job supply in general and more about a lack of opportunity for entry-level employment for recent graduates in particular. Their findings reveal that experienced librarians, as well as applicants with subject-specific PhDs who do not hold an MLIS degree, are applying for entry-level positions alongside graduates entering the library professional job market for the first time.

Despite a polarity of opinion on whether there will be a professional library job shortage or a professional library job surplus, there are several points on which there can be general agreement:

- Professional librarian salaries remain depressed when compared with other professions requiring comparable educational requirements.
- The energy, initiative, optimism, and technological dexterity of young, new talent are vital to the success of the profession.
- Library administrators continue to remark on the lack of qualified applicants for available positions.
- Data supplied by the annual ALISE Statistical Reports indicate the number of MLIS graduates remains stable over time.
- There is a lingering negative image of the professional librarian.
- Additional career opportunities for women in other professions offering competitive salaries and opportunities for growth have affected the number of women entering the field.
- An increasing number of MLIS graduates are seeking employment in business and industry settings.
- Despite the difficulty in accurately predicting the number of retirements, it is not difficult to calculate the number of librarians who will reach age 65 or over in the coming decades (ACRL, 2002). (See Table 1.)

Library Workforce Demographics

In their September 2006 report, *Diversity Counts!*, Davis and Hall presented their findings using some of the most currently available Census and NCSE data (Davis & Hall, 2006). Their demographic findings mirror somewhat the information available from the Association for Library and Information Science Education. According to the 2004 ALISE Statistical Report, the percentage of students of White origin in ALA-Accredited Library Science programs is 74.8% (Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE), table II-1-a-1). The percentage of students in that same group who are female is 79%; and the largest age group of students is in the 25 to 29 years old category.

Davis and Hall (2006) found that the nearly 110,000 credentialed librarians (librarians with an MLIS or MA) are predominantly white women aged 45-54. This latter category, age, is particularly significant. “The most pronounced alignment gap appears between the Census estimates for the library industry and ALA member response is in age categories,” (Davis & Hall, p. 10). They go on to report a 3% decline in the ‘under 35’ age range and a -41% decline in the 35-44 age range (Davis & Hall).

Recently, the ALA conducted an online survey of its members. As of September 2006, only 14% of members had responded. Of those respondents, 32% fell into the under 35 age range compared to the 11% offered by the Census estimates. Davis and Hall (2006) acknowledged the need for additional member responses to determine whether this is a stable pattern or a reflection of survey respondents. For Davis and Hall, these figures suggest three important points: 1) the profession is aging, 2) library workers are leaving the profession at a time when they should be moving into mid- and upper-

level managerial positions; and 3) our profession will be facing a *crisis of library leadership* in the coming decade.

Retirement, Recruitment, and Retention

The research of Davis and Hall (2006) reiterates an important point regarding the impending retirement crisis suggested by Crosby in 2001. Using 2000 Census data, the ALA updated its 2002 study of librarian retirements (which used 1990 Census data). The updated study determined retirements would be delayed and even more librarians would reach retirement age than previously thought (Davis & Hall). (See Table 1.)

Table 1: Number of Librarians Reaching Age 65¹

<u>Time Period</u>	<u>Number</u>
2000-04	5,479
2005-09	12,898
2010-14	23,208
2015-19	25,014

As stated previously, the ACRL paper identifies some important themes regarding recruitment of new librarians: additional professional opportunities, negative image, and a stable number of new graduates, for examples (ACRL, 2002). On the one hand, these themes have not made the profession a “hot” career (ACRL, 2002, p. 14). On the other hand, work opportunities for women in other fields of study have contributed to the loss

¹ Note. From *Diversity Counts!* (p. 12), by D. Davis and T. Hall, 2006, Chicago: American Library Association. Adapted.

of potential colleagues. Both elements have made recruitment to librarianship a difficult challenge.

A third element making recruitment to the profession difficult is the flat number of library school graduates. It is worth noting that Holt and Strock (2005), Davis and Hall (2006), and the ALISE (2004) data all report the number of LIS graduates is relatively stable at approximately 5000 graduates each year. In addition to being a concern for human resources officers, employers of librarians, and professional associations the annual number of LIS graduates should be an area of concern for library school administrators as well. If academic libraries are to fill vacant positions in the coming years, recruitment to the profession needs to be understood as a critical need and a shared responsibility. In the case of library school administrators, if the number of students graduating from LIS programs is insufficient to meet current demand, school administrators need to re-examine their role and responsibility in helping to resolve this shortage.

The ACRL paper raises a unique issue regarding retention. Its discussion of retention in academic libraries revolves around the issue of faculty status. The paper cites the emergence of anecdotal evidence “that recent MLIS graduates and librarians new to academic libraries do not care to enter organizations where librarians have faculty status,” (ACRL, 2002, p. 17). The authors go on to assert it is important to the Association to determine if faculty status is the reason why fewer and fewer MLIS graduates are pursuing careers in academic librarianship. Future research should be done in this area to determine whether faculty status is, in fact, a professional deterrent and, if so, then why.

Some surprising statistics regarding the retention issue are offered by Davis and Hall (2006). By comparing 1990 and 2000 Census EEO files, racial and ethnic minorities are shown to experience the most dramatic rates of attrition for all librarians. Between 1990 and 2000, Black librarians, for example, show a decline of 22.6% (15,500 in 1990 to 11,365 in 2000). Further, the number of racial and ethnic minorities in LIS programs does not reflect the rate of increase of racial and ethnic minorities across the country. Between 1990 and 2000, the 'minority' population grew 152% (Davis & Hall, 2006). The number of LIS graduates grew from 9% in 1991 to 13% in 2001. Instead of increasing the number of LIS graduates, existing LIS programs are only producing enough professionals to replace those who are retiring or exiting the profession prematurely. For Davis and Hall, the twin issues of recruitment and retention of minority librarians are inseparable.

The library profession, however, is not the first and only profession to face challenges of impending workforce shortages, recruitment and retention to the field, and looming retirements in massive numbers. Many professions such as teaching, nursing, and social work, for examples, have faced, addressed, and overcome similar challenges. Of particular interest is the nursing profession, because it faces similar labor shortage issues caused by an aging workforce, a negative image of the practitioner, and a plateau of school enrollment. It is remarkable of all the studies reviewed only the ACRL paper incorporated a discussion of nursing shortage and supply issues in its discussion of recruitment and retention issues for librarianship (ACRL, 2002).

The Nursing Shortage

Murray's study (2002) "The Nursing Shortage" describes a workforce that is facing challenges similar to the library workforce. (See Table 2.) First, there is a present nursing shortage expected to extend into 2020 with an estimated 400,000 registered nurse vacancies. An aging nursing pool, a decline in nursing school enrollment, increased career opportunities for women in a traditionally female-dominated profession, nurse 'burn-out', and a public misconception of a nurse's responsibilities are cited by Murray as some of the factors contributing to this shortage. The public perception that a nurse's work consists of long hours and low pay, she argues, has seriously affected recruitment of nurses and she notes the *Job Rates Almanac* of 2001 rated nursing the 137th most desirable job out of 250 professions.

Table 2: A Comparison of Factors Contributing to Workforce Shortages

	Nursing	Librarianship
Aging Workforce	Yes	Yes
School Enrollment	Declining	Stagnant
Lingering Negative Image	Yes	Yes
Increased Opportunities For Women Outside Librarianship	Yes	Yes

Murray (2002) cited other factors impacting recruitment and retention of nurses. According to Murray, 54% of nurses surveyed would not recommend their profession to their children or their friends. She cites inadequate numbers of nurses, rising patient loads, and declining quality of patient care as factors contributing to burn-out. She also

notes one out of every three nurses under age 30 plans to leave the profession within a year due to dissatisfaction with scheduling, mandatory overtime, and high levels of stress (Murray).

Finally, Murray (2002) reports a steady decrease in nursing school enrollment. For entry-level bachelor's degree programs, enrollment has been on the decline for 6 consecutive years. Enrollment in 5-year baccalaureate programs has reduced nearly 17% from 1996-2000.

Nursing Workforce Demographics

According to the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN), the percentage of students enrolled in a generic, baccalaureate nursing program in the years 1994-2004, and who declared themselves to be of White origin ranged from 75%-81%. The gender of nursing students enrolled in the same kind of program was 90.7% female in the fall of 2004 (AACN, 2004). Altier and Kresk found nurse residents have an average age of 26 (Altier & Kresk, 2006). This profile is not unlike that of the library and information science student. (See Table 3.)

Table 3: Demographic Profiles of Nursing and Library and Information Science Students

	Nursing	Librarianship
Gender	90.7% Female	79% Female
Ethnicity	75-81% White	74.8% White
Age	26 (average)	25-29

New Graduate Preparation

To address some of the workforce issues facing the nursing profession, Goode and Williams (2004) discussed three studies related to new nursing graduate preparation. They note the increasing difficulty experienced by new graduates in transitioning to the professional role. Nursing schools, they argue, emphasize a broad knowledge base leaving out preparation in specialty areas. The increase in nursing vacancy rates and current nursing shortage forces new graduates to learn the duties and responsibilities of their new role in a shorter amount of time. To complicate matters further, Goode and Williams cite a variation in perception among deans of nursing programs in how new graduates are recruited, oriented, and supported. This raises concerns about nurse burnout, high turnover rates, and the lack of a consistent approach in transitioning new graduates into their professional roles.

A study performed by the National Council of State Boards of Nursing indicated employers perceived the new graduate nurse to be inadequately prepared for entry-level service (Goode & Williams, 2004). A second study examined competencies of graduates of Clemson University's Bachelor of Science in nursing program. Although the graduates were praised for their professional behavior, broad knowledge, and eagerness to learn, evaluators noted organizational and time management skills, teamwork, and leadership skills as areas in which the new graduates were least prepared (Goode & Williams).

A third study by Oermann and Moffitt-Wolf (1997) assessed the stresses and challenges experienced by new graduates. Thirty-five new graduates from three hospitals in a metropolitan area in the Midwest participated in the study. The graduates identified

lack of experience, interactions with physicians, and a lack of organizational skills as predominant stressors. They also identified the ability to set priorities, the transition from student to professional, problem solving, and effective interaction with physicians as primary challenges. (Oermann & Moffitt-Wolf, 1997)

Oermann and Moffitt-Wolf (1997) conclude new graduates need guidance regarding strategies for interacting with workplace professionals. Simulations, role modeling, and individualized assignments are all suggested as strategies for assisting graduates develop communication skills and self-confidence in coping with the identified stresses and challenges. The role of the nurse preceptor is also significant. The preceptor is regarded as a highly qualified professional, resource person with expertise and knowledge of the teaching and training process for new nurse practitioners. Participants of this study identified consistent preceptors as facilitating, supporting, and guiding their learning. The healthcare setting, then, is responsible for preparing preceptors for their roles and designing an appropriate support system for their development.

Nursing Residency Programs (NRPs)

Various approaches have been employed by the nursing profession to address the lack of new graduate preparation and to attract and retain the new graduate nurse. One approach that is of documented value is the use of a post-graduate residency program or NRP (Altier & Kresk, 2006). This section describes the results of 5 different post-graduate nurse training programs. Examples of elements included in the discussion are program design, turnover rates, cost and return on investment (ROI), and program objectives.

The Casey, Fink, Krugman, and Propst Study

In a two part study in the Denver area, Casey, Fink, Krugman, and Propst (2004) initiated a study to identify the stresses and challenges experienced by cohorts of graduate nurses and to investigate how nurses' experiences change as they transition from new graduate to practicing professional. Citing an estimated graduate nurse turnover rate of 55% to 61%, Casey et al. also set out to study factors that may influence graduate retention.

Nearly three hundred graduate nurses working in 6 different hospitals were surveyed to determine similarities and differences in skills, procedures, level of comfort, level of confidence, and level of job-satisfaction. The study participants were assessed during specific periods: baseline, 3 months, 6 months, and 12 months using the *Casey-Fink Graduate Nurse Experience Survey*.

Of particular significance is the final part of the Survey. It included a series of open ended questions allowing graduates to voice their personal experiences. Casey et al. (2004) identified some themes common to all participating hospitals and time periods:

1. *Lack of confidence in skills performance and deficits in critical thinking*

In terms of skills and procedure performance, only 4% were comfortable performing all skills and procedures listed on the survey. Confidence, however, improved over time. Respondents showed an increase in confidence communicating with interns and physicians between 6 months and 1 year. After one year of practice, comfort and confidence levels in the professional role reached a high.

2. *Struggles with dependence on others yet wanting to be independent practitioners*

The tension between dependence and independence was evident. Graduates reported feeling “alone” and “overwhelmed.” Other graduates verbalized frustrated feelings of “guilt” when not comfortable asking for help (Casey et al., 2004).

3. *Organization and priority-setting skills*

Less experienced graduates (those with less than 6 months work experience) indicated a lack of organizational skills as a primary barrier to optimal performance. They had high expectations for themselves and described having difficulty leaving work “on time,” (Casey et al., 2004). As time progressed, however, organizational and time management abilities improved.

4. *Communication with physicians*

During the first 6 months, new graduates felt insecure and lacked confidence in communicating with physicians. They also verbalized a lack of respect from physicians. During the final 6 months of their first year in practice, these same frustrations and difficulties were not expressed.

A second phase of this study surveyed graduates who were participating in a hospital-wide nurse residency program. Additional questions were added to the survey instrument to provide an assessment of the work environment and to allow for the residents to share any concerns about the program.

Respondents from the phase 2 survey questions identified the need for a consistent preceptor and a desire for more feedback and encouragement, especially

surrounding the issue of time management. Regarding the perception of the residency program, most respondents appreciated the longer orientation period and noted their interactions with other new graduates offered “moral support,” (Casey et al., 2004). New learning opportunities, staff support, and teamwork contributed to satisfaction with the work environment.

Casey et al. (2004) found graduate nurses perceived it took at least 12 months to feel comfortable and confident as a practitioner of nursing. They also found the preceptor role is critical to graduate nurses’ job satisfaction and their developing competency in the professional role. In this study, the key strategy for ensuring continued support and learning for new graduates is a formal structure of instruction. This should include the active participation of management in development as it can improve socialization and mentoring and fill a vital role in levels of job satisfaction and effective transition from student to practitioner (Casey et al.). It is also noteworthy that the authors suggest closer partnerships between the academic and practice institutions as a means of facilitating the transition process.

The Owens, Turjanica, Scanion, Sandhusen, Williamson, and Hebert Study

In the northern Virginia region, five hospitals developed a new graduate nurse internship program to address the nursing profession’s workforce issues (Owens, et al., 2001). A committee of nurse educators, specialists, preceptors, and graduates evaluated the development, implementation, and evaluation of this program. Their goals were to retain new graduates, consider the needs of the customer (including both the new

graduate and the hospital), collaborate among institutions, and validate the program in meeting customer needs.

The components of the program included the development of interpersonal communication skills, formal and informal peer support, and the evaluation of the graduates' practice and goals. The committee decided to employ a variety of teaching methods to accommodate the different learning styles of the new graduates. Small and large group discussions, role play, cognitive testing, case studies, videos, simulations, and self-directed learning modules were engaged in the development of the curriculum. It is important to note that preceptors were also trained to teach communication skills, for example, to a variety of learning styles.

Upon completion of the program, new graduates responded to the question, "What is happening out there?" The purpose of the question was to provide program facilitators with qualitative data on stressors perceived by the graduates. Their responses included difficulty with workloads, effective communication, conflict resolution, and delegation of tasks.

Ultimately, the goal of the program was to retain new hires. For the July 1998 internship, 74% of new graduates were still employed by the original hiring institution. The September 1998 internship retained 73% of its program participants. The authors conclude the most significant implication of this study is the positive impact internship programs can have on recruitment and retention within the profession (Owens, et al., 2001).

The Beecroft, Kunzman, & Krozek Study

In Los Angeles, a 1-year internship was implemented at a Children's Hospital to address the increased need for healthcare in the specialty area of pediatrics. The authors argue that academic nursing programs provide only limited or no clinical pediatric experience and that is, consequently, incumbent upon the workplace to instruct and prepare new nurses in such specialty areas. The goals of the pediatric internship were to: 1) facilitate the transition of the new graduate to professional; 2) prepare an entry-level nurse to provide competent care; and 3) increase the commitment and retention of new nurse graduates within the organization. (Beecroft, Kunzman, & Krozek, 2001)

The authors determined the new graduate should acquire the values, attitudes, and goals of the profession as well as a sense of occupational identity. *Corwin's Nursing Role Conception Scale* (Corwin, 1961) was used to measure variables such as independence of practice, standards of excellence, membership in professional organizations, continued learning, and interest in research. This instrument was administered at the beginning and the end of the internship program. Other measures were used to assess the nurse's professional autonomy, residents' self-confidence, skills competency, and organizational commitment. At the end of the internship, a final measure, the Anticipated Turnover Scale, was taken.

A group of 50 new graduates was used in this study. A control group of 45 new nurses hired within 24-months before the beginning of the internship was established for comparison. Seventy-nine percent of the control group had 1.5 years or more of professional nursing experience. The average length of work experience for the intern group was 8 months.

Results of the self-confidence and skills competency survey show a continuous increase in score during the period of the internship. When compared to one another, the scores of both groups were the same after 12 months. A similar statement can be made regarding the results of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. At the end of 6 and 12 month intervals, Beecroft et al. (2001) found interns had comparable scores to the control group.

A significant difference emerges when comparing the two groups with regard to turnover. At the 6 month interval, the control group scores indicated a greater possibility of voluntary termination. During the 12 month period, the authors report their human resources department indicated an actual turnover rate of 36% for the control group. The interns, however, had a turnover rate of 7%.

An outstanding feature of the research conducted by Beecroft et al. (2001) is the inclusion of a discussion of the internship's calculated return on investment (ROI). ROI is the ratio of money gained or lost on an investment relative to the amount of money invested and is used to determine the cost effectiveness of a program. In the case of this program, the ROI is calculated by dividing the net program benefits by program costs.

Program costs for this internship, including manager teaching time, staff and intern salaries, photocopying expenses, supplies, equipment, and refreshments, were \$806,961.70. Program benefits were calculated by comparing two methods of recruitment: the "old way" and the "new way," (Beecroft et al., 2001). Under the old way, Beecroft et al. calculate 63% of new graduates were retained at the end of a 1-year period. Under the new way, however, through the internship program, 43 new hires remained employed at the end of a 1-year period for a retention rate of 86%. Beecroft et

al. calculate 21 new nurses were added to the staff that would not have been secured without the internship program.

The savings associated with hiring or replacing these 21 nurses were the program's net program benefits. For 21 full-time nurses earning an average hourly rate of \$27.57, this amounted to \$1,349,862.24. Program benefits minus program costs yields a net program benefit of \$543,131.64. Net program benefits divided by program costs yields a ROI of 0.673 or 67.3%.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{ROI} &= \mathbf{net\ program\ benefits/program\ costs} \\
 &= \mathbf{(program\ benefits-program\ costs)/program\ costs} \\
 &= \mathbf{(\$1,349,972.77-\$806,961.70)/\$806,961.70} \\
 \mathbf{ROI} &= \mathbf{67.29\%}
 \end{aligned}$$

Based on this study, Beecroft et al. (2001) conclude this program shows “encouraging results” in meeting program objectives. The authors assert the interns are confident, competent, and committed. Their performance at 12 months is comparable or better than the control group of nurses who have twice as much experience as the interns; and the turnover rate is less than half that of the more experienced practitioners (14% compared to 36%). The return on investment demonstrates a savings on money that would have been spent on costs related to turnover (recruitment, advertising, interviewing, hiring, training) and provides evidence of the fiscal soundness of post-graduate training programs.

The University HealthSystem Consortium (UHC) Study

In June 2002, task forces of nurse clinicians, faculty, nursing officers, and deans from the University HealthSystem Consortium (UHC) and the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) developed and implemented a standardized residency curriculum at 6 different hospitals. Two important features of the curriculum are: 1) it is assumed that essentials of baccalaureate education had been met so curricular content would not be repeated in the program; and 2) the curriculum is based on research with special attention given to problematic areas for new graduates.

Among the objectives of the program are efforts to reduce turnover, enhance job satisfaction and autonomy, and increase critical thinking skills. The objectives and attendant measures are listed in Table 4.

Table 4: Program Objectives and Measures²

Objectives	Measures
Transition from beginner to professional	Casey-Fink Graduate Nurse Experience
Develop effective decision-making skills	Scores on critical thinking assessment tool
Provide leadership	Gerber Control of Work Environment
Strengthen commitment to profession	Job satisfaction inventory
Formulate individual development plan	Resident constructed career plan
Incorporate evidence-based practice	Completion of research project

² Note. From "Post-Baccalaureate Nurse Residency Program," by C. J. Goode and C. A. Williams, 2004, *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 34, p.75. Copyright 2004 by Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, Inc. Adapted.

The curriculum is divided into broad areas such as leadership, professional development, and critical thinking. The content of these areas is listed in Table 5.

Table 5: Curriculum Content³

Leadership	Time management, delegation, communication
Professional Development	Scholarly responsibility
Critical Thinking	Complex situations and case scenarios

In addition to the curriculum, the design of the programs includes participation in a general orientation, access to a resident facilitator, and course work specific to the resident's specialty and work site. The curriculum is integrated into the work schedule, yet there is also a curriculum for preceptor training. Preceptor course content includes identification of learning needs, mutual goal setting, giving effective feedback, and facilitating critical thinking. A final, unique, feature of this program is the collaborative work between the academic hospital and the paired school of nursing.

Given these studies, Goode and Williams (2004) conclude that the development and implementation of standardized nurse residency programs needs more attention. New graduates need assistance with the application of knowledge and the acquisition of particular skills. They also require additional education in supervision, delegation, communication, organization, and time management. For Goode and Williams, the design and implementation of a standardized residency program is an important component in the professional development of new graduates and a long range strategy for enhancing the nursing practice and reducing nurse turnover.

³ Note. From "Post Baccalaureate," p.75.

The Herdrich and Lindsay Study

Finally, Herdrich and Lindsay, Directors of Clinical Education and Development at Wheaton Franciscan Healthcare in Milwaukee, also implemented a Nurse Residency Program to “address an alarming pattern of nurses leaving their initial job within the first 1-3 years of practice” (Herdrich & Lindsay, 2006, p. 55). Their review of the literature showed existing residency programs are highly variable in their structure and used traditional learning designs. They also found a lack of a common definition. Because of these variations in design, definition, and method, it is difficult to understand, analyze, and compare nursing residency programs. One of the purposes of this study, then, was to define an NRP, articulate its components, and highlight a successful learning design (Herdrich & Lindsay).

For these researchers, a nursing residency program is a joint partnership between academia and practice. It is a learner-focused, postgraduate experience designed to support the development of competency in nursing practice. The most significant difference from their program and another is in the design on the learning structure. Common components of NRPs include an extended orientation, a mentor arrangement, and structured education. For Herdrich and Lindsay (2006), however, it is the learning structure that facilitates a program’s effectiveness and not a matter of programmatic change.

The critical components of the learning structure include a competency-based, theoretical framework and program goals. These goals include the enhancement of job

satisfaction, development of clinical competence, expansion of critical thinking capacity, and increased organizational commitment. Learner assessments are also important components. The proposed NRP applied a principle of “knowing the learner”. This principle allowed for an assessment of the resident's learning style and personality characteristics. The Multiple Intelligence Learning Style and Myers-Briggs Personality Inventories enhanced the resident facilitator's understanding of the specific needs and learning characteristics of the residents. Ongoing dialogue with the residents also helped synchronize learning strategies with the needs of the learners.

The structure in which the residents come together, share individual experiences, and collectively reflect as a learning group is known as the “community learning design” It is another critical component of the overall learning structure. Learning sessions occurred at regular intervals, with both pre-session and post-session activities assigned to the residents. Collective conversations focused on the residents' topics and were facilitated toward a meaningful problem-solving outcome. Residents were also asked to apply the principles discussed to their practice and be prepared to present their results.

The delivery system used within the community learning structure is the action-reflection design. It is both a philosophical construct and a method for learning (Herdrich & Lindsay, 2006). A basic principle of this design is that there is no learning without action, and as action is taken, results are generated. In this model, responsibility for learning shifts from facilitator to resident. As the resident engages in this approach, he or she gains capacity to learn and becomes more capable of performing. “In essence, the resulting practice of action and reflection supports the development of lifelong learning,” (Herdrich & Lindsay, p. 58).

The effects of these structures are believed to have positively influenced program recruitment and resident retention. With the assistance of marketing strategies, the number of program applicants increased. One program reported the number of applications doubled from the introduction of the first program to the implementation of the second. Many applicants selected a particular hospital as a direct result of the support provided by the residency program. Retention rates for these NRPs are 90%. The use of a community learning design and action-reflection techniques facilitated and advanced the residents' base level of knowledge, professional behaviors, critical thinking skills, judgment, problem-solving ability, organizational socialization, and stress management abilities.

The outcomes of program components (job satisfaction, organizational commitment, stress and transition, for examples) were measured using established evaluation instruments. In terms of knowledge base, for example, an average improvement of 12% was reported on the Basic Knowledge Assessment Test (BKAT). Residents reported diminishing levels of job stress related to an improved ability to handle stressors. Critical thinking pretest and posttest measures were improved using the Critical Thinking Inventory and the Watson-Glaser critical thinking appraisal. Scores increased 41% at the end of 12 months. In addition, learners demonstrated an increasing depth of questioning and a higher understanding of the complexity of cases studied. Reflective journaling, participation in residency sessions, and individual evaluation sessions were also used to evaluate critical thinking skills and advanced judgment.

Herdrich and Lindsay (2006) conclude by highlighting the community learning design, the need for standardization of residency terminology, materials, and processes,

and the use of techniques that are evidence based. Finally, they conclude the development of a new graduate into a competent practitioner requires not only programmatic changes within existing programs, but also alterations in current learning structures and delivery systems.

Although the nursing residency programs described here vary in duration and in size, they share several similar elements. Broadly speaking, these NRPs sought to address nursing workforce issues and reduce turnover. More specifically, the purposes of these models include the study of stresses and challenges faced by new nurse graduates, how nurses experience transition from graduate to practitioner, and factors that contribute to retention. They were also designed to study and increase levels of comfort, confidence, job-satisfaction, occupational identity, and organizational commitment. Finally, a curricular component to facilitate the expansion of skills in the areas of critical thinking, interpersonal communication, personal organization, time-management, and stress-management was used.

The results of the programs were equally similar. Upon completion of a program, residents were described as confident, competent, and committed. Their performance was comparable or better than more experienced practitioners. The turnover rate of new graduates was reduced. Program participants demonstrated an increase in base level of knowledge, professional behavior, problem solving, critical thinking, stress-management, self-confidence, and autonomy. Finally, by calculating the return on investment, one program in particular was shown to generate a savings in money.

Residency Programs in ARL Libraries

The purpose of most academic library residency programs is to attract recent LIS graduates and new professionals to academic librarianship. Many, but not all, programs are carried out over a two-year period. During that time, recent graduates are offered substantial professional experience in an academic environment and accelerated training not typically available through entry-level employment. During the first year, the resident works with a variety of departments and areas of the library, gaining broad-based experience and exposure. During the second year, the resident selects a primary area of responsibility and works on a focused, sustained project. Relocation assistance and professional development funds may accompany the position.

In addition to attracting new professionals to academic librarianship in general, many residency programs use the position as a tool for increasing the library staff's diversity. The involvement of, and application from, under-represented ethnic and minority groups is often solicited and encouraged. In some cases, the Pauline A. Young Residency at the University of Delaware, for example, the residency program is one part of the Library's Affirmative Action Plan. The ultimate goal is that participants will remain in academic librarianship upon completion of the program. From an organizational standpoint, libraries benefit from having an energetic, continuous pool of new talent available. Residency programs offer libraries an opportunity to demonstrate their commitment to minority recruitment and they afford library directors an opportunity to experiment with temporary labor (Brewer, 1997).

Brewer and Winston (2001) conducted a study to identify the necessary components of an evaluation model for residency programs. They surveyed the academic library deans, directors, and/or program coordinators of residency programs in 22 different institutions. Their study found library administrators of programs considered quality of the applicant pool, completion of the program, and subsequent placement in an academic library to be the most important evaluation factors for measuring residency programs (Brewer & Winston). Regarding diversity-related factors, more than 75% of survey respondents noted that ethnic diversity among the pool of applicants was very important. Two-thirds of the respondents noted change in minority representation on the library staff as very important as well. Third, more than two-thirds (14 of 19 respondents) indicated as very important the degree to which the residency program supported the institution's diversity plan.

Brewer and Winston (2001) asked respondents to identify factors not accounted for in the survey instrument but considered important in program evaluation. In response, program coordinators suggested the following: quality of experience for the resident(s), quality of assignments available, acceptance by the staff at large, recurring funding, visibility and reputation of the program, effectiveness of mentoring, and resident growth in confidence and ability.

Yet, how do *currently active* academic library residency programs compare to nursing models? Do they assess critical thinking skills or teach communication and organizational skills? Are the programs successfully fulfilling their objectives? Research regarding library residency programs is extant, but not current. In fact, the majority of research in this area predates the turn of this century, with the lone exception of the work

of Brewer and Winston (2001). A survey, therefore, was created to assess the current state of active library residency programs.

METHODOLOGY

After receiving approval from the University of North Carolina Institutional Review Board, an online survey was distributed via email to human resources and personnel officers of ARL libraries in March of 2007. A link to the online instrument, along with a letter of invitation to complete the survey, was emailed to the Director of Diversity Initiatives at ARL. (See Appendix A.) The Director was then asked to forward the invitation email to ARL human resources and personnel officers' listservs. Implied consent was given by the respondents when they completed and submitted the survey.

The instrument included a combination of open-ended, closed-ended, and Likert-type scale questions. It also included a short set of contingency questions to accommodate those institutions who do not currently have an active program, but have had one in the past, as well as those who have never hosted a program.

The survey was designed to measure a library's current program status, the manner in which candidates are identified, and methods by which the resident(s) is/are developed (personality and critical thinking skills inventories, stress and job-satisfaction measures, mentoring components, for examples). The program's visibility, exposure, and reputation in the larger library system and overall University contexts were also surveyed. Finally, issues such as the program's annual cost, quality of resident activity, and frequency of evaluation were also measured.

The target population of the survey included academic libraries affiliated with ARL. An informal list of libraries known to have hosted programs in the past has been

generated by using published information available to the public such as the directory listed in Racquel Cogell's book *Diversity in Libraries: Academic Residency Programs* (Cogell, 2001).

Another list of programs was secured from the ALA Office for Diversity and still one more list was generated by the researcher's own online searching of residency program websites. Many programs have been listed on the Diversity Librarians Network (DLN) and on the ARL Research Library & Internship Programs Database, but neither of these online resources is current nor comprehensive. Further, information was requested from libraries that *do not* currently have residency programs in place. It was for these reasons that the input of all ARL libraries was sought, rather than only those that have been identified by Cogell, ALA, the researcher, the DLN, and the ARL database.

Given that the original data to be collected in this study describes a population too large to be observed directly, survey methodology was selected as the most appropriate method for measurement (Babbie, 2004). The instrument developed here, however, differs from those used in previous studies in that it draws on existing library residency research, but also adds to it questions regarding evaluation factors cited as being important or useful for future investigations by both library and nursing researchers.

RESULTS

Library administrators and residency program coordinators were asked questions regarding the identification of candidates, the development of the resident during the program, and the program's sources of support on the University campus. The researcher identified 13 currently active programs through methods described previously. Twelve

responses indicated the existence of a currently active program. It should be noted, however, the list of programs identified by the researcher is not comprehensive. It is likely there are programs in operation that were not identified by the researcher, but this number is equally likely to be very small. Given this information, the response rate of this survey for currently active programs is approximated to be between 75 and 92 percent.

Identifying A Candidate

Survey participants were asked about advertising methods, strategies for developing the applicant pool, and the interview process and structure. Nearly all respondents used their library website to advertise the residency program. Library and Information Science student listservs, professional organizations, and the ARL Diversity Initiatives Office were also used by a majority of survey respondents. (See Table 6.)

Table 6: Methods of Advertising

Answer	# Responses	%
Library Websites	11 out of 12	92%
LIS Student Listservs	9 out of 12	75%
Professional Organizations	9 out of 12	75%
ARL Diversity Initiatives Office	9 out of 12	75%
Serial Publications	6 out of 12	50%
Spectrum Scholars Listserv	5 out of 12	42%
Other	3 out of 12	25%
ALA Office for Diversity	2 out of 12	17%

‘Other’ methods of advertising included the use of the Diversity Librarians’ Network (DLN), ALA ethnic caucuses, individual recruiting, administrative offices of LIS schools, career services departments of HBCs, diversity listservs, and print media. Sixty-seven percent of respondents (8 out of 12) use four or more methods of advertising simultaneously.

In addition to advertising, respondents were asked to describe the use of any additional applicant pool development tools. Three respondents visited library schools as one marketing strategy. Two respondents indicated an internal search of some kind is used. In both cases, the programs drew from a pool of library school students at the host institution. A second pair of respondents indicated they sent letters to the Deans of library schools requesting nominations. One respondent indicated direct consultation with the Director of the ARL Diversity Initiatives Office was used in addition to advertising.

Seventy-five percent (9 out of 12) of the respondents indicated a committee is used to select candidates for an interview. In other cases, a supervisor or high level administrator (Associate Librarian or Associate Dean) is responsible for candidate selection. Those programs that used committees were asked to indicate positions and departments in which selection committee members worked. The composition of the selection committee varied widely. Some programs used a cross-section of library staff and faculty from various departments. Other programs used a combination of department heads (including Human Resources), Assistant or Associate University Librarians, Library Directors, and previous or current program participants. It was somewhat surprising to learn that paraprofessionals and current residents were not selection

committee members in the majority of programs: eight of twelve (67%) programs did not include paraprofessionals on selection committees while 7 out of 11 respondents (64%) indicated current residents did not serve on the selection committee. Seventy-five percent of respondents, however, indicated members of the departments in which the resident will work do serve on the committee.

In an overwhelming majority of the cases (10 of 12), the structure of the interview generally follows that of a regular professional position interview: meetings with librarians and staff, with Assistant or Associate Librarians, with the Director, and with the search committee. Lunch and dinner meals, and tours of the campus as well as the surrounding community are typical and the average length of the interview is one full day. Although only 9 of 12 respondents indicated members of the department in which the resident will work serve on the committee responsible for selecting candidates for an interview, 92% (11 out of 12) of the respondents indicated those members participate in the actual interview once a potential candidate has been selected. One notable difference in the resident interview structure is that a public presentation is required in only one-sixth of the programs. The responses indicated that relocation assistance, however, is provided by 10 out of 12 programs.

Resident Development

Respondents were asked to describe the development of the resident during participation in the program. Questions in this section addressed the design of resident program assignments, the use of personality and critical thinking inventories, and the structure of the mentorship element, for examples.

An overwhelming majority of programs did not include the resident's input in assignment design. Only one respondent indicated the participants' assignments were created through consultation with supervisors and program directors; and only one respondent indicated they were designed by the library director and a faculty member from the library school. In all other cases, work projects and assignments were developed by a combination of department heads, Directors, program coordinators, or a committee. One program does allow residents to choose which assignments are preferred, but these assignments were proposed by staff before the interview process.

Regarding the use of personality inventories and critical thinking skills assessments, the survey results suggest currently active residency programs simply do not use them. In response to the question of whether a learning style measurement (such as the Multiple Intelligence Learning Style or Myers-Briggs Personality Inventory) was performed on the resident, only 1 respondent answered in the affirmative. Ninety-two percent (11 out of 12 respondents) of programs responded such measurements are not used. A similar question was asked regarding the use of critical thinking skills inventories. All 12 respondents (100%) indicated such an inventory was not used.

Are learning style measurements performed on the resident?

Answer	# of Responses	%
Yes	1	8%
No	11	92%

Are the residents' critical thinking skills inventoried?

Answer	# of Responses	%
Yes	0	0%
No	12	100%

In terms of confidence, stress, and job satisfaction measures, however, the results are different. Seven out of 11 respondents (64%) indicated the levels of the resident's confidence and ability are measured during the course of the program. It should be noted, however, one respondent indicated confusion over the question and stated confidence and ability are ascertained during the interview but not formally measured in any way. Of those seven respondents who indicated confidence and ability were measured, four of them stated the measure was informal: verbal assessment or conversation/discussion, for examples.

Two-thirds of respondents indicated levels of stress and job-satisfaction were measured during the program. When asked to provide an open-ended answer to the question of when and how often the measure(s) was used, however, respondents indicated level of stress was not expressly measured. Some respondents also indicated formal measures were not used to determine levels of job-satisfaction. Although, verbal assessments and informal conversation were again listed as responses to this question, other respondents indicated residents participated in regular meetings and continuous dialogue with supervisors throughout the program to help measure job-satisfaction. This fact is further evidenced by response to the question of whether regular meetings between

residents and coordinators were held to discuss concerns to which 92% of respondents answered in the affirmative. “Down time” for assimilation and reflection of material or journaling, however, is a feature that is available in only 30% of the programs.

In terms of mentoring, 83% of respondents indicated it is a formal component of the program. The identification of mentors assumed a variety of forms. In one program, the assignment of a mentor is a “prerequisite for assignment.” In some cases, mentors are suggested. In others, mentors are assigned. In still others, faculty and staff are invited to volunteer to serve as a mentor or the mentor role is fulfilled by those involved in the coordination of the program, usually the supervisor. The process of pairing a mentor with a mentee is also variable. In one case the participant identifies a mentor based on need. Four respondents indicated the pairing is based on common professional interests while two other responses indicated uncertainty about this process. Finally, respondents were asked whether there was an element of relationship-building between residents across different programs. Seventy-five percent replied in the negative. Of all these processes and elements (assignment design, inventory and assessment, mentoring, and relationship building) only 3 respondents indicated their residents participated in them.

In terms of performance evaluation, two-thirds (8 out of 12) of respondents indicated residents are evaluated by the same formal process for librarian/faculty evaluation. The remaining respondents indicated an essay written by the supervisor or by both the participant and the supervisor was used for evaluation. Regarding evaluation frequency, one-third of all respondents conducted the evaluation process at the end of each rotation. Another third performed evaluations semi-annually. The last third conducted them on an annual basis.

The Program in Context

In the final section of the coordinator survey, respondents were asked to indicate the program’s visibility, reputation, measure of success, cost, and advantages and disadvantages.

Nine out of eleven respondents (82%) indicated new library staff did not receive an orientation to the program. The staff’s perception of the program varied from ‘Neutral’ to ‘Favorable.’ (See Table 7.)

Table 7. Responses to the question, “What is the staff’s perception of the program?”

Answer	# of Responses	%
Favorable	5	46%
Somewhat Favorable	4	36%
Neutral	2	18%
Total	11	100%

In terms of visibility, 64% of respondents indicated their program was ‘Somewhat visible’ within the University community. Sixty percent of respondents felt the reputation of their program was ‘Favorable’ while the remaining 40% described the reputation of their program as ‘Somewhat Favorable.’ Library websites and newsletters were the most popular methods of internal promotion. (See Table 8.)

Table 8. Responses to the question, “How is the program promoted internally? (Check all that apply.)”

Answer	# of Responses	%
Library Website	9 out of 11	82%
Library Newsletter	7 out of 11	64%
Other	4 out of 11	36%
University-wide Announcement	2 out of 11	18%
University Newsletter	1 out of 11	9%

The ‘Other’ category included the use of library listservs, an email to faculty and staff, promotion through the University office for affirmative action, and a recognition ceremony at the conclusion of the program.

Respondents were asked to provide information regarding their level of interaction with the program participant(s) after the program was completed, and the role of the program in the participant’s professional development. In particular, respondents were asked whether subsequent employers of program participants were contacted to discuss the role of the program in the resident’s professional development. One-hundred percent of respondents indicated subsequent employers were not contacted. (See Table 9.) Respondents were also asked whether a directory of past program participants was maintained; one that indicated the current employer of previous program participants. Forty percent of respondents did keep such a directory while 60% did not.

Table 9: Responses to the question, “Are subsequent employers of previous residents contacted to discuss the role of the program in the resident’s professional development?”

Answer	# of Responses	%
Yes	0	0%
No	10	100%
Total	10	100%

Respondents were provided with a list of measures used to determine a program’s success and asked to select all applicable measures. ‘Resident opinion’, ‘Placement in an academic library’, and ‘Success of the resident’ were the top three categories selected.

The complete results are listed in Table 10.

Table 10: Measures of Success

Answer	# of Responses	%
Resident opinion	11 out of 11	100%
Success of the resident	9 out of 11	82%
Placement in academic library	9 out of 11	82%
Change in demographics of the library	7 out of 11	64%
Public perception	7 out of 11	64%
Recognition of the program	7 out of 11	64%
Retention of resident upon program completion	5 out of 11	46%
Opinion of subsequent employer	4 out of 11	36%
Other	2 out of 11	18%

Respondents were also solicited for information regarding program funding. Eighty-three percent of respondents funded their programs through their existing library budget. The remaining 17% funded programs through either a salary line or through library reserve funds. Forty-five percent of the programs (5 out of 11 respondents) had an annual budget of less than \$50,000. Twenty-seven percent (3 out of 11) had an annual budget of more than \$200,000. Eighteen percent (2 of 11) had an annual budget of \$50,000-\$75,000 and 9% (1 respondent) had an annual budget of \$75,000-\$100,000.

Finally, respondents were asked to select from a list of advantages and disadvantages of residency programs. Each of the categories listed in the advantages table were selected by at least three respondents, with the exception of the 'Other' category. The five most popular categories selected were 'Recruits young talent to academic librarianship,' 'Invigorates library with fresh energy and new ideas,' 'Increases minority presence system-wide,' 'Provides skills training for future leaders,' and 'Contributes to the goals of the Library.' The complete results are listed in Table 11.

Table 11: Advantages of Residency Programs

Answer	# of Responses	%
Recruits young talent to academic librarianship	11 out of 11	100%
Invigorates library with fresh energy and new ideas	10 out of 11	91%
Increases minority presence system-wide	10 out of 11	91%
Provides skills training for future leaders	10 out of 11	91%
Contributes to the goals of the Library	10 out of 11	91%
Helps transition graduates from school to practice	9 out of 11	82%
Contributes to the goals of the University	9 out of 11	82%
Demonstrates commitment to diversity as an organizational value	9 out of 11	82%
Allows libraries opportunity to react to new workforce shifts and demands	8 out of 11	73%
Demonstrates commitment to training and development of young professionals	8 out of 11	73%
Prepares new professionals to succeed in management and leadership positions	8 out of 11	73%
Helps resolve a profession-wide shortage of librarians	6 out of 11	55%
Creates pool of temporary, short-term staff for pilot projects	4 out of 11	36%
Increased brand identity	3 out of 11	27%
Other	1 out of 11	9%

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

One disadvantage of this study includes its small sample size. There are only 14 programs that have been identified as currently active. (See Appendix B.) This is a reduction in number since previous studies were conducted. Brewer and Winston (2001) reported a response from 19 institutions with active programs. Further, of the 14 currently active programs, two are in only their first year of operation (Purdue and UNM) and one in its third year (Duke). For these programs, some survey questions may not have been applicable.

Although 12 responses were received from libraries currently hosting programs, the findings are not necessarily generalizable. Some respondents may have represented programs that do not have a typical, academic library residency structure. Rutgers University, for example, offers a three-year program model. Full-time, post-graduate work is done only in the third year while the first two years of program participation involve completion of coursework leading up to the MLS degree. Other responses may have come from specialized research libraries such as the National Library of Medicine or the Eskind Biomedical Library at Vanderbilt University. These are health science residency programs and not typical academic library programs, strictly speaking. Yet another response could have come from Georgetown University which hosts a law library residency program.

Nevertheless, the survey findings provide some useful information regarding the current state of academic library residency programs. First, the data suggest that library residency programs employ a variety of methods to advertise their positions and develop

their applicant pools. It is important to note the study conducted by Brewer and Winston (2001) found 96.6% of their respondents indicated ‘Quality of applicant pool’ as a “Very Important” or “Somewhat Important” evaluation factor. Visits to library schools, consultation with the Director of the ARL Diversity Initiatives Office, and letters to deans of library schools were all cited as additional recruitment tools beyond traditional advertising used to develop the pool of residency program applicants. These additional measures suggest a concerted effort towards attracting and hiring the highest-qualified candidates.

Second, the majority of respondents indicated they kept themselves informed of the resident’s professional goals, levels of confidence, ability, and job-satisfaction. The survey instrument used by Brewer and Winston (2001) did not address these factors, but their respondents listed “resident growth in terms of understanding academic libraries and personal confidence and ability” as factors they considered important to the evaluation of a program. The use of verbal assessments, annual appraisals, performance evaluations, and regular, informal conversations by current programs demonstrates an ongoing investment in the development of the resident.

Third, ten respondents identified mentoring as a formal component of the program. This finding is of particular interest given that mentoring, as an evaluation factor, is not listed among over 15 factors considered as “Very Important” or “Somewhat Important” in the program evaluation study conducted by Brewer and Winston (2001). This finding is made even more significant given that Brewer’s earlier study found that “residents identified mentoring skills and ability to provide constructive feedback as the two most important attributes for supervisors.” (Brewer, 1997, p. 533) In that same

study, residents went on to describe the overall mentoring skills of their supervisors relatively low. Although mentoring now appears to be recognized as an essential component of currently active library residency programs, little is known about the efficacy of this component. Additional research must be done in this area to determine if the mentor element is achieving its goal. It may be the case that staff and residents involved in a mentor relationship require additional skills and specific training in this area for it to be successful.

Fourth, 100% of respondents indicated the staff's perception of the program is either "Neutral," "Somewhat Favorable," or "Favorable," and a majority of respondents indicated the residency program is "Somewhat Visible" within the University community. The latter response is particularly important given that the "visibility of the program within the university community [in] further establish(ing) librarianship as a professional academic discipline to others in the university community," was identified as another factor considered to be important in program evaluation in the work of Brewer and Winston (2001). The use of newsletters, websites, electronic mail, and communication with offices for affirmative action and multicultural programs shows a multi-faceted effort to promote the program and increase its visibility beyond the immediate library community.

Fifth, eleven respondents indicated the success of the program was measured though the resident's opinion. This is consistent with an earlier finding of Brewer and Winston (2001) who cited input from residents as being very important by 90% of their survey respondents.

When the survey findings are compared against the purposes and components of the nursing models described, however, a different set of information is obtained. In terms of professional development, the survey indicates 92% of respondents do not perform any sort of learning style measurement on the resident. The Herdrich and Lindsay model emphasized a principle of “knowing the learner” and used both the Multiple Intelligence Learning Style and Myers-Briggs Personality Inventories to assess the learning style and personality of the resident. The use of these measures allowed for the customization of learning strategies to meet the specific needs of the resident learner.

One-hundred percent of survey respondents indicated critical thinking skills were not inventoried in library residency programs. Levels of confidence and ability were measured by slightly more than half of the survey participants (7 out of 11), but the open-ended responses asking how these items were measured suggest informal verbal assessments and regular performance evaluations were used instead of a curricular component.

A similar statement can be made regarding the evaluation of levels of stress and job-satisfaction. Although 8 of 12 survey respondents indicated these elements were measured during the course of the program, the open-ended response asking how the items were measured show that level of stress is not expressly measured, verbal assessments are used in place of formal measures, and a curricular component is absent.

‘Down time’ for journaling and reflection of material is a feature of only 30% of the programs participating in this study, but reflective journaling is listed as an essential component of the NRP described by Herdrich and Lindsay (2006). Not only is the practice of journaling an active process that allows for the assimilation of material, but it

can also provide coordinators and supervisors of programs with a tool to measure the development of critical thinking skills and enhanced judgment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Library residency programs provide opportunities for new graduates to begin, develop, and pursue a career in academic librarianship. Given the amount of resources required to manage a program, and given the current state of the library workforce, a determination of the success or failure of these programs is tantamount to their sustainability.

This determination is made problematic by a general lack of objective information regarding their cost, benefit, and value to the host institution and to the profession. Without this information, currently active programs may have difficulty justifying continued support; and institutions wishing to start a program may have similar problems generating new administrative, financial, and organizational support.

This lack of centralized information creates problems for LIS educators, career counselors, and students as well. Educators and counselors will have difficulty providing their students with informed assessments of their career choices, particularly as it regards entry-level opportunities for post-graduate development and training. Students will likewise have difficulty selecting a program when little is known about its reputation, design, and rate of success.

To help address these and other problems the following suggestions and recommendations for supplementing the existing structure and design of library residency programs are provided

For Library Residency Program Coordinators

In terms of recruitment, *create a web-presence for the program*. The sites at the University of Delaware, Buffalo, and Purdue provide excellent examples. These sites offer a combination of program information and history, information about the library and the surrounding community, and information about previous and current program participants. An ideal site will have all of these elements making the information seeking process easier and more convenient. It will help increase the visibility of the program and its participants and will benefit anyone, especially graduating students, seeking to learn more about a given program.

Employ a standardized terminology. In 1992, ALISE established *Guidelines for Practices and Principles in the Design, Operation, and Evaluation of Post-Master's Residency Programs*. The *Guidelines* include definitions of “intern”, “fellowship”, and “residency”⁴ (Brewer, 1992). Although many currently active programs share similar structure and duration, the terminology used to name and describe the programs varies. Some use the term ‘residency’ while others use the term ‘fellowship,’ even though the

⁴ ALISE defines ‘residency’ as: The post degree work experience designed as an entry level program for professionals who have recently received the MLS degree from a program accredited by the American Library Association.

programs may be similar in purpose. This creates confusion for potential applicants, career advisors, and future employers. The use of standardized terminology will reduce this confusion and make it easier for potential candidates to distinguish post-graduate training opportunities for new graduates from advanced skills development opportunities for librarians with some professional experience. It will help career advisors distribute vacancy announcements more efficiently, and it will help future employers understand more precisely the substance and quality of residency program work experience.

In terms of resident development, *identify skills needs and infuse the program with a curricular component to develop and expand residents' skills* in areas where they are needed most. The research of Davis and Hall (2006) suggested a leadership crisis in the library profession is looming. Do new graduates need leadership training? Leadership courses may be offered at schools of LIS, but they are not typically required. The nursing models described here provide a useful guide for the design, implementation, and delivery of curricular components. They also show a curricular component was present in each of the programs where levels of job-satisfaction and stress management were increased. Skills levels in the areas of critical thinking, interpersonal communication, and time-management likewise showed improvement where a formal curriculum was followed.

Develop training programs for library staff responsible for resident education.

Just as nursing preceptors were offered training in the instruction of skills needed by library residents, so too should library staff trainers be offered educational experiences in the delivery and transfer of residency program components.

It will also be useful *to identify an organization's staffing needs in both the short and long term*. Many current, professional, vacancy announcements require either substantial supervisory experience or experience in a specialty area. The work of Beecroft et al. highlighted the use of a training program designed to address the need for care in a specialty area. It is conceivable that a library residency program can be altered to train new graduates in analogous specialty areas such as metadata, electronic licensing and contracts, personnel management, outreach, professional development, or continuing education.

Do the math. Beecroft et al. (2001) offer a model for calculating a program's return on investment (ROI). Determine the costs of program operation and organizational benefits. Beecroft et al. found a residency program constituted sound fiscal planning. Individual libraries will have to gather the data necessary to conclude whether the operation and maintenance of a residency program leads to a net financial improvement.

For LIS Faculty and Practitioners

Faculty and practitioners can design and create library specific job skills assessment tools, inventories, and curricular components. How does one teach a new graduate to be a leader in academic librarianship? What sorts of exercises develop organizational commitment to the profession? How do we expand interpersonal communication skills and levels of confidence within the practice of academic librarianship? These are questions that can be answered through the development of

educational instruments and implemented through delivery models tailored to meet the needs of the individual resident learner.

For ALA and other professional organizations (ALISE, ARL, ACRL)

Create a Residency Working Group and establish a joint task force of members from professional associations, program coordinators, and faculty and deans of library schools whose mission will be to outline short and long terms goals for the Group. The Residency Working Group would be responsible for centralizing information regarding library residency program availability and current and past program participants, for examples. This may take the form of a centralized clearinghouse or database of programs and/or participants, but dedicated staff will be required. One of the members of the Working Group, for example, may have as a primary responsibility the regular upkeep and maintenance of the ARL Residency and Internship Program database. Another member may be responsible for maintaining a database of program participants, both past and present. Such a database will provide longitudinal evidence for library residency program assessment by offering information regarding participants' current placement and how a program assisted in a resident's professional development and education, for examples.

The Residency Working Group can also be responsible for supporting research opportunities regarding the operation and impact of residency programs. There are many

questions surrounding the use of residency programs as a recruitment tool in which further research is required, and from the discussion of which the professional community at large can benefit. One example can be the faculty status deterrent issue. Another can be the investigation of why previous programs are no longer active. Although information regarding this issue was sought by the survey instrument, the results did not yield any responses. A central sponsoring agency or association will add a measure of credibility, identity, standard, and value to the publication of such research.

Former residents identified the need for job placement assistance upon completion of a program (Brewer 1997). A central group can provide such assistance. Online tools such as blogs and wikis can be coupled with in-person gatherings at conferences to allow residents opportunities to share experiences and information with other former, current, and potential residents face-to-face and virtually. The Residency Working Group can help provide the administrative and technological support to coordinate such opportunities.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This study identified similarities in workforce demographics and workforce issues in the library and nursing professions. It provided a discussion of how residency programs have been used in both professions to address similar workforce issues: impending job surplus, lack of preparation, and low retention rates, for examples; and it included a detailed analysis of five different nursing residency programs including their

purpose and their results. The results of a survey of program components, as reported by personnel officers and program administrators, were described and evaluated. A comparison was made between nursing residency programs and library residency programs. Recommendations for supplemental improvement in academic library residency programs were derived and constructed from this comparison.

While nursing residency programs and library residency programs share similar goals, their model and execution differ. The anecdotal evidence gathered informally from previous and current residency participants indicates residency programs are effective and successful in achieving their programmatic goals. These programs may enjoy additional success if they incorporate some of the practices and principles used by other residency programs in both the library profession and the nursing profession. Potential adoption of nursing residency curricular components as well as centralized focus on library residency programs by national associations should contribute to the development of effective library residency programs in addressing some of the workforce challenges faced by the profession today.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACRL Ad Hoc Task Force on Recruitment & Retention Issues. (2002). *Recruitment, Retention, & Restructuring: Human Resources in Academic Libraries*. Retrieved August 8, 2006, from <http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlissues/acrlrecruiting/recruitment.htm>
- Altier, M., & Kresk, C. A. (2006). Effects of a 1-Year Residency Program on Job Satisfaction and Retention of New Graduates [Electronic version]. *Journal for Nurses in Staff Development*, 70-77.
- American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN). (2004). *Enrollment and Graduations in Baccalaureate and Graduate Programs in Nursing*. Washington, D.C.: AACN.
- Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE). (2004). *Library and Information Science Education Statistical Report*. State College: ALISE.
- Babbie, E. (2004). *The Practice of Social Research*. Belmont: Thomson.
- Beecroft, P. C., Kunzman, L., & Krozek, C. (2001). RN Internship: Outcomes of a One-Year Pilot [Electronic version]. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 575-582.
- Brewer, J. (1992). *Internship, Residency, and Fellowship Programs in ARL Libraries*. SPEC Kit #188, Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries.
- Brewer, J. (1997). Post-Master's Residency Programs: Enhancing the Development of New Professionals and Minority Recruitment in Academic and Research Libraries [Electronic version]. *College & Research Libraries*, 528-537.
- Brewer, J., & Winston, M. D. (2001). Program Evaluation for Internship/Residency Programs in Academic and Research Libraries [Electronic version]. *College & Research Libraries*, 307-315.
- Casey, K., Fink, R., Krugman, M., & Propst, J. (2004). The Graduate Nurse Experience [Electronic version]. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 303-311.
- Cogell, R. (2001). *Diversity in Libraries: Academic Residency Programs*. Westport: Greenwood.

- Corwin, R.G. (1961). The Professional Employee: A Study of Conflict in Nursing Roles. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 604-615.
- Crosby, O. (2000). Librarians: Information Experts in the Information Age. *Occupational Outlook Quarterly* .
- Davis, D. M., & Hall, T. D. (2006). *Diversity Counts!* Retrieved October 10, 2006, from the American Library Association Web site:
http://ala.org/ala/ors/diversitycounts/DiversityCounts_rev07.pdf
- Goode, C. J., & Williams, C. A. (2004). Post-Baccalaureate Nurse Residency Program [Electronic version]. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 71-77.
- Herdrich, B., & Lindsay, A. (2006). Nurse Residency Programs: Redesigning the Transition into Practice [Electronic Version]. *Journal for Nurses in Staff Development*, 55-62.
- Holt, R., & Strock, A. L. (2005, May 1). The Entry Level Gap. *Library Journal*. Retrieved September 5, 2006 from
<http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA527965.html>
- Murray, M. K. (2002). The Nursing Shortage: Past, Present, and Future [Electronic version]. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 79-84.
- Oermann, M. H., & Moffitt-Wolf, A. (1997). New Graduates' Perceptions of Clinical Practice [Electronic version]. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing*, 20-25.
- Owens, D. L., Turjanica, M. A., Scanion, M. W., Sandhusen, A. E., Williamson, M., Hebert, C., et al. (2001). New Graduate RN Internship Program: A Collaborative Approach for System-Wide Integration [Electronic version]. *Journal for Nurses in Staff Development*, 144-150.

APPENDIX A

Letter of Implied Consent and Survey Instrument

March 2, 2007

To the Personnel and Human Resources Officers of ARL Member libraries:

My name is Megan Perez and I am a candidate for the Master's of Science in Library Science degree at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Currently, I am finishing my Master's Paper which is on the present status of academic residency programs in ARL member libraries. The research for this study is being conducted under the direction and supervision of my faculty advisor, Katherine Wisser.

Last fall, I completed a literature review and a study of library workforce issues and demographics. Now I am reviewing the use of a core curriculum in nursing residency programs. I hope to gather additional information from those of you who are currently hosting a post-MLS residency program *as well as* those of you who have hosted one in the past. The final results of this study will benefit individual participants by informing them of the design and practices of other similar residency programs. It will provide a means for evaluating their own programs, if they host one. For institutions who wish to establish a program in the future, this study will provide a model for duplication. New library school graduates will also benefit from this study by becoming aware of available programs accepting applications. This study can also benefit graduate school advisors and placement officers by supplying them with additional career choices.

For the purposes of this survey, "Residency" is defined according to the ALISE Guidelines and Standards: post-graduate, entry-level work experience for recently graduated library and information science students.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. To participate, you simply complete the online survey found at the URL listed at the bottom of this letter. Submitting a response to the survey connotes your consent to be a participant in this study. The survey is composed of questions regarding the identification of residency candidates, resident activities and responsibilities, and the program's visibility within the larger University setting. Completion of the questionnaire should take no longer than 25 minutes. You are free to answer or not answer any particular question and have no obligation to complete the questions once you begin.

I would like you to know that your participation is anonymous. You are asked not to submit any identifying information on the survey. All data obtained in this study will be reported as group data. No individual can be or will be identified. The only people who will have access to the data are myself and my advisor, Katherine Wisser.

If you decide to participate in this study, you should know there are neither risks anticipated nor any anticipated benefits from being involved with it. However, there will be professional benefit from this study, as the information I obtain will be communicated to the professional community through publication in the literature, presentation at professional meetings and direct dissemination to national associations. There is no cost

to you or financial benefit for your participation, but your colleagues will benefit immensely from your thoughts.

You may contact me with any questions at (607) 339-1121 or by email (perezm@email.unc.edu).

All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject you may contact, anonymously if you wish, the Institutional Review Board at 919-966-3113 or by email to IRB_subjects@unc.edu. If you contact the IRB, please refer to study number 07-0166.

To access the survey, click this link:

[Post-MLS ARL Residency Programs Survey](#)

If this custom link does not work, paste this direct link into your browser:

http://uncodum.qualtrics.com/SE?SID=SV_3DZkvjTq7e6d9SA&SVID=Prod

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Megan Perez
UNC-Chapel Hill
School of Information & Library Science
MSLS Candidate 2007
perezm@email.unc.edu
607-339-1121

Kathy Wisser,
Faculty Advisor
arbo@email.unc.edu
919-843-1178

Post-MLS ARL Residency⁵ Programs Survey

Current Program Status

Does your library have a currently active post-MLS residency program?

- Yes
- No

If “Yes”: please proceed to the next section, “Identifying a Candidate.”

If “No”: has your library ever had a post-MLS residency program?

- Yes
- No

If “Yes”: What is the primary reason your program is no longer active?

- Lack of funding
- Lack of qualified applicants
- Lack of institutional support
- Legal opposition
- Challenges from staff
- Insufficient resources
- Lack of interest
- No benefit to institution
- Insufficient return on investment

If “No”: Thank you for your participation.

Identifying a Candidate

How is the position advertised? (Check all that apply)

- Library Websites
- LIS Student Listservs
- Professional Organizations
- Serial publications
- Spectrum Scholars listserv
- ARL Diversity Initiatives Office
- ALA Office for Diversity
- Other

⁵ For the purposes of this survey, “residency” is defined according to the ALISE Guidelines and Standards: post-graduate, entry-level work experience for recently graduated library and information science students.

How is the applicant pool developed? (Beyond advertising, are there any other tools used to increase the quality and quantity of applicants? Please describe)

Who selects candidates for an interview? (Please do not provide names but rather indicate position and/or department.)

If a committee is used, who serves on the committee? (Please do not provide names but rather indicate position and department of committee members.)

If a committee is used, is a paraprofessional on the committee?

- Yes
- No

If a committee is used, are current residents on the committee?

- Yes
- No

If a committee is used, are members of the departments in which the resident will work on the committee?

- Yes
- No

How are the interviews structured? (How long are they and who is present?)

Is a public presentation a requirement of the interview process?

- Yes
- No

Are previous residents involved in the interview?

- Yes
- No

Are members of the departments in which the resident will work a part of the interview?

- Yes
- No

Is relocation assistance offered?

- Yes
- No

Developing the Resident

Who designs the resident's assignments?

Are learning style measurements performed on the resident? (Multiple Intelligence Learning Style or Myers-Briggs Personality Inventories, for examples.)

- Yes
- No

If "Yes," which ones? (Please list.)

Are the residents' critical thinking skills inventoried?

- Yes
- No

If "Yes," when and how?

Are the post-residency, professional goals of the resident known? (For example, would the resident rather develop skills to publish original research or volunteer to serve on national committees?)

- Yes
- No

Are the levels of the resident's confidence and ability measured during the course of the program?

- Yes
- No

If "Yes," when and how?

Are levels of stress and job-satisfaction measured at any point during the program?

- Yes
- No

If "Yes," when and how?

Are there regular meetings between the resident(s) and the coordinator(s) to discuss concerns or share with each other?

- Yes
- No

Is "down time" for assimilation and reflection of material or journaling a feature of the program?

- Yes
- No

Is mentoring a formal component of the program?

- Yes
- No

If “Yes,” how are mentors identified?

On what basis is the mentor-mentee pairing made? (Common research interests, staff availability or interest, shared workspace, for examples)

Is there an element of relationship-building between residents at your institution and fellows/residents from other institutions?

- Yes
- No

Do previous residents participate in any of these processes or elements?

- Yes
- No

If “Yes,” then which ones?

- Resident assignment design
- Learning style assessment
- Skills inventory
- Confidence measurement
- Stress and job-satisfaction measurement
- Mentoring
- Relationship-building

How is resident performance evaluated?

How often is resident performance evaluated?

The Program in Context

Do new library staff receive an orientation to the residency program?

- Yes
- No

What is the staff’s perception of the program?

- Unfavorable
- Somewhat Unfavorable
- Neutral
- Somewhat Favorable
- Favorable

How visible is the program within the University community?

- Not visible at all
- Somewhat hidden
- Neutral
- Somewhat visible
- Highly visible

How is the program promoted internally? (Check all that apply.)

- Library newsletter
- University newsletter
- Library website
- University-wide announcement
- Other

Are subsequent employers of previous residents contacted to discuss the role of the program in the resident's professional development?

- Yes
- No

Is a directory of past program participants maintained; one that indicates the current employer of previous program participants?

- Yes
- No

What is the reputation of the program?

- Unfavorable
- Somewhat Unfavorable
- Neutral
- Somewhat Favorable
- Favorable

How is the success of the program measured? (Check all that apply.)

- Retention of resident upon completion of program
- Placement in other academic library
- Change in demographics of the library
- Public perception
- Recognition of the program
- Resident opinion
- Success of the resident
- Opinion of subsequent employer
- Other

How is the resident program funded? (Check all that apply.)

- Existing library budget

- Endowed library funds
- Parent institution
- Library association or agency
- Other

What is the annual budget for the program?

- Less than \$50,000
- \$50,000-\$75,000
- \$75,000-\$100,000
- \$125,000-\$150,000
- \$175,000-\$200,000
- \$225,000-\$250,000
- Greater than \$250,000

In your opinion, what are the advantages of residency programs? (Check all that apply.)

- Recruits young talent to academic librarianship
- Helps transition recent graduates from school into actual practice
- Increased brand identity
- Helps to resolve a profession-wide shortage of qualified librarians
- Invigorates library with fresh energy and new ideas
- Increases minority presence system-wide
- Provides skills training for future leaders
- Contributes to the goals of the Library
- Contributes to the goals University
- Allows libraries opportunity to react to new workforce shifts and demands
- Creates pool of temporary, short-term staff for pilot projects
- Demonstrates commitment to training and development of young professionals
- Demonstrates commitment to diversity as an organizational value
- Prepares new professionals to succeed in management and leadership positions
- Other

In your opinion, what are the disadvantages of residency programs? (Check all that apply.)

- Cost
- Resentment from existing employees
- Raises expectations for performance that may not be met
- Requires significant staff resources
- Resistance to diversity initiatives from staff
- Does not contribute to the goals of the Library
- Does not contribute to the goals of the University

Thank you for your participation!

APPENDIX B

Active Residency Programs as of April 2007 (in alphabetical order)

Cornell University
Library Fellowship Program
<http://www.library.cornell.edu/diversity/>

Duke University
Library Diversity Fellowship Program

Kansas State University
Post-MLS Residency Program
<http://www.lib.ksu.edu/news/residency.html>

Miami University
Resident Librarian Program
<http://www.lib.muohio.edu/employment/resident.pdf>

North Carolina State University
Fellows Program
<http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/fellows/>

Purdue University
Diversity Fellowship Program
<http://www.lib.purdue.edu/diversity/fellowship.html>

University at Buffalo
Jean Blackwell Hutson Library Residency Program
<http://ublib.buffalo.edu/libraries/asl/residency/intro.html>

University of California, Santa Barbara
Library Fellowship Program
<http://www.library.ucsb.edu/hosted/diversity/brochure.pdf>

University of Delaware
Pauline A. Young Residency Program
<http://www2.lib.udel.edu/personnel/brochure.htm>

University of Iowa
Librarian Residency Program
<http://www.lib.uiowa.edu/about/employment/residency.html>

University of New Mexico Libraries
Library Resident in Research and Instruction Services
Contact: Linda Skye (lskye@unm.edu)
University of New Mexico Libraries
MSC 05-3020
1 University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM, 87131-0001

University of Notre Dame
Librarian-in-Residence Program
<http://www.library.nd.edu/diversity/residence.shtml>

University of South Florida, Tampa
Henriette M. Smith Residency Program
<http://www.lib.usf.edu/residency/>

University of Tennessee
Minority Residency Program
<http://www.lib.utk.edu/diversity/activities/residency/minorityresidency.html>