Study of 21st Century Librarianship Initiatives:

Consultant Report

Prepared by

Holly Hinman
and
Joan Frye Williams

December 2002

Study of 21st Century Librarianship Initiatives:

Consultant Report

Prepared by

Holly Hinman
And
Joan Frye Williams

December 2002

Table of Contents

❖

Study of 21st Century Librarianship Initiatives

Key Findings and Conclusions

Both of the Stanford-California State Library Institute on 21st Century Librarianship sessions were successful events, valued by those who participated and respected by those who did not.

In approach and curriculum, the Stanford Institute was quite similar to other residential leadership training programs, with two notable exceptions: An average class in other programs numbers 25 - 30 trainees; Stanford hosted 140 -150. And almost all other programs target librarians with 3 -10 years of professional experience; a significant number of Stanford participants were further along in their careers, with more than 10 years experience.

Other leadership training models – leadership academy, distributed workshops, and physical challenge courses – have also proven successful for libraries and in other disciplines.

Benefits of Stanford Institute participation are largely intangible. In particular, trainees report increased confidence, increased enthusiasm and increased commitment to the library profession.

Costs of the two Stanford Institute events were generally in line with costs of similar residential training sessions. However, study of other training delivery methods and residential program options indicates that it is possible to achieve similar, positive results at a somewhat lower cost.

Compared with a control group of librarians who did not attend either of the sessions, Stanford Institute participants report no significant differences in behavioral measures such as job advancement, frequency of initiation of workplace changes, participation in professional association activities, publication, etc. The changes they have initiated at their libraries are of a somewhat greater magnitude than those suggested by non-participants. It should also be noted that the comparison was relatively informal, and that such differences may develop over time.

Directors of larger California public libraries support leadership training as a continuing education priority, but not as their top priority. Their top continuing education priorities are technology and management/supervisory skills. This finding is consistent with the results of both the 1992 *Continuing Education Plan for California's Libraries* and the 2001 *California Library Staff Continuing Education Needs Assessment.*

Directors of larger California public libraries support the residential model of leadership training, but not as their preferred model. Their preferred model is distributed workshops. They frequently cited Infopeople workshops as their preferred model.

Opinion of the Stanford Institute was generally quite positive. The only significant objection raised by the individuals surveyed and interviewed for this study was that the amount of money invested in the two events benefited only a small number of librarians.

Recommended next steps include

✓ Review and evaluation of consultant recommendations;
✓ Validation of survey results by sampling responses from other types and sizes of libraries;
✓ Articulation of a statewide leadership development strategy in the context of an overall approach to continuing education; and
✓ Development of a leadership training implementation plan, with costs.

Study of 21st Century Librarianship Initiatives

Introduction

Stanford University is one of the most prestigious institutions of higher learning in the world. Its libraries share that prestige and, under University Librarian Dr. Michael Keller, became renowned for vision, leadership in the library profession, and advanced technology applications. At the end of the 1990's, librarians from all over the world were asking to visit and learn from the Stanford University Library. At the same time, within the California library profession, a generation of library leaders from the "baby boom" generation was nearing retirement. Where was the next generation of leaders going to come from? Were they prepared for the challenges ahead? The California State Library saw a nexus of opportunity between Stanford's need to accommodate visiting librarians more efficiently and the library profession's need to plan for succession and develop new library leaders.

In fiscal year 1999/2000, therefore, the California State Library awarded to the Stanford University Library a federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) grant for a project called the "Stanford-California State Library Institute on 21st Century Librarianship." The Institute participants would be the next generation of library leaders, from within and outside of California, and from all types of libraries. The intensive, residential program would draw heavily on the resources available from Stanford, but would also involve outside experts and speakers. Since leadership training is always expensive, plans for the Institute from the beginning included a fund-raising component that would offset the sizable commitment of LSTA funding for the project.

The first Stanford-California State Library Institute on 21st Century Librarianship was held on the Stanford campus in August 2000. The California State Library made a second grant award, and a second Institute was held in August 2001. The Evaluation and Training Institute (ETI) conducted pre- and post-Institute surveys of the participants, and also sent observers to both sessions. Based on the participant surveys and the third-party observations, ETI rated the Institutes as highly successful.

The California State Library is committed to supporting a strong continuing education program, to help provide library staff with the skills they need to serve the state's citizens. Indeed, the State Library allocates more grant funding to support of continuing education than to any other area. The Stanford-California State Library Institute on 21st Century Librarianship is only one of many projects and initiatives that provide continuing education and training to California library staff at all levels. The State Library needs to monitor its grant allocations to insure the greatest return on its many and various investments.

After the second Institute, the California State Library convened an ad hoc advisory group to discuss future directions for the Institute. Subsequently, State Librarian Dr. Kevin Starr and Stanford University Librarian Dr. Michael Keller held discussions, and on April 16, 2002, issued a Joint Statement that read in part:

> Although the two Institutes were highly successful, no major funding source has been identified for their continuation. Accordingly, this interim year will permit a detailed study of the Institute in terms of its relationship to the needs of the California library community and alternative approaches to meeting them.

This report is the result of six months of study of the Institute, continuing education needs in California libraries, and other leadership training models. Specifically, the consultants were tasked with providing a report that would include the following:

> An analysis of Institute results, considering the targeted audience and the longitudinal impact of the Institute on those participating.
> The relationship of the Institute to the continuing education studies conducted in 1992 and 2001.
> Alternative continuing education opportunities for Californians, both current and potential.
> A comparison of the Institute with similar programs, such as the Snowbird Institute and the forthcoming ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute.
> Input from the directors of larger California libraries regarding the Institute and staff continuing education needs in general.
> The identification and analysis of potential changes in the Institute and/or the State Library's overall thrust for support of continuing education opportunities to make it more responsive to the needs of the state.

The focus of this report is on leadership training. The term "leadership training" is used within the library profession to mean many different things, and some programs that are considered "leadership training" are very different from the Stanford-California State Library Institute. The report therefore seeks to delineate different definitions and models of leadership training. The report looks at the relative priority of leadership training in the larger context of library continuing education needs in California. Continuing education areas and initiatives other than leadership training are not discussed except in the context of overall priorities and needs.

The report describes the two Institutes, summarizes the ETI reports, and analyzes two surveys the study consultants conducted in the summer of 2002. One survey asked Institute participants from both years a series of questions designed to determine behavioral impacts that might be

attributed, at least partially, to the Institute. The other survey asked similar questions of a control group made up of individuals who had not attended the Institute.

Finally, the report outlines a multi-year, multi-pronged approach to leadership training that gives the California State Library a variety of options for providing continued support in this area.

Definition of Leadership Training

One of the first tasks of this study was to arrive at a working definition of leadership training. To that end, review of the literature and extended conversations with training providers and recipients yielded the following assumptions:

It is not clear whether leaders are born or made. However, training can serve both to identify leadership potential and to enhance the skills of those who exhibit such potential. Effective training can also accelerate the progress of developing new leaders.

Leadership is not the same as management. Care must be taken in distinguishing between the two concepts. The main aim of a manager is to maximize the effectiveness of the organization through administrative action. The manager oversees, controls, and conducts operations. The main aim of a leader is to inspire action in others. The leader influences and guides people. Leadership is just one of the many assets a successful manager must possess. Leadership training, while useful to managers, does not focus on the same topics or perspectives as management training.

Leadership is not limited to administrators. A leader is someone people follow through their own choice, with or without a supervisory relationship. For example, in small groups such as task forces, a group member with specific talents often emerges as the leader and moves the group in a certain direction. Leadership training can benefit people at all levels of an organization.

What makes a person a leader?

There appears to be general agreement that certain attributes characterize effective leaders. These attributes include:

Vision. A leader has a clear sense of what it is possible to achieve, and is not limited in that vision by what has already been achieved (or not achieved) by others.

Ability to Set Direction. A leader can chart a credible course from the status quo to the desired outcome, articulating both a goal and a path towards that goal.

Commitment to Action. A leader does not just think up ideas, but translates those ideas into action. A leader also understands how best to direct his or her own actions for maximum effectiveness.

Ability to Make Decisions. A leader can identify and evaluate possible courses of action, and decide intelligently between them.

Ability to Inspire and Mobilize Others. A leader communicates vision and models desired behaviors in ways that inspire trust and encourage others to take action.

Willingness to Take a Risk. A leader understands that progress may involve taking risks, and failure may be less harmful to an organization than inaction.

Which topics constitute leadership training?

Training to develop and enhance the attributes that characterize effective leaders generally consists of instruction and practice in the following areas:

Vision
    Environmental Scanning
    Strategic Analysis
    Knowledge of Best Practices in Own Discipline
    Recognizing and Importing Useful Ideas from Other Disciplines
    Creativity and Idea Development

Setting Direction
    Planning
    Problem Solving
    Goal Setting
    Adapting to Change
    Coping with Ambiguity

Commitment to Action
    Role and Responsibility of the Professional in the Organization and the Community
    Personal and Professional Growth and Development
    Career Management

Decision Making
    Critical Thinking
    Systems Thinking
    Evaluation Techniques

Inspiring/Mobilizing Others
    Managing Power and Influence
    Building Trust and Credibility

      Organizational Culture
      Diversity
      Mentoring
      Team Building
      Advocacy
      Group Process
      Communication/Presentation Skills

Risk Taking
      Risk/Benefit Analysis
      Confidence Building (for Oneself and Others)

Leadership Training Techniques

Leadership skills are understood to be valuable only to the extent that they are
applied. Therefore leadership training generally involves a variety of teaching
techniques: presentations, discussion, videos, exercises, projects and case
studies. Trainees benefit most from active participation in the teaching-learning
process.

Study Methodology

The consultants used a variety of research methods and tools to develop the data and analyses requested by the State Library. The primary research techniques used in this study were: literature reviews; Web-based surveys; focus groups; telephone interviews. In addition, the consultants talked informally with many people, including California librarians, consultants involved in providing leadership training in other states and professions, California State Library staff, staff from other state libraries, and representatives of various library associations and consortia that provide training. An appointed Advisory Council, broadly representative of the California library community, guided the study process.

Advisory Council

The California State Library appointed an Advisory Council for the study that included representation from the Advisory Group for the Stanford-California State Library Institute. Members of the Advisory Council for the study were (in alphabetical order):

> Gregg Atkins, Sacramento City College
> Deborah Barrow, Watsonville Public Library
> Nancy Crabbe, Santa Clara City Library and Chair, CLA Continuing
>   Education Committee
> Linda Crowe, Peninsula Library System
> Andrew Herkovic, Green Library, Stanford University
> Luis Herrera, Pasadena Public Library
> Susan Kent, Los Angeles Public Library (represented by Cecilia Riddle)
> Les Kong, California State University San Bernardino and incoming CLA
>   President
> Jane Light, San Jose Public Library
> Mary Minow, California Association of Trustees and Commissioners
>   (CALTAC)
> Mark Parker, Sacramento Public Library
> Vicky Reed, San Diego County Office of Education
> Heidi Sandstron, PSRML/Biomedical Library, UCLA
> Blanche Woolls, School of Library and Information Science, San Jose
>   State University

> *Ex officio:*
> Tom Anderson, Assistant Bureau Chief, Library Development Services,
>   California State Library
> Barbara Will, Library Development Services, California State Library

The Advisory Council met twice, on June 25, 2002, and on September 24, 2002. The first meeting was in Oakland and the second in Los Angeles. At each meeting, the Council received an update from the consultants, followed by discussion. The Council members made numerous suggestions, many of which were incorporated into the research process and the study results. Minutes from the meetings are included as *Appendix #1*.

Literature Reviews

The three areas of this study that involved literature reviews were:
> definition of "leadership" and of "leadership training";
> models of leadership training;
> California library continuing education needs.

The consultants reviewed both print and electronic publications in the areas of leadership development and adult learning, state and national level leadership initiatives, leadership program evaluations and personal narratives, as well as ongoing discussion via ALA's LEADDEV online discussion list.

The following Web sites deserve special mention as valuable resources on the state of the art in modern leadership:

Center for Creative Leadership
http://www.ccl.org/index.shtml

Frye Leadership Institute Resource List
http://web.library.emory.edu/about/program/FryeInstitute/

Leader to Leader
http://www.pfdf.org/leaderbooks/l2l/complete-text.html

Mentoring: Library Leaders for Our Future
http://www.pla.org/conference/conf02/mentoringbibliog.pdf

In terms of California library continuing education needs, the consultants were asked specifically to examine the following two studies:

1. O'Donnell, Peggy, and Virgo, Julie A.C. "A Continuing Education Plan for California's Libraries." April 1992. *(Appendix #2)*

2. Evaluation and Training Institute. "California Library Staff Continuing Education Needs Assessment." September 2001. *(Executive Summary, Appendix #3)*

In addition to these two studies, the consultants reviewed the following studies, all conducted within the last ten years:

1. Low, Kathy. "Results of Continuing Education Survey." June 1998. *(Appendix #4)*

2. Lehn, Carla. "Library Practitioner Certification Project Advisory Group Report." April 2001. *(Appendix #5)*

3. Williams, Joan Frye. "Report of the InFoPeople Marketing Study." June 2001. *(Appendix #6)*

Web-based Surveys

The consultants used survey methodology to help determine whether the 2000 and 2001 Institutes had any discernible behavioral impact on participants. For example, did participants get promotions or change jobs? Did they become more active in the profession or in their communities? Did they take on new projects, make suggestions for change in their organizations, or mentor others? Did they take more risks? The consultants identified a range of behaviors associated with leadership to form the basis of a survey of Institute participants and a second survey of a control group of similar library professionals who did not attend the Institute.

Since all of the Institute participants had Web access, the consultants elected to use a Web-based survey. After examining various options, they selected the Web survey company Infosurv to administer the survey(s).

Institute Participant Survey

The Institute participant survey, which consisted of 45 questions on seven Web pages, was pre-tested on several Institute participants. Most of the questions could be answered with a simple mouse click, and the entire survey required only about 15 minutes to complete. The survey (https://www.infosurv.com/pls.html) was available from May 20, 2002 until June 17, 2002, and was announced by Infosurv to individual e-mail addresses of Institute participants, and by the consultants to the two Institute listservs. Response was excellent, with 199 Institute participants, or 78%, completing the survey. Results were compiled by Infosurv and released on June 24, 2002. The consultants shared the survey results with the Advisory Council at its first meeting on June 25, 2002. A copy of the Participant Survey results can be found in *Appendix #7.*

Institute participants were asked in the survey to give their opinions about the survey, and to make comments in regard to how it could have been improved.

Over 88% thought the survey was easy to complete. Comments that were made by more than one person included:

Seven (7) people said that too many questions had only a yes/no answer, and they wanted to be able to add explanations or clarifications.

Six (6) people wanted the comment boxes to be larger. (This was a limitation imposed by the survey software.)

Three (3) said many of the questions did not apply to them, because the respondents were not librarians.

Two (2) thought the surveys should be anonymous. (The survey included an explanation that personal identification was strictly for the consultants, in case they needed to follow up with a respondent.)

Two (2) complained that some of the question implied cause and effect -- i.e., that Institute attendance caused certain behavioral changes. (The consultants hoped that comparing participant responses with control group responses would in fact show any difference.)

Two (2) reported technical difficulties with the survey.

Overall, the survey was well received by the Institute participants and certainly elicited a strong response rate.

Control Group Survey

The consultants turned to the Institute participants for assistance in recruiting a control group. Every Institute participant was asked to identify someone in a position similar to that which he/she held at the time he/she attended the Institute, and to ask that person to respond to the online control group survey (https://www.infosurv.com/pl2.html).

The survey was available from June 21, 2002, until August 15, 2002. One hundred twenty-five (125) people completed the survey. Infosurv compiled the responses and on September 5, 2002, delivered a report that summarized the control group survey responses and compared them to the participant survey responses. Ninety-three per cent (93%) of the control group reported that the survey was easy to complete. Comments made by more than one person were the following:

Eight (8) people wanted to have definitions or explanations – for "leadership" and for various leadership institutes other than Stanford.

Five (5) complained that too many questions had only yes/no responses, and said they wanted more alternatives.

Three (3) said that on some questions where they were asked to pick one response they wanted to be able to select more than one.

Focus Groups

The consultants held two focus groups to elicit the opinions of the directors of the largest public libraries in California, those serving populations greater than 500,000. All libraries in Group 1 of the California Library Statistics Directory were surveyed in writing regarding dates for the focus groups, and all received a written invitation to attend the focus group sessions. The first focus group was held in Pleasant Hill (northern California) on July 17, 2002. Libraries represented at this meeting were Alameda County, Contra Costa County, San Francisco Public, and San Jose Public. The second session was held in Los Angeles on July 19, 2002. Libraries represented at the Los Angeles meeting were the County of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Public, Riverside County, San Bernardino County, and San Diego County. The questions and the summaries of the responses can be found in *Appendix #8.*

Telephone Surveys

In order to augment focus group results with data from a larger pool of public librarians, the consultants conducted telephone interviews with all of the directors of libraries serving populations between 200,000 and 500,000 (Group 2 of the California Library Directory), along with those Group 1 library directors who did not attend a focus group meeting. Each interview took between twenty (20) minutes and one hour. The consultants interviewed a total of thirty (30) directors, from the following libraries:

    Anaheim
    Butte County
    Chula Vista
    El Dorado County
    Glendale
    Huntington Beach
    Kern County
    Long Beach
    Merced County
    Monterey County
    Oakland
    Oceanside
    Orange County
    Oxnard
    Riverside
    San Bernardino Public
    San Diego Public
    San Luis Obispo
    San Mateo County
    Santa Ana
    Santa Barbara

Santa Clara County
Santa Cruz
Shasta County
Solano County
Sonoma County
Stanislaus County
Stockton-San Joaquin
Tulare County
Ventura

Questions asked in the telephone survey and a summary of responses can be found in *Appendix #9.*

Leadership Training Models

Throughout the course of this study the consultants identified and investigated leadership training programs offered by a number of different providers. All of these programs followed one of these five primary training models:

Residential Programs. A typical residential training program selects a class of 20 to 30 trainees by means of a competitive application process, and invites them to a conference center or retreat setting, occasionally to a college campus, where they live, work, study, and interact together for a period of four to seven days. Residential programs offer an intensive experience, with total immersion in the learning environment. One of the primary goals of residential programs is to create a cohort of trainees who can continue to support and encourage one another after the training is completed.

Examples of library-related residential programs include the Northern Exposure to Leadership Institute and (with a much larger than average group of trainees) the Stanford-California State Library Institute on 21st Century Librarianship. The residential model is the model most frequently followed by other library leadership training programs.

Leadership Academy Programs.   Most leadership academy programs focus on the needs of a single organization or a small group of similar organizations, e.g. a single county or a regional group of community colleges. A typical leadership academy program does not usually employ a competitive application process, though library-specific academy programs are an exception to that rule. Each "academy" is made up of a class of 10 to 30 trainees, usually comprised of all management employees who have attained a specified grade or job classification. Academy programs are very rarely offered to non-managerial personnel. Academy programs usually include individuals from different disciplines in the same class.

Academy trainees meet together for training sessions of one or more days in length, at regular intervals, usually over the course of a year. Each session focuses on a single topic.

Examples of library-related leadership academy programs include Synergy: The Illinois Library Leadership Initiative, and the Michigan Leadership Academy. The academy model is the model most frequently followed by California city and county government.

Workshops. Leadership-related training is also offered in the form of one-day workshops, frequently in conjunction with professional association conferences. These workshops may be general, open enrollment offerings from universities, non-profits, or commercial training providers, or they may be customized contract

workshops tailored to the needs of a particular group or organization. The workshop format allows individuals who are just beginning to explore their leadership potential to get a sense of the issues to be addressed.

Examples of library-related leadership workshops include the LAMA *Leadership Survival Kit* preconference and PALINET's *Everyday Leadership* workshops.

Mentoring Programs. Mentoring programs typically use a competitive application process to select and match trainees with established leaders who act as individual mentors. The mentor provides instruction, coaching and support while the trainee completes a substantial leadership-related project, typically over the course of a year. Class size varies from 15-50 trainees, and mentors are always drawn from the trainees' own field. Most mentoring programs provide opportunities for both face-to-face time and remote interaction between mentors and trainees. Mentoring is frequently combined with residential or workshop instruction.

An example of a library-related mentoring program is the Urban Library Council's Executive Leadership Institute. This model is also employed, though less formally, by many library professional associations.

Physical Challenge Programs. These programs remove groups of 8-12 trainees from their usual workplace and comfort zone, exposing them to physically challenging experiences designed to increase leadership, communication, and team building skills. The focus is on "pure" leadership rather than leadership as applied to any particular subject area or discipline. Programs typically last from one to three days. Trainees report greatly enhanced self-confidence and a strong cohort-building experience.

The best known example of this type of program is Outward Bound. This model is seldom employed by libraries but both formal pre-and post-testing and individual testimonials indicate considerable success among participants from the business, education and non-profit sectors.

Detailed descriptions of the library leadership programs investigated for this study are provided in *Appendix #10*.

Leadership Training Opportunities for California Librarians

Leadership training is available to California librarians from a number of different sources, both inside and outside the state, and from both library-specific and

more general training programs. During the course of this study the consultants identified the following leadership training providers that could, potentially, serve the needs of California librarians. The providers noted below offer a variety of training experiences, from formal degree programs to customized workshops to week-long residential programs.

Library-Specific Programs

ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute (for academic librarians)
contact   http://www.gse.harvard.edu/~ppe/programs/acrl/program.html

ARL Leadership and Career Development Program/Diversity Program (for academic librarians who are members of underrepresented ethnic or racial groups)
contact   http://www.arl.org/diversity/lcdp/index.html

Training Institute for Librarians of Color (for early career librarians from underrepresented groups
contact
http://www1.umn.edu/urelate/newsservice/newsreleases/00_7library.html

UCLA Senior Fellows Program (for senior level academic librarians)
contact   http://is.gseis.ucla.edu/seniorfellows

University of Maryland Public Library Leadership Institute (for public librarians)
contact   http://www.clis.umd.edu/programs/institute6.html

Urban Libraries Council Executive Leadership Institute (for public librarians)
contact   www.urbanlibraries.org/eli.html

Other Leadership Training Opportunities Available to California Librarians – Academic Providers

California State University, Sacramento Executive and Leadership Development Team
contact   916-278-4433 x 141or houghl@csus.edu

Claremont University Institute for Advanced Studies in Leadership
contact   909-621-8877

Mills College Women's Leadership Institute
contact   http://www.mills.edu/WLI/wli.home.html

**Other Leadership Training Opportunities Available to California Librarians -
Government Providers**

State of California, State Training Center - California Leadership Institute (for
top level policy and executive staff, including local government personnel)
contact   http://www.dpa.ca.gov/tcid/stc/courses/stc150.htm

**Other Leadership Training Opportunities Available to California Librarians -
Non-Profit Providers**

EDUCAUSE Institute Leadership Program (for individuals with campus
information technology responsibilities)
contact   http://www.educause.edu/inst

Frye Leadership Institute (for individuals involved in higher education)
contact   http://www.fryeinstitute.org

National Association of Counties Advanced Leadership Training (for county
officials)
contact   http://www.naco.org/events/training/leadership.cfm

National Hispana Leadership Institute (for Hispanic women)
contact http://www.nhli.org

The Next Level - Ropes Course Leadership Training
contact   http://www.tnextlevel.org

Outward Bound – Leadership Development Experiences
contact   http://www.outwardboundpro.org/

Other Leadership Training Opportunities Available to California Librarians - For-
Profit Providers

Center for Leadership Studies

contact   http://www.situational.com

Library Leadership Consultants

The following consultants have conducted a number of library-specific leadership training and development events:

Barbara Miller and John Vogelsang
contact   http://www.supportctr.org

Becky Schreiber and John Shannon
contact   http://www.flash.net/~jonbeck

Maureen Sullivan
contact   Msull317@aol.com

Pat Wagner
contact   http://www.pattern.com

The Stanford-California State Library Institute on 21st Century Librarianship

The Stanford-California State Library Institute on 21st Century Librarianship (hereafter referred to as either "the Stanford Institute" or simply "the Institute") was an intense, week-long, residential program held on the Stanford University campus in August of 2000 and again in August of 2001. The target audience was described as "the next generation of library leaders," and the majority of participants self-identified as mid-management. The Institute explored issues related to the future of libraries, technology applications in libraries, and library leadership. Financial support for the Institute came from a federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) grant award from the California State Library.

Content

Content of the Institute was organized along five tracks. In 2000, the tracks were: Leadership, Information Technology, Library Collections and Services in the Digital Age, Organizational Effectiveness, and Facilities Planning/Emergency Preparedness/Preservation. In 2001, the tracks were: Leadership, Technology Impacts, Libraries in the Digital Age, Organizational Effectiveness, and Into the Future. The Institute program followed a daily pattern that began with a morning plenary session followed by small group discussion. After lunch, participants could select from a number of concurrent afternoon programs, related to the five Institute tracks. Afternoons concluded with assigned small group work on case studies. The 2000 Institute included two evening sessions, which were expanded to six evening sessions in 2001. The 2001 Institute also added a daily leadership activity after the morning plenary session.

Speakers

Plenary session speakers in 2000 were:
    David Kennedy, "The Warrior and the President: Two Case Studies in Leadership"
    Andrew Leonard, "The Deep Structure of Duplication"
    Dr. Michael Keller, "This Magic Moment"
    Amal Johnson, "Challenging the Management Status Quo"
    Margaret Hedstrom, "Digital Preservation: A Time Bomb for Digital Libraries"
    Ekaterina Walsh, "Gen Y Information Use Patterns"

Plenary session speakers in 2001 were:
    LaDoris Cordell, on leadership
    John Markoff, on information technology
    Dr. Michael Keller, "Jerusalem:Shining City on a Hill or Vision Versus Reality"
    Marty Manley, "Analog Leadership in a Digital World"

Rick Luce, "A Quantum Leap"

Afternoon speakers in 2000 were:

Leadership track:
    Susan Kent, "Getting Political: Politics and the Library"
    Joey Rodger, "Leadership for the Future"
    Rita Scherrei, "Librarian? Information Professional? Cybrarian? Sigh-brarian?"
    Jose Aponte, "Cultural Facets of Leadership"
    Eugenie Prime, "Assertive Leadership"

Information Technology track:
    Karen Nagy, Don Intersimone, and Mike Molinaro, "Technology and Library Buildings"
    Chris Warnock, "Ebooks and Digital Libraries"
    Terry Winograd, "Human Computer Interaction"
    Neil Scott, "Making Computers Accessible to Everyone"
    Lois Brooks, "Support for Technology in Scholarship: The Academic Technology Specialist Program"

Library Collections and Services track:
    Vickie Reich, "LOCKSS: Lots of Copies Keeps Stuff Safe"
    Susan Kornfield, "Copyright and Intellectual Property"
    Patricia Brevick and David Loertscher, "Information Competency"
    Susan McGlamery, "Moving Reference to the Web"
    Dan Greenstein, "Digital Libraries and Their Challenges"

Organization Effectiveness track:
    Mary Birchard, "Social Entrepreneurship: Balancing Mission and Money"
    Susan Hildreth, "Gen Y Information Use Patterns Discussion"
    Richard Ackroyd and Ken Thompson, "Using GIS to Describe Library Communities"
    Judy Register and Mary Dolven, "Joint Use Libraries"
    Brian Trelstad, "Core Competencies and Libraries"

Facilities, Preservation track:
    Maria Grandinette and Connie Brooks, "Preventive Preservation"
    Karen Nagy, Don Intersimone, and Mike Molinaro, "Planning Library Buildings"
    Walter Henry, Karen Nagy, and Don Intersimone, "Disaster Preparedness"
    Deanna Marcum and Walter Henry, "Digital Preservation"
    Richard Hall, "Libris Design: A Library Facility Planning Database"

Afternoon speakers in 2001 were:

Leadership track:
    J.J. Baskin, "Building Community Partnerships"
    Eugenie Prime, "Assertive Leadership"
    Phil Batcherlor, "Libraries and Politics"

Technology Impacts track:
> Terry Winograd, "Human-Computer Interaction"
> Jim Barrentine, "Wireless Libraries"
> Neil Scott, "Assistive Technology"

Libraries in the Digital Age track:
> Vickie Reich, "LOCKSS: Lots of Copies Keeps Stuff Safe"
> Susan Kornfield, "Copyright and Intellectual Property"
> Hattie Jeon-Slaughter, "Electronic Journals"

Organizational Effectiveness track:
> Jan Cohen, "Know When to Hold Them, Know When to Fold Them"
> Brian Trelstad, "Core Competencies and Libraries"
> Roberta Shaffer, "Deconstructing the Ivory Tower"
> Jose Aponte, "Revolution Within"

Into the Future track:
> Gary Strong, "Libraries as Community"
> Alex Pang, "Artifacts Online"
> Margaret Hedstrom, "Digital Preservation"

The morning leadership activity that was added in 2001 was conducted by Dr. Marilyn Manning, a management consultant based in Mountain View. The specific topics covered during this segment of the Institute were:
> Monday – Leadership Style Assessment
> Tuesday – Leadership Style Assessment Breakout
> Wednesday – The Map Game
> Thursday – Managing Change
> Friday – Work/Life Balance

According to the Institute evaluation done by the Evaluation and Training Institute (ETI), "participants enjoyed the cumulative learning process, with each day contributing to the next."

The evening sessions in 2000 consisted of workshop on "Web Tools for Librarians" taught by Michael Gonzalez, and a session on "Your Leadership Style" conducted by Marilyn Manning. In 2001, the Web Tools workshop was offered on two evenings; a "Visioning Workshop" conducted by Dave Brier was offered on the same two evenings; the third option on those evenings were "Evening Discussion Groups" that covered E-Journals, Knowledge Management, School/Public Cooperation, and Birds of a Feather.

Social Events

In addition to evening sessions, the Institute offered participants several evening social events. The class of 2000 went to a Giants game and to the Exploratorium. The class of 2001 went to a dinner and jazz concert, to the New Guinea Sculpture Garden, and to the Tech Museum in San Jose. These social events

were an integral part of the Institute experience, because one of the goals of leadership training institutes in general, and of the Stanford Institute in particular, is to form a "cadre" of professionals who will continue to interact with and assist each other after the end of the institute. Social events and informal interaction over meals and during unscheduled time promote the bonding that is necessary for cohort formation.

ETI Evaluation of the Institutes

The Evaluation and Training Institute (ETI), located in Los Angeles, conducted evaluations of both the 2000 and 2001 Institutes. In both years, they surveyed the participants both before and after the Institute. In addition, ETI staff attended both Institutes as observers. The ETI evaluation reports are included as *Appendix #11.* In regard to the 2000 Institute, ETI found: "Overall, participants were exceptionally pleased with the Institute experience and gave it a *very satisfied* rating on the survey. According to the participants the Institute had a way of making them feel special. The entire week was "well organized," "the food was gourmet," "the speakers were cutting-edge," and "social activities were well planned and very enjoyable." (p. ii)

Findings for the 2001 Institute were similar, with ETI reporting: "Like their predecessors, participants were extremely satisfied with the Institute. Participants arrived at the Institute with a diverse range of expectations, many of which were fulfilled. The majority of participants' gains over the week paralleled their initial expectations." (p. ii) Indeed, 96% of the 2001 participants reported that the Institute met their expectations, and 94% said they would recommend Institute attendance to others. The 2001 Institute received an overall rating of 3.9 on a 4.0 scale. In both years, the plenary sessions were the most popular segment of the Institute and the case studies the least popular. Afternoon sessions were described as varying in quality as well as format, and ETI recommended in 2001 that the Institute organizers should provide more detailed descriptions of the content of the afternoon sessions so that participants could make more informed choices. From the point of view of participant satisfaction, then, the Institutes were very successful.

Participants

Institute participants came from all types of libraries and from all over the world. There were 132 participants in 2000 and 145 in 2001. The breakdown of participants by library segment was:

	2000	2001
Public	48%	61%
Academic	23%	19%

School	14%	11%
Corporate	5%	*
Law/med.	2%	6%
Other	8%	3%

Those who identified themselves in the "other" category included library commissioners, freelance librarians, employees of library networks or consortia, and librarians in environmental organizations and other nonprofits.

In both years, the ratio of California to out-of-state participants was two to one (2:1).

The study consultants surveyed Institute participants in the summer of 2002. A total of one hundred ninety-nine (199) people completed the survey. Forty-four per cent (44%) of the responses were from the class of 2000, and fifty-six per cent (56%) were from the class of 2001. Sixty per cent (60%) of those responding said that they considered themselves to be mid-career when then attended the Institute; twenty-two per cent (22%) considered themselves to be early career; eighteen per cent (18%) identified themselves as late career. Forty-three per cent (43%) of respondents identified themselves as being mid-management when they attended the Institute; 34% self-identified as management; 14% were line staff; 9% said they were "other." Those who checked the "other" category reported that they were consultants, commissioners, solo librarians, faculty, librarian/teachers, group or project leaders, and "all of the above."

ETI looked at participant demographics in terms of how many years of professional library experience each individual had, and reported the following:

Experience	2000	2001
0-5 years	10%	5%
5-10 years	31%	31%
10-20 years	27%	36%
20+ years	31%	31%

What Participants Wanted from the Institute

According to the ETI assessments, in both years participants said that what they wanted from the Institute was:

   To gain inspiration through the acquisition of new ideas

   To develop leadership skills, specifically:

> *Methods for implementing change*
> *Skills to communicate with and lead others*
> *Strategies for working with people with different styles*
> *Techniques to motivate an entrenched workforce*
> *Increase assertiveness and self-confidence*

To gain access to experts and resources on library issues
To network with colleagues

First year participants also wanted to learn about role of information technology in libraries. In the second year, technology was at the bottom of participants' interests.

The 2002 survey of Institute participants asked people why they attended the Institute, and elicited the following responses (multiple reasons were allowed):

90%   were looking for personal growth, inspiration, and new ideas
77%   wanted access to experts from within and outside the profession
74%   hoped to advance their careers and develop leadership skills
72%   wanted to improve their libraries/organizations
71%   were looking to network with other mid-career professionals
41%   were attracted by the prestige of Stanford
40%   sought to make a contribution to the profession
27%   went because the Institute was recommended
18%   went because "my boss/director sent me"
3%   wanted college credit
2%   were hoping for a salary increase

Nine per cent (9%) checked "other," and some of the additional reasons cited were:

To get out of a slump, recharge my batteries.
What it offered was appealing, and unusual. I relished the opportunity to learn again, in an academic setting!
To find out where libraries of all types were in I.T. and where they thought it should go…
To have fun.
I thought it would be better than standard ALA, TLA conferences and workshops.
Wanted my perspective included in the discussion of the future of libraries outside Ohio.
I had just taken a new job and thought this might expand my thinking as I moved into my new position.
Not just the prestige of Stanford but the quality of Stanford was very important to me. If it weren't there I wouldn't have applied.

Impact of the Institute(s)

Both ETI and the consultants for this study surveyed Institute participants in an effort to determine what impact the Institute had. The ETI surveys were done at the end of each Institute and so could not measure actual behavioral impacts, but only the anticipated or planned impacts. Specifically, the ETI surveys asked participants: to rate each program or activity; to identify the three most important things learned; to identify three specific ways in which the participant planned to apply information from the Institute; whether the participant expected to use knowledge acquired at the Institute to make changes. The detailed program and activity ratings can be found in the ETI reports, *Appendix #11*. For purposes of this study, it is sufficient to note that ratings for the programs were consistently high, and the only area of weakness was the case studies. In both years, participants identified the following as being among the most important things learned, although the order varied:

    Leadership skills
    The importance of networking
    Technology skills

In addition, the class of 2001 identified "creating and implementing a vision" and "personal rejuvenation" as important results.

Organizational Impact

ETI asked participants if they planned to use the knowledge they gained from the Institute to make changes in their libraries/organizations. Ninety-four per cent (94%) of the class of 2000 and ninety-one per cent of the class of 2001 answered affirmatively. The consultants for this study asked participants three related questions that followed up on the ETI question about organizational change, i.e.:

    Since you returned from the Institute, and as a direct or indirect result of your Institute attendance, have you suggested any changes in your library/organization?
        ➢ 79% answered "yes"
        ➢ 21% answered "no"

    (If yes) Were your suggestions accepted?
        ➢ 81% answered "yes"
        ➢ 19% answered "no"

    (If yes) Have your suggestions been implemented or begun to be implemented?
        ➢ 75% answered "yes"
        ➢ 25% answered "no"

Changes Initiated as a Result of the Institute(s)

The consultants asked each survey respondent to list up to three specific changes that they had suggested or made. The complete list of responses can be found in *Appendix #7.* Analysis of the suggestions reveals that many were tied directly not only to the Institute, but to specific Institute speakers or programs. Trends were evidenced by multiple changes in the following areas:

Mentoring

Sample responses:
➢ "Mentoring of Middle Staff by Executive staff. Grooming/Training staff for future management positions. <The library> will have a lot of upper management retiring in the next 2 years, this mentoring will help the library transition."
➢ "More focus on mentoring librarian, non-librarian, and student staff."
➢ "Develop a network of mentors."
➢ "Changes in the mentoring process and how mentors are selected/assigned."
➢ "I learned more about mentoring and we began to talk about the need for more leaders."
➢ "I have incorporated the leadership training in working directory with my own staff. I see myself as a mentor and I look for learning opportunities for individuals as well as for the whole group. The staff development I design for youth services is more directed and more 'meaty' than before the Institute. I pan an even higher value on team building and I have noticed the staff using the same methods with the people they work with at their branches. The changes that have resulted from this focus are very satisfying for all of us."

Youth orientation, with focus on policies and services for Gen Y

Sample responses:
➢ "That we evaluate on an ongoing basis our services to Gen Y and Gen Y patrons as well as generations following (Z? etc.)
➢ "The discussions relating to Generation Y had a tremendous impact on me. We have now moved to installing learning commons allowing mobile phones in some areas and talking in the majority of areas in the Library. I am looking at installing vending machines and allowing food consumption in discrete areas as well. It would be fair to say however that the University Librarian was also thinking along similar lines so these changes would have occurred at any rate. I have played a stronger leadership role than would otherwise have been the case however."
➢ "To be more relaxed with teens' use of Internet, understanding their perception of this medium is quite different from ours. That leads to Internet user policy and a general attitude towards teens and Internet."

- ➢ "Technology – acknowledge the way Gen Y uses the library and plan services for them."
- ➢ "From one of the presentations we are looking more at how we can serve generation x, y, especially when setting up computer lab and space allocation."
- ➢ "That the library which supports a new Teen Center to be built at the new Main Library include multimedia, since youth like to listen to music as they study."
- ➢ "Developed a system-wide YA outreach pamphlet."
- ➢ "Designing new facilities to encourage youth to utilize the library."

Adoption of new technologies, especially wireless networking, Web development software, and e-books

Sample responses:
- ➢ "Instituted wireless network access."
- ➢ "We have brought on-line a union catalog."
- ➢ "Change to Dreamweaver web development tool."
- ➢ "Webpage improvements."
- ➢ "Investigate digital reference service as a method of extending library services to distance students."
- ➢ "My staff were not comfortable offering Word processing and other Microsoft Office Products. They were very reluctant – I did it anyway and felt more confident implementing an unpopular decision knowing it was right for the public."
- ➢ "Upgrade the technology used in the library to better position us for digital projects. We plan to digitize the senior projects and a few other special collections and provide access over the web via our online catalog."
- ➢ "Ongoing advocacy for the creation of an eLibrary work unit with staff hired to work in the development and delivery of eLibrary services (tied in especially with Dan Greenstein's lecture on creation of digital libraries.)"
- ➢ "Created enhanced library homepage with skills collected from institute workshop."
- ➢ "Wireless school with laptop carts."
- ➢ "Designed web-based tutorial in an effort to expand our 'virtual library' on the model of the Los Alamos Research Lab."
- ➢ "Redesign website focusing on non-library graphics to reach a non-library audience (especially teens)."
- ➢ "Implemented Online reference service via our website. And Online homework help for our After School Program with tutor. com."
- ➢ "I accelerated our involvement in new technology applications by purchasing a PDA for all of our librarians and IT staff so that they would understand their functionality and explore applications for users in our environment. This led to classes that we developed, a PDA Web page, a user group, a PDA Fair on campus that was sponsored by the library and attended by over 600 people."

Training and staff development

Sample responses:
➢ "We changed the format of our Staff Development Day. We requested and received funding from the Library Friends Group so we could have Marilyn Manning as the Facilitator."
➢ "Requested workshops by Center for Teaching and Learning for all staff that teach library workshops."
➢ "Encouraged my boss to send my colleagues or junior staff for training in order to equip themselves with the use of computers and learn to search for information through the Internet."
➢ "Provide more staff development opportunities (similar to workshops we had at the Institute for new librarians and interested paraprofessionals."
➢ "Ask staff to take classes as offered by the County, InfoPeople for self-improvement. County will pay the cost and time is made available to take off…"
➢ "Spend more on continuing education for staff and library board commissioners."
➢ "Due to the shortage of children's librarians and the administration's plan to 'grow our own' children's services staff, I offered to conduct workshops on the basics like collection development, integrating creative movement into storytimes, and how to evaluate art in picture books."
➢ "Hired Marilyn Manning to conduct training at our library."
➢ "I suggested that our library system should develop an ongoing in-house program to encourage and pay for library school attendance for current Library Assistants, Aides and Pages. I also suggested that we have an in-house training program for 'demi-librarians' who have had our training but not yet received an MLS."

Library organization, position classification/reclassification

Sample responses:
➢ "Participated in administrative retreat leading to reclassification of three Deputy County Librarians so positions are recognized as administrative and not supervisory. New management positions will be created to support the work of each Deputy County Librarian."
➢ "Changed reporting structure of program coordinators so that line staff report to supervisors or managers and not directly to Deputy County Librarian, Public Services."
➢ "Change in organizational management."
➢ "I have suggested that we take a closer look at our functions in reference service, effectively address the ways in which our roles have changed by creating more realistic job descriptions and assigning work accordingly."
➢ "Created a new position for technical support; prior to funding for this position, I handled all of the technical planning and problems in addition to my management responsibilities."

➢ "Changed the management structure in Main Library departments."

Staff recognition/reward

Sample responses:
➢ "Rewards program for staff."
➢ "Reward positive attitudes."
➢ "More attention put into recognition of staff contributions."
➢ "Make money available as part of a branch staff recognition program."
➢ "Staff development – staff appreciation – staff manual, cohesive training, and mentoring."

Decentralization of leadership, authority

Sample responses:
➢ "Involve more staff (esp. line staff) in the decision making process."
➢ "Give library assistants a chance to have 'moments of leadership.'"
➢ "Push power and authority out further in the management tree (from librarians to staff to student library assistants.)"
➢ "Delegated more tasks to the paraprofessionals."
➢ "Changes in the way we make decisions about new technology – to include more lower-level staff in the active decision-making."
➢ "Rotate leadership in loan and reserve so <staff> can develop more skills including planning for change."

Application of core competencies

Sample responses:
➢ "I serve as chair of our library's strategic planning committee. We have been struggling with a way to determine what to stop doing as a library. As a result of the Institute, I have introduced core competencies as a tool to use."
➢ "Staff development – core values and basic competencies."
➢ "Working on core competencies for all library staff."
➢ "Outlined core competencies and focused on them – either eliminated or outsourced non-core tasks. Example: who really needs html skills, do we need to train everyone or should we use a resource person."

Improved communications

Sample responses:
➢ "How to use technology to improve our internal communications."
➢ "Suggest library management share more information, particularly budget information, with branch and division managers."
➢ "Promote staff input as to needed changes."

- "Using web (specifically the library's intranet) more efficiently and effectively as a communications tool within the library system."
- "Utilize leadership style assessment within library management team to improve communications."
- "Used Kennedy's task vs process management paradigm as a means to mitigate conflicts in manager ranks."
- "More constructive meetings with agendas and open discussions."
- "Proposed development of a Library Communication Plan to include at least a part-time position to coordinate. Moved printed staff newsletter onto Web Staffnet."

Leadership

Sample responses:
- "Took the lead in organizing medical school administrators, faculty, and IT leaders on campus to develop a multi-year and multi-institutional grant proposal to develop a strategic plan for information management throughout our enterprise. The group elected me chair of the planning team and I am a co-investigator on the grant proposal with the Senior Associate Dean for the School of Medicine."
- "In the weekly management meetings I am a much stronger advocate for the staff and its input. I am able to describe more clearly what I think it means to be a leader and I think the Director would agree that I'm not shy about bringing that up when necessary. I have seen the positive effects on my colleagues and the way we have handled some recent challenges."
- "The biggest change has been in how I behave as a leader in our organization. Since the Institute, I am trying to be more assertive and proactive, and my new role as University Librarian is giving me lots of opportunity to practice what I learned."
- "I have the self-confidence to express my belief that working in teams results in better decision-making and long-term results than chain-of-command management. Since setting up teams often requires more time and some training upfront, it is sometimes difficult to convince superiors of this."
- "Series of team-building exercises on advice of Marilyn Manning."
- "Made a written recommendation to my supervisor that we arrange for at least a pilot group of staff to take the Leadership Style Assessment."
- "Courage to support and lead the institution's efforts to more fully adopt internationally used standards in its cataloging operations. (Tied in especially with Michael Keller's lecture on leadership and the need to take risk, Joey Rodger's session on leadership and Amal Johnson's plenary session on organizational effectiveness.)"
- "The Academy suffered a major fire and the death of one of our researchers while he was in the field, on the same week of September 11. The training that I received during the Institute provided me with a great deal of support in helping the staff work through the difficult time. I

received such positive information from the various coaching opportunities during the Institute that I brought in a Psychologist to work with the staff following the events of September."

Customer service

Sample responses:
➢ "Emphasizing the importance of providing customer service from the customer's perspective."
➢ "The <library> developed a countywide customer satisfaction survey to be administered annually."
➢ "Open Friday evenings rather than Sunday evenings to better serve our patrons."
➢ "Longer hours, especially in the morning for students who arrive at school early giving them a quiet calm environment where they can wake up, finish homework, read, etc. This took a change in hours for the library technician but it has worked out wonderfully for us and our students."
➢ "This is not a direct change, but as a result of some of the lectures, I had a better understanding of my customers and where they are coming from."
➢ "Implementing procedures to make library systems more responsive to library users."

Measurement and evaluation of services and programs

Sample responses:
➢ "Implemented an evaluation process for library programming."
➢ "Strive to better quantify library use using better indicators via surveys."
➢ "Ongoing documentation of the use of the two media centers is currently part of the routine in a formerly chaotic situation."
➢ "Evaluate the way the library measures services. In particular, the need to establish new relations with non-library users."
➢ "To use methods described by Janet S. Cohen to define what services to keep, discontinue, or change."

Development of partnerships

Sample responses:
➢ "Partnering with other agencies."
➢ "Develop partnerships with hospitals, police, city hall, the public library, the marine base library."
➢ "More collaborative relationship with Information Technology Services (who have the big bucks). As a result we have been able to provide mobile computing services (wireless access), upgraded text based catalog to web based catalog, upgraded the lab and public workstations in the library, installed Internet 2 infrastructure."

➢ "Offer a staff development workshop on developing effective partnerships in the community."
➢ "Network with community organizations whose mission is similar to library's."
➢ "Partnership is the most effective way to reach the target population. We can partner with non-profit organizations, schools, and other City/County departments. This will help us share resources and reach our customers more effectively."

Collection development

Sample responses:
➢ "Reviewed current collection development organizational structure and created a written document outlining my review."
➢ "Realigned collection development to include Interlibrary Loan/Document Delivery service and oversight."
➢ "Developed and implemented a collection development plan and team-based approach with web-based ordering."
➢ "Creating a centralized collection development system."
➢ "Proposed to administrative council, in a written document, refining collection development organizational structure … creating a core collection development staff… to maximize effectiveness and efficiencies."

Services

Sample responses:
➢ "Move to Sunday hours."
➢ "When the Library received the okay to begin a fee-based books-by-mail program, I suggested we launch a pilot program and offer it free to patrons who are homebound."
➢ "Establishment of a procedure through which persons with disabilities could request reasonable accommodations that permit them to do things that are different from posted 'guidelines for patron behavior.'"
➢ "Introduce café."
➢ "Information Literacy was not a topic to which I'd given much thought before my Stanford Institute. Afterwards, I began to rethink how we should present and even think of the Introduction to the Internet classes that we offer at my local library. I talked to the staff about the concept and how I wanted them to regard our 'reference' transactions as another way of teaching information literacy. I encourage reference staff to remind patrons that the Internet is a tool like any other and can't be used to the exclusion of other tools or they are doing themselves a disservice. This was more of an attitude change on my part, and hopefully my staff's, rather than a policy change."
➢ "The branch I manage is serving as a model for other branches to work as a 'library of the future': that is to look at the way we do business, assess

what works well and what doesn't, make changes as necessary, and never use the argument 'that's the way we've always done it' or 'we've tried that and it doesn't work.'"

A review of these responses shows a clear relationship between knowledge and skills gained at the Institute and changes that were suggested or implemented on the job. The actual changes also show considerable congruence with the anticipated applications of Institute experience reported on the two ETI posttests (*Appendix #11*). In 2000, the ETI posttest indicated that "improving leadership was the most common theme. Improving technology and technology awareness was the second most common theme." In 2001, participants put less emphasis on technology but mentioned applications in the area of personal rejuvenation. The 2002 survey did not reveal any significant references to personal rejuvenation, but that might be explained by the wording of the question, which focused on organization rather than personal change.

Sharing Institute Experiences

ETI asked participants how they planned to share their Institute experiences. The overwhelming majority (91% in 2000 and 89% in 2001) said they would do so through informal discussions with colleagues. Smaller percentages (67% in 2000, 59% in 2001) indicated that they would give a formal presentation or write a report. A similar percentage (71% in 2000, 66% in 2001) planned to share Institute materials with others. Only 57% (2001) planned to share their experiences with their supervisors.

What did they actually do? The consultants for this study posed nine (9) questions related to sharing Institute experiences with others, and received the following responses:

Questions	Responses	Percent
13. Did you share your Institute experiences with library management?	Yes	93%
	No	7%
13a. How did you share our Institute experiences with library management? (check all that apply)	Informal discussion	87%
	Formal oral presentation	42%
	Written report	39%
	Workshop(s)	9%
	Web-based reporting	3%
	Other (please describe)	11%
14. Which of the following best describes library management's attitude towards your Institute experiences?	1 - Not at all interested	2%
	2	8%
	3 - somewhat interested	26%
	4	37%
	5 - extremely interested	27%

15. Did you share your Institute experiences with your peers, inside or outside of your library?	Yes	98%
	No	2%
15a. How did you share your Institute experiences with peers? (check all that apply)	Informal discussion	95%
	Formal oral presentation	29%
	Written report or article	22%
	Workshop(s)	6%
	Web-based reporting	3%
	Other (please describe)	7%
16. Which of the following best describes your peers' attitude towards your Institute experiences?	1 - Not at all interested	2%
	2	2%
	3 - somewhat interested	41%
	4	40%
	5 - extremely interested	15%
17. Did you share your Institute experiences with your parent organization or management outside of the library, such as a dean, city manager, etc.?	Yes	34%
	No	66%
17a. How did you share your Institute experiences with your parent organization or management outside of the library, such as a dean, city manager, etc. (check all that apply).	Informal discussion	67%
	Formal oral presentation	21%
	Written report or article	24%
	Other (please describe)	13%
18. Which of the following best describes the attitude of your parent organization or management outside the library towards your Institute experiences?	1 - Not at all interested	17%
	2	15%
	3 - somewhat interested	38%
	4	20%
	5 - extremely interested	10%

Infosurv accurately summarized the responses to these questions as follows:

Most respondents shared their Institute experiences with management at their library through informal discussions, formal oral presentations and written reports. The majority noted that their management's attitude towards these experiences ranged from somewhat to very interested. In addition, some respondents choosing "other" to this question indicated that PowerPoint presentations and email communiqués were effective methods of sharing notes. In a special circumstance, one respondent tried to share their experiences but found that management at their Institution was simply not interested.

A slightly larger percentage of Institute attendees shared their Institute experience with their peers. This occurred mainly through informal discussion, but also through formal oral presentations and written reports. In addition, some respondents choosing "other" to this question indicated that they used staff newsletters, staff meetings and email to communicate what they learned at the Institute. One respondent recommended the Institute to coworkers they thought would benefit from attendance. Once again, the majority peer response to this

information ranged from somewhat to very interested with only 2% not at all interested.

Significantly fewer (34%) Institute attendees shared their Institute experiences with a parent organization or management outside of their organization. Those who did share their experiences outside of their organization note using informal discussion more than any other method, although approximately 20% used written reports and formal oral presentations. In addition, a majority of these parent organizations were somewhat interested in these experiences, with a small percentage (10%) very interested and a larger percentage (15%) not at all interested. Many respondents choosing "other" to this question indicated that these experiences are typically reported to the parent organization or outside management in annual reports. Several suggested that the question was not applicable to their situation.

Cadre Formation

Since one of the goals of the Institute was to encourage the formation of a cadre of future library leaders, the consultants asked two questions about continuing contact with other Institute participants. Those questions, and the responses, were:

Question	Response	Percent
21. Since attending the Institute, have you remained in contact with people you met there? (check all that apply)	Yes, through the listserv - read the postings.	82%
	Yes, through the listserv - I have posted to the list.	26%
	Yes, through email to individuals.	62%
	Yes, via telephone to individuals.	20%
	Yes, through in-person meetings.	32%
	Yes, through professional association activities.	44%
	No	5%
21a. How often have you had contact with people you met at the Institute?	Once	8%
	2-5 times	48%
	6-12 times	27%
	more than 12 times	17%

Only five per cent (5%) of those responding had not remained in contact with other Institute participants. The primary mechanisms for ongoing contact are the two listservs, and eighty-two per cent (82%) report that they just read the postings; only twenty-six per cent (26%) have posted messages. These percentages are consistent with other lists, where approximately four-fifths of the subscribers are, in Internet parlance, "lurkers." However, almost two-thirds of the

respondents (62%) have exchanged e-mails with other individual Institute participants, forty-four per cent (44%) have reconnected through professional associations, and almost one-third (32%) have had in-person meetings with their Institute classmates.

Does this mean that a cadre has formed? There are no hard-and-fast rules for cadre development, no measurable standards, and no published statistics on continued contact for similar events. However, the statistics cited above, when combined with the comments elicited when the consultants gave participants the opportunity to say whatever they wanted about the Institute, lead to the conclusion that the Institute did offer the kind of intense experience that promotes bonding and makes people comfortable enough to call on others who went through the same experience, even years later.

Career Mobility and Behavioral Impacts

The consultants for this study had the opportunity to look at longitudinal impacts of the Institute, the "one to two year follow-up of Institute participants" that ETI recommended. They asked a number of questions related to job change or promotion and professional activities. As some respondents noted in their comments on the survey, there was not necessarily a cause-and-effect relationship between Institute attendance and subsequent career developments and professional growth. However, the consultants hypothesized that an aggregate comparison of Institute participants with a control group would show some differences from which an Institute impact could be inferred.

Questions on career mobility and professional activities since the Institute, and the responses, were:

Question	Response	Percent
19. Have you changed jobs or received a promotion since you attended the Institute?	Yes	24%
	No	76%
19c. Do you think that Institute attendance contributed to your job change or promotion?	Yes, greatly	17%
	Yes, somewhat	59%
	No	13%
	Don't know	11%
22. Since attending the Institute, have you been elected or appointed to office in any professional association?	Yes	28%
	No	72%
23. Since attending the Institute, have you joined any professional associations you did not already belong to?	Yes	31%
	No	69%
24. Since attending the Institute, have you written any articles for professional publications, print or electronic?	Yes	25%
	No	75%

25. Since attending the Institute, have you delivered any presentations at professional conferences?	Yes	40%
	No	60%
26. Have you participated in any additional leadership development training since the Institute?	Yes	44%
	No	56%
27. Have you participated in any other continuing education since the Institute?	Yes	26%
	No	74%
28. Have you voluntarily taken on a new professional project since the Institute?	Yes	79%
	No	21%
29. Have you mentored anyone since the Institute?	Yes	65%
	No	35%
30. Since the Institute, have you assumed any new leadership roles outside the library (e.g., in a service organization?)	Yes	35%
	No	65%

The percentage of positive responses to this question, in themselves, are simply raw data, with no implications as to the effect of the Institute on participant behavior. Implications regarding the Institute's impact can be drawn only by comparing the participants' responses with responses from a group of similar library professionals who did *not* attend the Institute, and were asked similar questions about their careers and professional activities over the last two years. That comparison will be made in the next chapter.

While only 24% of the Institute participants reported changing jobs or receiving promotions, 76% of those reported that they thought Institute attendance had some impact on their career move. Seventy-nine per cent (79%) report voluntarily taking on a new professional project. Sixty-five per cent (65%) have mentored someone since attending the Institute. All of the other questions elicited positive responses that were less than fifty per cent (50%), but that in itself is insignificant until compared with a control group. In terms of continuing professional development, additional leadership training is obviously of more interest to this group that other types of continuing education, with forty-four per cent (44%) reporting that they have participated in additional leadership training, but only twenty-six per cent (26%) reporting participation in other continuing education activities.

Self-Perception of Institute Impacts

The 2002 survey asked seven questions that required respondents to report their self-perceptions of the impact that the Institute had on them. Those questions, and the responses, were:

Question	Response	Percent
31. Did Institute participation prompt you to take more risks in your professional life?	Yes	77%
	No	23%
36. Participation in the Institute has influenced my career:	1 - not at all	3%
	2	7%
	3 – somewhat	30%
	4	30%
	5 - very much	30%
37. Participation in the Institute has changed the way I think about the issues and challenges facing the library profession:	1 - not at all	2%
	2	4%
	3 – somewhat	26%
	4	36%
	5 - very much	32%
38. How useful has what you learned at the Institute been to you so far?	**1 - not at all useful**	2%
	2	2%
	3 - somewhat useful	25%
	4	30%
	5 - very useful	41%
39a. Did you get the results you hoped for from attendance?	**Yes**	94%
	No	6%
41. Has attending the Institute affected your career plans?	**Yes**	50%
	No	50%
42. How has your confidence in your ability to be a library leader changed since attending the Institute?	**Decreased**	1%
	Stayed the same	19%
	Increased	80%

The above responses clearly show that participants felt that the Institute made an enormous difference in the professional lives. Over three-quarters (77%) reported taking more risks, while four-fifths (80%) said that the Institute increased their confidence in taking a leadership role. Ninety per cent (90%) reported that the Institute has already influenced their careers. Ninety-four per cent (94%) changed their thinking about professional issues as a result of Institute attendance. Ninety-six per cent (96%) reported that what they learned at the Institute has been useful to them. Ninety-four per cent (94%) got the results they hoped for from the Institute. (ETI asked a similar question, "Did the Institute meet your expectations?" and received similar responses, 86% in 2000 and 96% in 2001.)

Participants' Open-Ended Comments

The consultants for this study gave the respondents the opportunity to make open-ended comments about the Institute. Almost all respondents made

comments, and the vast majority were highly positive (18 reflected some negativity). Analysis of the comments yielded the following trends:

A desire for opportunities for structured networking with same-type libraries (also noted by ETI).
Plenary session speakers were most valued.
Marilyn Manning's leadership sessions in 2001 were repeatedly cited for their excellence.
The small group work was criticized (also noted by ETI).
Networking with others was valuable, and the comments reinforced the concept of cadre formation.
The Stanford experience was regarded as a strong benefit in many ways, ranging from just getting away from the library to the perception of "special treatment."
Participants expressed strong positive support for continuation of the Institute.

Sample positive comments:
- "It provided a mechanism for libraries to learn new ideas, to be more aware of other philosophies from business leaders and innovative people. It sounds basic but librarians are exposed to the same forms of leadership and the same management philosophies over and over again at their annual conferences. The Stanford Institute was fresh and creative. I truly hope it will continue."
- "The Institute was quite simply the best professional opportunity I've had the fortune to participate in. It was such a morale-booster and offered so many opportunities to gain information from experts outside of the library field, but who had pertinent insights which were applicable to our profession. It was such a motivator to be treated as a "mover and shaker" and t get tips on how we can influence the information profession in the future."
- "The Institute was a wonderful experience. It allowed me to interact with a wider range of library professionals than I normally do. Before the Institute, I would have never really considered public libraries as a career path, but now I would because of the people I met. The Institute also made me feel better about my profession. At the Institute, librarians were just as important as CEOs and I feel that did wonders to boost my image of the profession. I feel that I want to make an important contribution to the profession and I am working on finding a way."
- "I went in with very few expectations; I ended up meeting phenomenal people, having 'fun' and being inspired. I didn't realize until several weeks later how much I learned and absorbed at the Conference. In very intangible ways it made me feel good about myself, my profession and my colleagues. Having a solid week in such a wonderful environment, pampered as we were (even in dorms!) and made to feel utterly professional, it was truly an incredible experience."

- "It was an amazing week. I can't tell you how interesting it was to meet with librarians from all over the country (and the world) and find that many of us are experiencing the same problems and by coming together, were able to come to some interesting solutions. Fire them all! While not practical in a civil service world, the discussion on the results of this dictum on the listserv has been valuable. We need to come together, we need to hear what is new and innovative, we need to hear what works elsewhere, and we need to participate with other colleagues. Thank you for a wonderful experience."
- "This was a fantastic week of learning and feeling good about the library profession. It gave me an opportunity to learn about other kinds of libraries and how different or same they are from mine. It gave me an opportunity to talk with other school librarians and see how well I am doing, yet to learn new ideas from them. It felt great to be treated so well and made to feel so important. I loved the format of each day and the whole week of learning. It was very well constructed. Every piece fit into place. Of course being at Stanford gave it a great atmosphere."
- "In general, this was easily the most productive professional development experience I have ever had. And I feel I have had many great experiences."
- "It was invaluable to me personally and professionally. I interacted with so many people I might never have had the chance to meet through ALA or PLA. The intensity of the experience and concentrated exposure to intellectually stimulating presenters and peers was invaluable."
- "I thought it was one of the best experiences of my life. I got my own batteries recharged and I ended up seeing my profession and professional responsibilities much more broadly … the word 'stewardship' pops in to my head often as a direct result of the Institute. I think my vision had become quite narrow, and Institute changed that."
- "The Institute was by far the most important training I have received since library school. I basically went to the Institute because my boss wanted me to. I was overwhelmed by the quality of the Institute and the organization of the activities. The only training I have ever received that took our profession seriously and trained people to take the profession seriously. A fantastic experience that inspired me to stay in the profession! It would be a crime if the Institute were to be discontinued."
- "The Institute was truly transformational. It is unlike any other development program I know about. The strengths were the speakers from outside the profession bringing new ideas to us and then using them to work on problems. Truly worth 25 ALA conferences."
- "It was invaluable to me. I met people that I wanted to be. The Marilyn Manning sessions helped me to work on my lifetime goals and to decide what kind of leader I wanted to be and how I would get there. To many, it may look like I have taken a step backwards, to take a lesser status, yet more money. I look at it as a 'correction in the stock market' … at some point my career will shoot up again."

- o "Although it appears that I have not done very much since the Institute I should say that attendance at the Institute actually reinforced what I had a sense of prior to attendance. I came back with a positive attitude that I was on the right track after all. I realized that I need to continue to educate myself and stay involved in college activities and remain a committed member of the community."
- o "It helped me focus on areas that I needed to focus on, like doing a better job of leading from my line position and looking for innovative ways to approach work. Marilyn Manning's work with us was the most valuable part of the Institute."
- o "In seventeen words: the Institute was intensive, interactive, physically fatiguing, mentally exhausting, exciting, incredible, fascinating and a fabulous learning experience.

Most of the negative comments came from people who wanted an experience more tailored to the types of libraries in which they worked, or from out-of-state participants who thought that the Institute was too California-centric. Several participants, and one Advisory Group member, complained that the experience was too much like library school and did not stimulate original thought or support grass-roots directions.

Comparison of Stanford Institute Participants to Non-Participants

In order to isolate the longitudinal behavioral impacts of the Stanford Institute, the consultants surveyed a group of library professionals similar to Institute participants, but who did not attend the Institute. Typically and ideally, when a control group is used to assess the effects of something on the subjects of a study, the control group is selected at the same time as the study group. This was not possible here, since the study of longitudinal effects of the Stanford Institute was commissioned approximately nine months after the second Institute was held.

Methodology

The consultants identified a control group by using the Institute participants and the directors of libraries where the participants worked. Institute participants recruited colleagues on approximately the same professional level. Library directors recruited employees similar to those who attended the Institute.

The control group took a Web-based survey administered by Infosurv, the company that administered the participant survey. A total of one hundred twenty-five (125) people completed the survey. While this was smaller than the number of people completing the participant survey (199), Infosurv considered it to be statistically valid as a control group. The complete survey results, as reported by Infosurv, are included as *Appendix #12.* The survey asked three demographic questions that enabled the consultants to determine how similar the control group was to the participant group. Responses to the questions are summarized below:

Question	Response	Participants	Non-Participants
9. *(8.)* Education (check all that apply):	B.A. or B.S.	68%	69%
	M.L.S. or equivalent	89%	94%
	M.B.A.	2%	
	M.P.A.	1%	
	Other Masters Degree	21%	14%
	Ed.D.	NA	1%
	Ph.D.	2%	
	J.D.	5%	2%
	Teaching Credential	13%	11%
	Other specialized certificate(s) (please list)	9%	7%
11. When you attended the Institute, did you consider yourself to be: *10. Do you consider yourself to be:*	early career	22%	15%
	mid-career	60%	57%
	late career	18%	28%

12. When you attended the Institute, did you consider yourself to be: *11. Do you consider yourself to be:*	line staff	14%	19%
	mid-management	43%	46%
	management	34%	27%
	other (please specify)	9%	8%

Infosurv concluded that "Institute participants and non-participants are very similar demographically." Key findings include the facts that a majority of both groups identified themselves as mid-career and a majority of both groups considered themselves to be mid-management or management. The control group included proportionately more people in late career (28% vs. 18%) and fewer in early career (15% vs. 22%). This difference is understandable, because people in late career often think that they are past the need for leadership training, or they have made a decision not to seek leadership positions. They would, therefore, not have applied to attend the Stanford Institute.

Behavioral Comparison

The major purpose of surveying a control group was to determine whether the cadre of Institute participants would demonstrate different behavior in two areas: leadership or innovation within their organizations, and career mobility and professional activity.

To assess organizational leadership or innovation, the survey asked the control group the following questions:

In the last two years, have you suggested any changes in your library/organization?
➢ 86% answered "yes" (compared with 79% of Institute participants)
➢ 14% answered "no"

(If yes) Were your suggestions accepted?
➢ 89% answered "yes" (compared with 81% of Institute participants)
➢ 11% answered "no"

(If yes) Have your suggestions been implemented or begun to be implemented?
➢ 83% answered "yes" (compared with 75% of Institute participants)
➢ 17% answered "no"

These responses seem to indicate that there is very little difference in the two groups in terms of organizational leadership or innovation, and that in fact non-participants have a slight positive edge in this area.

Both surveys asked the respondents to list up to three specific changes that they had suggested or made. The content analysis of the participants' responses,

reported in the previous chapter, revealed strong trends in making change in the following areas:

Mentoring
Youth orientation, with focus on policies and services for Gen Y
Adoption of new technologies, especially wireless networking, Web development software, and e-books
Training and staff development
Library organization, position classification/reclassification
Staff recognition/reward
Decentralization of leadership, authority
Application of core competencies
Improved communications
Leadership
Customer service
Measurement and evaluation of services and programs
Development of partnerships
Collection development
Services

Content analysis of the responses of the control group reveals few areas of overlap, i.e.:

Collection development
Services
Adoption of new technologies (but with a different emphasis – automated systems and improvement of Web site content)
Library organization, position classification/reclassification
Training and staff development

The control group also reported much interest and activity in the following areas, which were not mentioned by the participant group:

Circulation and access procedures, including public access computers
Physical plant/building changes
Public relations and marketing
Vendor relations
Technical services

Overall, the suggestions made by the control group were of a lower magnitude than those made by Institute participants. The control group suggestions were more reactive, internally focused, and related to day-to-day operations. Quite a few could be considered to be simply part of "doing the job." There was much more consistency among the control group suggestions, with more duplication of the same suggestions. While the complete responses are available in *Appendix #12,* inclusion of some sample responses here will illustrate the level of suggestions reported by the control group.

Collection development and access

Samples responses:
- "Spend additional funds on easy materials to avoid shortages of books in the summer."
- "Subscribe to a new journal only in electronic form due to its enormous size and our limited shelf space."
- "Start a DVD collection due to patron demand."
- "Withdraw an outdated media from the collection."
- "I suggested that the library start purchasing juvenile dvds."
- "I suggested we not purchase a $3000 video collection that was available by interlibrary loan from a county consortium."
- "Suggested and implemented librarian input on all aspect of collection development."

Adoption of new technologies
Sample responses:
- "Implement an automated library system (OPAC/circulation)." (Reported numerous times)
- "Create a digital library service."
- "Creation of a single user interface for database searching (Webfeat)."
- "Moving the library's web pages from static to dynamic, db driven."
- "Creation of library site on corporate intranet."
- "I suggested we fine tune our OPAC access for patrons. Now, Internet access is through 8 computers that are used almost exclusively for e-mail. By opening up our newer WEB2 PACs for non e-mail Internet use, we will provide more access for researchers."
- "Discontinue mediated online searching service."
- "Acquire and implement a system with an Open URL resolver and a versatile multisearch capability."

Circulation and access procedures
Sample responses:
- "To shorten the number of days before an overdue item's status is changed to lost and the patron is billed from 60 to 30."
- "Saving slips from unretrieved holds, so that staff member can continue to search and missing items can be identified and replaced."
- "I suggested we have money kept at our circulation desk to collect fines, make change for copiers, etc."
- "Purchase of access management software to control customer access to and timed use of the Internet." (Reported multiple times.)\
- "Developing a way to serve teens and children who are delinquent borrowers."
- "Change procedures for checking out library materials when library user forgets his library card."
- "Streamline shelving directly from trucks rather than sort shelves."

➢ "Librarians can help support staff in keeping up with shelving issues … by this I mean librarians can pitch in and help shelve materials (something they weren't previously doing here.)"

Physical plant/building changes
Sample responses:
➢ "We needed to move a lot of our giveaways out to the lobby because we are running out of room. We cleaned up the lobby, I bought pamphlet holders for our many giveaways. The lobby can be windy if doors at both ends open at the same time during windy days. The pamphlet holders keep things from blowing around."
➢ "Remove a lot of unused, bulky furniture to make one area of the library more attractive and inviting."
➢ "Resurface the parking lot."
➢ "To expand the physical size of the library. This was not part of the modernization plan. I suggested that a wall be taken down and use the teacher workroom as part of the library. This will be done this summer with modernization funds."
➢ "'Coffee Break' brought in a latte machine and offers lattes to teachers and staff, making non-library users more comfortable in library."
➢ "The city department responsible for taking care of building maintenance requests does not provide feedback. They never report that they have taken care of a maintenance request, or that they haven't because they're waiting for parts, etc. The department is understaffed and therefore can't always take care of requests promptly. I have suggested that lack of communication has its own costs. But, despite the fact that the entire Library department shares this view and has communicated it to the building maintenance department and the city manager, nothing has changed."

Services
Sample responses:
➢ "Elimination of Detention Facility Library Service."
➢ "Centralization of Summer Reading Club planning, including an end of Summer Reading Club party for all participants at a local park."
➢ "I suggested we start a book discussion group."
➢ "Opening up a dedicated library training room to open computer lab whenever classes were not held."
➢ "Created 3 unit research methods class which is now offered in spring and fall semester."
➢ "Pay for additional summer performers and for events during the school year to save staff time in preparing events."
➢ "Change reference to reach out more: visit law school office building more, roam library stacks and computers, explore synchronous digital reference."

Library organization, position classification/reclassification

Sample responses:
➤ "Adding an Assistant Director."
➤ "Hire credentialed library media teachers."
➤ "Establish an administration-level position to coordinate and support outreach efforts systemwide."
➤ "Change job duties of librarians in my unit due to loss of selection responsibilities."
➤ "Complete reorganization of Central Library, consisting of many parts."
➤ "Add a clerical aide."
➤ "Suggested that we change from an inverted pyramid hierarchy to a flattened hierarchy with fewer managers and a more hands-on, consensus oriented leadership."
➤ "Realignment of staff … closing desks that were not as busy as others, deletion of one department and consolidation with another."
➤ "Staff get unpaid time off on a regular basis if find someone to cover their hours."

Training and staff development
Sample responses:
➤ "I suggested monthly meetings for the system's Children's librarians and a change in their meeting focus from programming to systemic problems/solutions."
➤ "We need to have a more coordinated effort at staff training … with an advisory team and a leader who facilitates the objectives of the team."
➤ "Increase emphasis on staff training and continuing education – both promoting various opportunities and increasing the financial support given by our organization."
➤ "Plan for active staff training before technology is implemented.'
➤ "Implementation of comprehensive job rotation at Central so all desk staff would be familiar with other desks and departments and collections."

Public relations and marketing
Sample responses:
➤ "Create a targeted marketing brochure to highlight online services."
➤ "To have a library presence in the community."
➤ "Introduction of merchandising concepts for branch libraries/increased attention to visual presentation."
➤ "Place labels and displays to promote services to students."
➤ "Direct marketing library services."

Vendor relations
Sample responses:
➤ "Change of primary automation vendor."
➤ "Change in primary book vendor and approval plan."
➤ "Change in journal vendor."
➤ "Recommend anew service provider for automation."

Technical services
Sample responses:
➢ "Outsource continuations."
➢ "Eliminate the reinforcing of paperbacks to speed processing and reduce costs."
➢ "I suggested we process newspapers differently to save time. Another employee and I wrote the steps to be taken, or rather the steps to be cut back, and presented to administration."
➢ "Eliminate the use of selected audiovisual labels and eliminate the repackaging of CD-ROM products to streamline/speed the processing of audiovisual materials."
➢ "Formalize requests from Public Services to Technical Services for material change of status; create form."

 When the control group suggestions, as a whole, are compared to the participant suggestions, as a whole, it is evident that Institute participants displayed more creative thinking and a broader understanding of libraries. Whether because of their Institute experience or not, the participants demonstrated an ability to "see the forest" rather than the trees.

The control group survey asked nine questions related to career mobility and professional activities. The questions were based on the hypothesis that individuals who committed a full week to intensive leadership training would be more likely than a control group of their peers to receive promotions, move into new positions, or exhibit leadership behavior through professional or community associations, writing or presentations, mentoring, etc. The control group survey questions and responses are shown below, along with the comparable questions and responses from Institute participants.

Question	Response	Participants	Non-Participants
19. Have you changed jobs or received a promotion since attending the Institute? *12. Have you changed jobs or received a promotion in the last two years?*	Yes	24%	45%
	No	76%	55%
22. Since attending the Institute, have you been elected or appointed to office in any professional association? *14. In the last two years, have you been elected or appointed to office in any professional association?*	Yes	28%	29%
	No	72%	71%
23. Since attending the Institute, have you joined any professional associations you did not already belong to?	Yes	31%	28%

15. In the last two years, have you joined any professional associations you did not already belong to?	No	69%	72%
24. Since attending the Institute, have you written any articles for professional publications, print or electronic?	Yes	25%	24%
16. In the last two years, have you written any articles for professional publications, print or electronic?	No	75%	76%
25. Since attending the Institute, have you delivered any presentations at professional conferences?	Yes	40%	31%
17. In the last two years, have you delivered any presentations at professional conferences?	No	60%	69%
26. Have you participated in any additional leadership training since the Institute?	Yes	44%	48%
18. Have you participated in any leadership training in the last two years?	No	56%	52%
27. Have you participated in any other continuing education since the Institute?	Yes	26%	79%
19. Have you participated in any continuing education in the last two years?	No	74%	21%
28. Have you voluntarily taken on a new professional project since the Institute?	Yes	79%	84%
20. Have you voluntarily taken on a new professional project in the last two years?	No	21%	16%
29. Have you mentored anyone since the Institute?	Yes	65%	53%
21. Have you mentored anyone in the last two years?	No	35%	47%
30. Since the Institute, have you assumed any new leadership roles outside the library (e.g., in a service organization?)	Yes	35%	30%
22. In the last two years, have you assumed any new leadership roles outside the library (e.g., in a service organization)?	No	65%	70%

Responses of the two groups show few dramatic differences. Surprisingly, the control group is more mobile in terms of careers than the participant group, by a factor of approximately two to one. Perhaps Institute participants feel loyalty to the organization that sent them to the Institute, or perhaps it is simply too early to

see the kinds of behavioral changes that might be anticipated in the Institute cadres. Institute participation seems to have had minimal impact on immediate professional behavior as expressed in the various measures surveyed. Infosurv summarized the survey results as follows:

"Institute attendees were slightly more likely than non-participants to have written articles for publication, delivered presentations at professional conferences, mentored someone and assumed new leadership roles outside the library.

"Non-participants were slightly more likely than Institute attendees to have been elected or appointed to a professional association, participated in leadership training or voluntarily taken on a new professional project in the last two years.

"The only significant difference is that non-participants noted they are 53% more likely to have attended other continuing education programs in the last two years than Institute attendees were likely to have participated in continuing education other than the Institute. This probably indicates only that most people will only attend one training program per year or longer."

Continuing Education Priorities

The consultants asked the control group about their continuing education priorities, interest in the Stanford Institute should it be held again, and barriers to participation in leadership training. Forty-three per cent (43%) of those responding indicated that leadership development is their top continuing education priority. The fifty-seven per cent (57%) of respondents who said that leadership development was not their top continuing education priority were asked, "What is your top continuing education priority." Responses were coded into the categories used by the Evaluation and Training Institute in their 2001 study of statewide continuing education needs.

The top needs were identified as technology and library technical skills, followed by management skills and (a new category, not used in the 2001 study) teaching and training skills, for both staff and customers. When asked about preferred training formats, the most popular format, with 39% of respondents selecting it, was a one-day (or shorter) workshop or seminar; this is consistent with the results of the 2001 survey and earlier surveys. This was followed by a multi-day conference, which was preferred by 35%. Only 10% preferred Web-based courses.

Cost was identified as the greatest barrier to participation in leadership training, although 41% of those responding said that their library or institution would pay for their attendance, and 39% said they didn't know if the library would pay. The second most significant barrier to attendance was release time, selected by 18% of respondents. The release time factor may have been under-reported, since

22% selected "other" in response to this question, and, when asked to elaborate, gave responses like the following:

➢ 'Young family at home needs me, and my wife is also a full-time professional."
➢ "I have a 7 year old son. My priority is to him first and being available for staff and community at my library second. It's difficult to be pulled away for any length of time."
➢ "Family commitments make it difficult for me to participate in training away from my immediate geographic area or commit to a course that may meet over several weeks."
➢ "Difficult to travel due to family obligations."
➢ "Child care concerns."
➢ "Family responsibilities."

Regardless of barriers, however, ninety-five per cent (95%) of the control group said that they would consider attending the Stanford-California State Library Institute on 21st Century Librarianship if it were held again.

Conclusions

Survey of a control group and comparison with Stanford Institute participants did not yield strong evidence of leadership-related behavioral impacts that can be attributed to the Stanford Institute. Indeed, in overall terms, it is difficult to document many significant differences between the two groups, or to accurately interpret the differences that do exist. The major differences are:

♦ Non-participants have displayed greater career mobility over the last two years, with almost twice the percentage of non-participants vs. participants reporting job changes or promotions. The Infosurv analysts suggest that, as start performers already, Institute participants might not be as likely to change jobs. Another possible interpretation is that, since 87% of the participants had their way paid by their institutions, they feel some loyalty to those institutions and are not yet ready or willing to change jobs. A follow-up survey would be needed to fully explore the meaning of this survey finding.

♦ Non-participants have been much more active than participants in taking advantage of other continuing education opportunities, with 76% having taken some continuing education program in the last two years, whereas only 26% of Institute participants have participated in any other continuing education since the Institute. This finding may not be as dramatic as it seems on the surface, however, because the Institute took an entire week, or the equivalent of seven one-day workshops. In reality, the level of training received by the two groups may be much closer than it appears.

♦ Content analysis of the essay responses describing the changes that the two groups have proposed and/or made in their organizations reveals a significant

qualitative difference between the groups. The participants displayed more creativity, a grasp of the "big picture," pursuit of more ambitious changes and projects, and implementation of more "cutting edge" technologies and methods than the control group. Responses from the control group were more focused on internal organizational changes, especially in regard to policies, procedures, and physical arrangement of the library. Control group responses were also more negative and self-serving.

"Leadership" is an intangible quality that is difficult, if not impossible, to quantify. The consultants for this study developed a survey that included questions about a number of behaviors that might reasonably be associated with leadership and might reasonably be "outcomes" of leadership training. Responses from Institute participants meant nothing in themselves, because there was no way to know whether any responses was high, low, or average for the general population of library professionals. The consultants hypothesized that if essentially the same questions were asked of a control group, the responses would either indicate that the Institute had indeed resulted in documentable behavioral outcomes, or that Institute participants were no different in their behaviors than the general population. As it turns out, at least at this time, Institute participants are very similar in their behaviors to the control group. It is possible that the time lapsed since the Institutes is insufficient for new behaviors to develop.

However, the consultants believe that that qualitative differences revealed by content analysis of the changes described by the two groups are significant. Those responses clearly reveal the strong impact that the Institute had on participants, and are on the whole, when compared with the control group responses, the responses of "leaders" in the profession.

Library Leadership Training in Context

In addition to examining the long-term results of the Stanford-California State Library Institute on 21st Century Librarianship, this study sought to determine the relative priority of library leadership training in the context of overall library continuing education needs in California.

Methodology

The consultants used several techniques to assess the relative priority of leadership training for California libraries, including:

Review of continuing education needs assessments conducted over the last ten years, with particular attention to:

O'Donnell, Peggy, and Virgo, Julie A.C. "A Continuing Education Plan for California's Libraries." Prepared for the California Networking Continuing Education Task Force in Cooperation with the California State Library. April, 1992.

Evaluation and Training Institute. "California Library Staff Continuing Education Needs Assessment." Submitted to the Stanford-California State Library Institute on 21st Century Librarianship, Infopeople, and the California Library Association. September, 2001.

Focus groups involving the directors of public libraries serving populations greater than 500,000 (Group 1 in the California Library Statistics directory).

Telephone interviews with the directors of public libraries serving populations between 200,000 and 500,000 (Group 2 in the California Library Statistics directory).

Discussion and interviews with members of the Advisory Council on California Continuing Education, which was broadly representative of the California library community.

1992 Continuing Education Plan

Examination of the 1992 Continuing Education Plan authored by Peggy O'Donnell and Julie Virgo was part of the charge for the current study. Obviously, some elements of the plan are outmoded because of the many changes that have occurred over the last ten years, particularly in regard to the Internet and other advanced technologies. However, the study was a comprehensive look at continuing education for California libraries and provides a long-term historical perspective.

While needs assessment was an element of the 1992 study, it was not the entire focus. The goal of the study was to develop "a progressive and practical three-year plan including a needs assessment to coordinate state wide continuing education activities that can be readily implemented." The plan that was developed was accepted, but not implemented.

The consultants for the 1992 study employed a variety of methodologies that were similar to those used by the consultants for the current study, i.e.:
    Survey questionnaires (350 were returned)
    Focus groups (3)
    Interviews, both telephone and in-person
    "Desired Futures" session

The plan that was developed had the following purpose: "The continuing education plan was designed to provide a comprehensive education program for the staff and trustees of California libraries. Its purpose is to ensure that members of the library community can find the education activities they need to perform effectively on the job, to keep current in changing times, and to develop personally and professionally to the fullest extent of their abilities."

Elements of the plan included:
1. A coordinating/administrative structure, to be located at the California State Library, called the Continuing Education in California Center. This Center would have its own staffing, and would be guided by an Advisory Council including providers and consumers.
2. Regular assessment of individual and institutional CE needs.
3. A CE clearinghouse.
4. A CE resource center, including consulting services.
5. A planned curriculum; that is, a sequence of courses that would be offered in a variety of delivery modes.
The plan also included provision for quality control of CE offerings.

The 1992 study's identification of continuing education needs is the aspect of the plan that is most relevant to the current study. The 1992 study found that most continuing education needs fell into five categories:

    Financial management
        Examples of courses in this category:
                Costing library services
                Writing grant proposals
                Budget preparation
    Management/administration
        Examples of courses in this category:
                Planning
                Managing the small library
                Collection development

Communication/personnel relations
    Examples of courses in this category:
        Team building
        Handling stress
        Developing leadership skills
Multicultural diversity
    Examples of courses in this category:
        Understanding different ethnic populations
        Reaching out to non-English speaking populations
Technology
    Examples of courses in this category:
        Preparation for automation
        CD-ROM
        Online databases

In addition to these main areas, the study identified a need for training in basic skills for paraprofessionals and for offering that would provide updates on current library trends and issues.

It is significant that the study identified leadership skills as a subset of training in communications and personnel relations, rather than a category of its own. This may reflect the fact that in the early 1990's economic and demographic factors were considerably different than they are today. The California economy was in recession, and library positions were difficult to obtain. There was little mobility in the profession. The bulk of the California library workforce, and especially library directors, were not thinking about retirement. A decade later, the librarian shortage is considered to be one of the greatest problems facing the profession, and an entire generation of library directors is retiring or preparing to retire. Under current conditions, leadership training assumes and importance that was lacking a decade ago.

Other findings from the 1992 study that have implications for the structure and delivery of all continuing education for California libraries include the following:
➢ People prefer one-day workshops as a delivery mechanism, but are willing to look at "long distance learning and video."
➢ All training needs an interactive component.
➢ The major factor that leads people to take part in CE is the availability of quality programs that meet the need for skills that help them perform their jobs more effectively.
➢ All but 2% of those surveyed received at least partial support for continuing education.
➢ A major problem is that there is little coordination among providers and little accessible information.
➢ Top librarians and mid-managers had the most access to CE. Paraprofessionals had the least. There was concern about paraprofessionals

who were interested in obtaining an MLS but with little time or money to pursue it.

➢ Scheduling and location of training is important. On-site training is regarded as ideal.

➢ People are primarily motivated to attend CE programs by the need to improve their job performance. They are more likely to attend a program if they have full information about an offering.

➢ Lack of time was identified as the greatest barrier.

➢ The study found that CEUs were not important to the majority of CE participants but they did want administrative recognition and the opportunity to use new skills.

➢ Library management looked most often to the State Library for CE, then to regional systems, and last to in-house training. This was reversed as you moved down through the ranks, with paraprofessionals most often receiving CE from in-house training, then from systems, and last from the State Library.

Many of these findings have been confirmed in more recent CE-related studies, including Carla Lehn's study of rural library needs and Joan Frye Williams' marketing study for Infopeople. Planning for leadership training should consider the factors enumerated above.

Interestingly, although the 1992 plan was not implemented as such, the California State Library has de facto implemented much of it through the Infopeople Project.

2001 ETI Needs Assessment

The "California Library Staff Continuing Education Needs Assessment" conducted by the Evaluation and Training Institute in 2001 was supported by a federal Library Services and Technology Act grant. The study was strictly a needs assessment that provided a detailed look at the continuing education needs of all levels of library staff, from clerical to administrative, from all types of libraries. ETI conducted the study by means of a survey that was both distributed in hard copy and available on the Web. They mailed three thousand (3,000) paper surveys and received a 21% response. One thousand sixty-one (1,061) people completed Web surveys. ETI did extensive analyses of the data collected, including in their report breakdowns by:

Type of library
Association membership
Urban/rural location
Level of staff

The study included both individual and institutional perceptions of continuing education needs, and included a look at the management view of CE needs for various levels of their staff.

Some basic facts about those who responded to the ETI survey follow:

The largest percentage (43%) of responses came from those who classified themselves as "professional." 17% said they were mid-managers. 19% were paraprofessionals.

53% of those responding held an MLS degree.

Almost 1/3 of the respondents said that they did not supervise anyone. The median number of people supervised by the respondents was 2.

Over _ of respondents have been in their current positions 10 years or less. Over _ have been at their institutions 10 years or less. 1/3 have been in the library field 10 years or less.

Respondents came from different types of libraries in the following proportions:

> 47% public
> 23% academic
> 21% school
> 8% special

The ETI survey asked a variety of questions about participation in continuing education in general, including questions about providers, preferred formats, the amount of time available for CE, how respondents learn about CE offerings, barriers to participation, and financial support for CE. Key findings from this part of the survey include the following:

✓ The largest source of training is in-house; over half of respondents said they have only 1-2 days per year for training.

✓ In terms of format, 87% of all respondents preferred one-day hands-on seminars/workshops/institutes. Lectures, guest speakers, discussion groups, and web-based tutorials were also acceptable. Teleconference, videoconference, and e-mail were not popular training formats.

✓ 30% of respondents said they want CE from colleges and universities, and 29% said they want to attend an accredited library school. These options were most popular among paraprofessional and clerical staff.

✓ Most people still learn about CE opportunities via print announcements sent to work.

✓ 60% said both the individual and the institution are responsible for paying for CE. Rural respondents personally spend less and receive less from their institutions. School librarians personally spend the most and receive the least support.

✓ The greatest obstacle to participation in CE is release time (82%), followed by travel distance (63%), and then expense (54%).

The survey also asked about the perceived need for training in specific topics within six broad areas:

> Technology
> Needs assessment
> Leadership/career
> Management
> Library technical skills
> Community outreach and public service

The specific topics were pre-defined by ETI, working with and advisory group from the California library community. Within any of the six areas, the topics listed were not comprehensive. For example, in the Technology area there was no topic that would cover training in subject-specific Internet resources, such as law or business. Respondents did have the opportunity to add a topic of their own, but few did so. The following table, from page 18 of the report, shows the overall picture of perceived library staff continuing education needs, from the individual perspective:

Continuing Education Area	Primary <u>Have Taken</u> Topics	Primary <u>Want to Take</u> Topics
Technology	*Basic Software Skills* (76%) *Basic Internet Skills (74%)*	*Library Service Related Specific Technology Updates* (55%) *Electronic Information Resources Management (50%)*
Library Technical Skills	*Basic Reference Skills* (54%) *Basic Cataloguing (42%) Collections Development* (40%)	*Managing E-Resources* (42%) *Electronic Reference (39%)*
Leadership/Career	*Written and Verbal Communication Skills* (45%) *Conflict Resolution Skills (44%) Supervisory Skills (44%) Stress Management (40%)*	*Fostering Creativity and innovation (46%) Promoting Cultural Competence (34%) Supervisory Skills (34%) Stress Management (40%)*
Management	*Emergency Preparedness (39%) Staff Communication (34%)*	*Using Data for Decision Making (36%) Technology Planning (36%) Staff Motivation (35%) Public Relations (34%)*
Community Outreach	*Customer Relations (52%) Communication Skills (45%)*	*Promoting Library Services (30%) Serving Individuals with Low Literacy Skills (30%) Serving Diverse Clientele (27%) Providing Access to Information Resources (26%)*
Needs Assessment	*Evaluating Resources and Collections (24%) Program Evaluation (17%) Community Needs Assessment (15%)*	*Evaluating Resources and Collections (48%) Technological Needs Assessment (41%) Community Needs Assessment (38%) Program Evaluation (38%) Instruments for Measuring Service (37%)*

Of particular interest to the current study of the Stanford Institute were the ETI findings on what continuing education topics top managers thought their mid-managers should take. The following table (p. 21 of the study) displays the topics identified by library managers as being of most importance for their mid-management staff.

Continuing Education Area	Continuing Education Topics
Management	*Staff Motivation* (42%) *Staff Communication* (39%)
Leadership and Career	*Fostering Creativity and Innovation* (41%) *Supervisory Skills* (39%) *Goalsetting* (38%)
Technology	*Electronic Information Resources* (25%) *Basic Software Skills* (25%) *Library Services Related Specific Technology Updates* (25%)
Needs Assessment	*Technological Needs Assessment* (36%) *Instruments for Measuring Services* (35%) *Community Needs Assessment* (34%) *Program Evaluation* (33%)
Library Technical Skills	*Licensing and Negotiating Contracts* (29%) *Managing E-Resources* (25%) *Electronic Reference* (22%)
Community Outreach	*Promoting Library Services* (37%) *Customer Relations* (31%) *Serving Diverse Clientele* (28%)

Some general observations on the ETI findings by CE area follow.

Technology. ETI concluded that "Technology training is the most popular area among library staff and across analyses." 92% of the respondents had taken at least one technology-related CE course, and 88% said that they wanted to take more training in this area. The widespread deployment of technology training through the Infopeople Project may partially account for the findings in this area.

Library technical skills. Topics in this area are popular among library staff, with 71% having taken, and 79% wanting to take, courses in this area. The survey results also documented the need for basic core courses for paraprofessional and clerical staff, and for those working in rural public libraries.

Leadership/career. This area ranked third in the overall individual needs assessment, with 70% of respondents having taken, and 72% wanting to take, courses in this area. However, many of the specific topics listed in this area relate more to career than to leadership development as defined in this study. In fact, only "Goalsetting" and "Fostering creativity and innovation" would fit into leadership training as defined earlier in this study, and neither of

these topics ranked at the top in this area. However, top managers listed both topics as of high importance for their mid-managers to take.

Management. Although ETI identified this area as "not nearly as popular a continuing education area as technology and technical skills," top managers ranked it at the top in terms of importance for mid-managers.

Neither Community Outreach nor Needs Assessment was perceived as an area of high need.

The ETI survey results were consistent with earlier and less comprehensive studies from the O'Donnell/Virgo study. All of these studies rank leadership training somewhere in the middle in terms of the continuing education needs of California libraries – not as important as technology or basic library skills, but higher than community outreach or needs assessment. It should be noted, however, that the studies presented leadership training as simply another topic, or series of topics, that would presumably be delivered as one-day workshops or in some other very short-term mode. Leadership training was not presented in any of the studies as it is delivered by institutes such as Stanford, Snowbird, or Frye – that is, as an intensive, multi-day, residential program. In order to get an assessment of how California libraries would react when presented with leadership training as a residential institute, the consultants conducted two focus groups and thirty individual interviews with public library directors.

Focus Groups

The consultants invited the directors of those California public libraries that serve populations greater than 500,000 to participate in a focus group devoted to library continuing education needs in general and to the Stanford Institute in particular. The first focus group was held in northern California, at the Contra Costa County Library headquarters in Pleasant Hill, on July 16, 2002. The second was held in southern California, at the Los Angeles Public Central Library, on July 19, 2002.

The agenda for the groups consisted of a series of questions that led from consideration of continuing education and training in general to discussion of leadership and leadership training, and ended with a discussion of the Stanford Institute. The specific questions that were addressed to the groups were:

Questions on CE and training

1-must discuss:
How important are CE and training in your library?
        Is training a crisis, a challenge, or just business as usual?
How do you identify what training your staff needs?
Who's in greatest need of training?
        New hires?

Support staff?
Line staff?
Mid-managers?
Managers?
What do you regard as the most important CE/training needs in your library?
What are the greatest barriers to meeting those needs?
What kind(s) of assistance would help you to overcome those barriers?
Who is responsible for ensuring that library staff are properly trained?
What is the local library's role?
What is the parent jurisdiction's role?
What is the individual staff member's role?
What is the State Library's role?
What is the local system or network role?
What is CLA's role?
Are there other entities that have a role, and what is it?
In your opinion, should CE be a statewide priority at this time? Why or why not?

2-also important:
Have you identified core competencies for your library staff?
Which staff levels are affected?
Have you tied performance evaluations to core competencies or CE?
Does your library use individual training plans or learning contracts?
Does your library have a formal training program?
Do you have a full-time training coordinator or training staff?
Do you have a budget for training?
What proportion of your training is done in-house?
Do you use outside contractors/CE providers? Who? What factors
determine which providers you use?
What factors drive your decisions in regard to staff training?
What factors drive your decisions about training for yourself?
Describe two training or CE events that really had an impact on you.
From a statewide perspective, what do you think are the major gaps or
weaknesses in library education in California?

Questions on leadership

What is library leadership?
How can leadership best be fostered?
One on one mentoring?
Degree program?
Other kind(s) of training?
Do you think that it is possible to develop leaders through training, or are leaders
"born that way"?
If organized training is appropriate, what should library leadership training look
like?
What is the difference between leadership training and management training?
How did you become a leader? Did you attend any specific program or training?
Were you mentored?

Who is responsible for developing library leaders?
> What is your role as an individual?
> What is the local library's role?
> What is the parent jurisdiction's role?
> What is the individual staff member's role?
> What is the State Library's role?
> What is the local system or network role?
> What is CLA's role?
> Are there other entities that have a role, and what is it?

In your opinion, should leadership development be a statewide priority at this time? Why or why not?

Questions on the Stanford Institute

Did your library send anyone to the Stanford Institute?
> If yes, what did you hope that your staff would gain from the Institute?
> Did you discuss their Institute experiences with them?
> Were the results what you expected? Why or why not?
> If you didn't send anyone, why not?

What other approaches or alternatives for leadership development or training can you suggest?
> What are the strengths and weaknesses of each?

If the Institute were to be continued in a modified form, what do you regard as the essential elements that must be maintained?
> What changes could be made?

In your opinion should continuing the Stanford Institute or a similar program be a statewide priority at this time? Why or why not?

If there's one message you want to be sure we hear from you today, what would that be?

Since the responses of the two groups were quite different, the two meetings will be summarized separately.

Northern California Focus Group, July 16, 2002

The group had the following comments about continuing education and training:

In regard to the CE needs of large libraries:
> Rapid changes in society and technology mean that CE needs are greatest in those areas.
> Large libraries have a long-term workforce, little turnover, few opportunities to bring in new people or expose staff to new ways of working.
> Professionals in large libraries are less likely to get a broad range of different types of experience; they tend to be specialized, and insulated from management.
> If just one person participates in training, the benefit of that training tends to get lost in a large organization; it is best if at least three people from the

library participate together, so they can reinforce training and support each other back on the job

Training is needed to supplement library school content, preferably after the librarian has spent some time on the job. Some specific training needs are:
>　help with learning how to think strategically, to look beyond the immediate problem;
>　encouragement to make one's own lifelong CE plans, to take responsibility for one's own continued professional development;
>　training in critical thinking skills;
>　training in/exposure to interdisciplinary issues, e.g. how public policy (not just library policy) is developed, how large organizations work;
>　training in project management;
>　training in how to plan and teach others to deliver service, as opposed to delivering it oneself;
>　training in how to promote growth and development of others.

Non-librarians – including paraprofessionals, allied professionals (literacy specialists, IT staff, business office staff, fundraisers) and commissioners – would benefit from training in core library values as applied to current library issues

California should look into the development of formal CE requirements for library professionals:
>　Certification can be a seal of quality.
>　If CE were required, that might protect training budgets – travel and training are often targeted for budget cuts when money is tight.
>　Large libraries may function as training institutions – "teaching libraries."
>　Realistically, agreements with employee organizations will make the transition to any kind of mandatory CE very difficult.

This group saw the State Library's role in CE as being to:
>　continue and expand Infopeople, addressing new topics and reaching out to new groups, based on ongoing needs assessment.

The group had the following comments about leadership and leadership development:

They defined leadership as including:
>　awareness of, and sensitivity to, the broader community;
>　vision;
>　communicating vision and values to others;
>　setting the tone for an organization and its services;
>　coaching and encouraging staff at the next level down.

Qualifications for leadership include:
>　political sense, interest;

strong work ethic;
high energy level;
critical thinking skills;
self confidence, comfort with oneself;
ability to have ownership and responsibility for an issue or project without being too ego involved – ability to step back and redirect without feeling a personal failure;
ability to stay the course, not cave in to pressure to abandon one's professional judgment;
ability to make decisions;
willingness to be mobile, to plan one's career strategically.

Leadership training "essentials" include:
quality experience, atmosphere, environment;
big picture perspective;
on site for at least 3 days;
bring people from different organizations together to form peer groups;
allow unstructured networking time;
leaders need time to reflect;
support for risk taking;
invite highest quality, outside speakers;
need some kind of concrete follow up plan to translate training into action.

Different types of leadership training may be needed at 5, 10, or15 years into a professional's career – the current library directors' critical "turning point" came at about the 8-year point (age 30 for somebody who entered library school right after college).

People who are already in leadership roles need training in how to be good professional coaches.

In regard to the State Library's role in leadership development, this group thought that:
Leadership development is definitely a statewide issue – individual libraries can't do all that's needed.
An institute-style event is the most promising approach.
The State Library should invite grant proposals – and possibly earmark funds – to support ideas/projects that come out of an institute event, to give trainees a chance to put what they've learned into practice
The State Library should consider sponsoring mid-career fellowships so that prospective leaders can partner/shadow a director at another institution – this must be practical, on-the-job (not just theoretical) training. While it may be difficult to get candidates to relocate, it would be very worthwhile if this could be accomplished.

The Northern California group had the following comments about the Stanford Institute:

They suggested modifications including:
- Make it an event, not an institution.
- Reduce the number of attendees, but hold it annually.
- It could be less frequent than annual if necessary; the group had a positive response to the idea of alternating the institute with an enhanced CLA and/or the public library directors' meeting.
- Reduce the time to 3-5 days.
- Do not hold it over a weekend.
- Consider using a conference center rather than a college, because of the availability of experienced support staff.
- Do not invite out-of-state participants.
- Accept that leadership training is expensive; the group was willing to have libraries pay more of the cost, up to $2500-3000 per attendee.

Southern California Focus Group, July 19, 2002

Comments about Continuing Education and Training:

Discussion soon revealed, as one participant noted, than even among the largest public libraries in the state, there is a great diversity of needs. However, the group shared some common issues:
- Need to train paraprofessionals, in practical skills and in library philosophy and values.
- Concern about "lifers" who don't want to change or learn anything new. Training will not impact these people.
- Civil services concerns.
- Geography and staff size are two major factors impacting the ability to deliver training.
- Distance education cannot take the place of face-to-face interaction.
- Consistency in the quality of training is important and difficult to achieve.
- Local jurisdictions provide training in the basics – Word, supervisory skills, etc.
- It is probably impossible to deliver the amount of training that staff would consider "just right" – it seems that they either think there's not enough or too much.
- Recruitment, especially of MLS librarians, is the biggest issue in every library – but it's not a training issue.
- Workloads have changed – they are greater – so it is more difficult for staff to take time for training.
- All libraries present use and like Infopeople training. Several libraries requested more Infopeople training in their areas.
- Several libraries expressed the need for more "train the trainer" instruction, like the recent Infopeople Master Trainer Program.

Participants expressed varying opinions about library schools, ranging from a comment that they are "boring and worthless" to suggestions that they might be used as partners in a program designed to recruit more people into the profession.

The group had the following comments about leadership and leadership development:

There was consensus that leadership development and training is important.
    Leadership training is difficult to provide.
    Tight civil services systems inhibit leadership development.
    Leadership training is expensive.
    If you're going to do it, do it right – invest the necessary money.
    The Tall Texans program might be a model worth investigating. It is less costly than Stanford. It involves 40 or so people at a time. It's a great way of increasing camaraderie among librarians.
    Mentoring is an important, perhaps crucial, element of leadership development. Several of the libraries had mentoring programs in the past.
    The current wave of retirements is stripping libraries of the experienced administrators who could serve as mentors.
    You can be a leader without being a manager, and leadership development needs to include ways to engage people in leadership – through projects, community outreach, etc.
    The leadership training program recently initiated by the Urban Libraries Council does not meet the needs of the libraries participating in this focus group.
    PLA has developed a statement on leadership competencies. Susan Kent has been involved in the PLA workshop "What Makes a Leader."

Are leaders born or made? The group concurred that some people never respond to any kind of training. They felt that you can tell in a short time whether an individual has a lot of potential. They also noted that some people with a lot of potential never develop it.

The group identified the following attributes of a leader:
    open-mindedness;
    flexibility;
    willingness to take risks;
    willingness to speak out;
    charismatic;
    interested in making a difference.

Several members of the group said that the library field offers nothing that nourishes and meets the intellectual needs of the directors of large public libraries, so they have to go outside the field. Suggestions included:
    The State Library should put together a "cutting-edge" event for library directors.
    This event should combine a "refresh experience" that would, like the Aspen Institute, be broader than libraries and would include someone who can "push the envelope" with practical, real-world example of things that organizations have done.
    Top management consultants should be hired to address the library directors.

The Southern California group had the following comments about the Stanford-State Library Institute:

The Institute was a really great idea, and people are still talking about it. However:
    It was very expensive.
    It was exhausting for those who participated.
    There was too much emphasis on technology.
    Few people from the libraries represented at the focus group attended, primarily because of the length of the Institute.
    If the Stanford Institute is to continue (and that was a big if for the group), it should be scaled back to become much more modest. The primary change should be in length of the event.
    There was some interest in linking the Institute to the CLA Conference.

Individual libraries supported the following concepts:
    A series of leadership training events, held over time and available in enough locations that people would not miss more than one day of work at a time. The library that supported this approach felt that because the training would take place over time it would be absorbed better. This approach also would reach more people at lower cost.
    Attach the Institute concept to CLA.
    Modify the Institute by shortening the length but hold it every year for a smaller group of participants. The audience could be targeted or rotated – e.g., one year could focus on youth services librarians, etc.

The group had the following comments about the role of the State Library in continuing education:

There was general agreement with the suggestion made by one of the libraries present that the State Library should distribute funding for continuing education on a per capita basis. It was noted that this approach would be responsive to geographic needs as money would be given to all geographic areas. Also, this approach would be simple to apply for and administer because it would be formula-driven. The group thought that at least some funding should be distributed in this manner, and that there should be a matching requirement.

Other suggestions included:
    The state's role should be to coordinate training efforts and to make sure that people are aware of what's available.
    There should be more cooperation between the State Library and CLA.
    Public libraries need a new type of cutting-edge event for library directors.
    There was general agreement that getting all public library directors together is valuable.
    The State Library should purchase blocks of seats at existing leadership development institutes.

The State Library could make trainers available on a "circuit rider" basis, so they could go directly to branch libraries to teach.
State Library consultants should not do training themselves.
The State Library should fund the development of a database of trainers, with evaluations.
The State Library should partner with the library schools in a program to recruit more people into the profession.
The concept of a library practitioners' program holds some interest as a way to bridge the gap in skill sets. One library expressed interest in having it be part of a ladder that would take people through college and library school.
There is some interest in having a college or university offer a B.A. or B.S. in Library Science.

In summary, the northern focus group was in favor of continuing the Stanford Institute in a modified form. The southern focus group was much less favorably disposed towards continuing the Institute, but thought that if it were continued it would have to be modified. There was more support among the southern group for alternative means of leadership development.

Telephone Interviews

In August 2002, the consultants conducted individual telephone interviews with the directors of thirty California public libraries serving populations of 200,000 or more. All were asked the same questions and were given an opportunity to make additional comments. A complete summary of the interview responses is available as *Appendix #9*.

The library directors were asked whether they would be likely to invest local library funding in training in five areas:
Leadership development
Management/supervisory skills
Technology
Library skills
Customer service/professional development

Leadership development fell in the middle in terms of positive response – i.e., the number of directors who said they would be "likely" to invest in training in this area. The areas ranked as follows in terms of positive response:
1. Technology – 24 libraries "likely" to invest
2. Management/supervisory skills – 23 libraries "likely" to invest
3. Leadership development – 20 libraries "likely" to invest
4. Customer service/professional development – 20 libraries "likely" to invest
5. Library skills – 17 libraries "likely" to invest

Almost all library directors reported that their local jurisdictions (city, county) have "leadership academies" or other leadership training programs.

The directors were asked to assign a high, medium, or low priority to State Library investment in the same five training areas. Leadership development ranked second, just behind technology, in the number of directors ranking it as a "high priority" for the State Library. The areas ranked as follows by number of directors assigning a high priority rating:

1. Technology – 24
2. Leadership development – 20
3. Library skills – 17
4. Customer service/professional development – 14
5. Management/supervisory skills – 7

All but one of the directors were familiar with the Stanford Institute; the one who wasn't had recently moved to California from another state. Less than half of the libraries, thirteen (13), had staff who attended the Institute. The directors who had staff attend were asked what outcomes, if any, they noticed, and reported the following:

       No real change (4)
       Greater confidence (3)
       Increased enthusiasm (4)
       More global perspective (2)
       Takes initiative on projects (2)
       Doing good work but still doesn't want to be and administrator (2)
       Left immediately to take another job
       Slightly more likely to take a risk
       More committed to the profession
       Participants were senior managers already. They had a great time.
       Participants took on major projects with great confidence and won
           awards from the city

The seventeen libraries that had no one attend the Institute were asked why no one attended. Factors that were mentioned multiple times include:

       Lack of interest (8)
       Staff shortages – couldn't give release time (6)
       Personal scheduling issues (2)
       Financial issues (2)
       Too many other commitments at the library (2)

Other responses were:

       No time to complete the application
       Distance
       Not impressed with the curriculum – too "university"
       Restrictive local travel policy

Over two thirds of the directors – 22 – had taken some type of formal leadership training themselves. Many noted that they did this on their own, after they became directors.

The directors were presented with alternative methods for providing leadership training, and were asked to rank each as being of high interest, some interest, or

little or no interest. The alternatives ranked by number of "high interest" responses were as follows:

1. Provide leadership training as a series of shorter events that would be offered multiple times in multiple locations. (20)
2. Provide scholarships for California librarians to attend other leadership programs. (17)
3. Continue the Institute in a modified form. (12)
4. Contract with some agency, such as the CSU, that will do leadership training as a business. (11)
5. Provide an incentive for one of the library schools – or some other California educational institution – to develop a library leadership program. (3)

A large majority of the directors – 25 of the 30 – thought that leadership training should be targeted to librarians with 3-10 years of experience.

Overall, the directors surveyed perceived a need for leadership training. Two-thirds were willing to invest their own funds in such training, and two-thirds identified it as a high priority area for the State Library. In the context of other CE needs, for local libraries leadership development falls about in the middle. The directors surveyed were open to re-examining the format for delivering library leadership development in California. Fewer than half expressed high interest in continuing the Stanford Institute even in modified form. Two-thirds expressed high interest in providing leadership training as a series of shorter events offered multiple times in multiple locations (the Infopeople model). Almost two-thirds (17) had high interest in the idea of scholarships for California librarians to attend leadership programs that already exist.

Continuing Education Opportunities in California

In order to make a recommendation concerning the future of the Stanford Institute, the consultants were asked to identify continuing education opportunities within California for California library staff. Of particular interest would be any leadership training.

The largest single provider of continuing library education in California is the Infopeople Project. Infopeople offers over 300 on-ground workshops per year. The workshops cover over 40 different topics, many of which are new introductions and deal with cutting-edge technologies. In addition, Infopeople has pioneered asynchronous Web-based instruction and Webcasts. Infopeople has expanded, in response to demand from the field, beyond narrowly defined technology training. Infopeople took over a series of library construction workshops from the Stanford Institute, and offers workshops on non-technology topics such as Project Management, Rethinking Library Staffing, Effective Library Statistics, and Library Laws. Infopeople is a federal Library Services and Technology Act project funded by the California State Library. Fees charged for Infopeople workshops are used to support program activities, and supplement the federal grant support. Infopeople does not provide leadership training per se.

Other library continuing education opportunities include:

Individual libraries and jurisdictions
- Surveys indicate that the largest percentage of library CE is provided through individual library jurisdictions, but there is no information about topics, quality, frequency, etc.

Library systems and networks
- Both CLSA systems and LOC networks provide various kinds of training opportunities for their members. The nature, quality, and frequency vary by system.
- Good training is not identified and shared statewide.

College and University Library Education Programs
- 3 Master's degree programs
- 6 universities award Library Media Teacher credentials
- 15 colleges offer library technology/media technician degrees or certificates
- non-degree activities, e.g. UCLA Friday Forums

Professional associations
- CLA – primarily through the annual conference, although some sections offer workshops during the year (e.g., ACTSS)
- American Society of Indexers – northern and southern chapters –each do 3-4 workshops/year
- CARL – holds an annual conference, plus various interest groups hold 1-2 workshops per year
- SLA – 4 chapters, each holds numerous meetings with speakers and offers workshops
- Workshops are usually offered in only one location and are not repeated.

California State Library
- Periodic workshops throughout the state, usually related to LSTA projects

There is currently no library leadership development offered by any CE provider in California.

Advisory Council Comments

The consultants for this study were guided by an Advisory Council that was broadly representative of the California library community, and that included providers as well as consumers of continuing education. A list of Advisory Council members can be found in *Appendix #13.*

The Advisory Council met in June and September, and through group deliberations determined that the following elements are essential to any future library leadership development in California:

> A residential program in an academic or retreat environment, with Adequate free time for bonding and rejuvenation.
> High-end speakers.
> Participants must stay for the entire program.
> The program must include small group activities that are interactive, practical, and short.
> There must be team building or other exercises in the afternoon that involve small group dynamics.
> The event must be held on some kind of regular schedule that is known far enough in advance so that people can plan.
> There must be sufficient, "go-fer" type help and good IT support.
> Participants must include a mix across types of libraries.
> It is not necessary to include participants from outside California.
> There must be good communication with the field.
> There should be CEUs for those who want them.
> Provide discounts or other incentives for contributions.
> **It must happen!**

The Advisory Council also noted that the term "leadership" is applied to a whole range of skills and behaviors, from basic supervision to the visionary sorts of behavior that the Stanford Institute sought to foster. They thought that Infopeople can handle the technical training on budgeting, developing business plans, conducting needs assessments, etc., but that there is a need for training beyond this level, training like that provided by the Stanford Institute.

The Advisory Council believes that there is merit to having a focused, multi-day leadership training event. Among the benefits of this approach are:

- o Strong cohort development
- o Provides different setting, away from the library, which enables participants to focus
- o Allows participants to interact with people from outside the library

Complete minutes from the Advisory Council meetings are available on the Institute Web site at http://institute21.stanford.edu/.

California Library Leadership Training Needs

Review and analysis of all of the data collected during the course of this study have identified the following areas as the most important components of California library leadership training:

Career management. The concept of charting a strategic course for one's career that stretches into the future and over a series of different jobs is not a traditional part of professional library training. However, there is consensus among current library leaders that it is important for the leaders of the future to understand their personal and professional development decisions in the context of overall career management.   Career management skills include
    Viewing one's career development as an ongoing process;
    Formulating career goals;
    Making realistic plans for continuing professional development;
    Identifying the range of opportunities open to one; and
    Seeking job assignments that best enable one to learn and grow as a leader.

Leadership assessment.   Prospective leaders can progress more quickly if they are able to identify their leadership strengths and weaknesses. This enables them to use their strengths to best advantage, and to pursue training and development opportunities that address their weaknesses. Leadership assessment entails
    Assessment of individual abilities in critical leadership areas e.g., goal setting, analytic reasoning;
    Understanding of one's personal leadership style;
    Learning how one's personality, emotional intelligence, and interpersonal skills shape leadership behaviors; and
    Understanding the implications of different leadership behaviors in specific organizational contexts.

Many leadership assessment tools are based on personality profile instruments such as Meyers-Briggs and Enneagram. Some forms of leadership assessment involve peer evaluation and 360-degree feedback. There are also a number of basic leadership assessment tools available free or for a nominal fee online. Representative examples can be viewed at:
PsychTests: http://www.psychtests.com/tests/career/leadership_r_access.html and
Leadersdirect: http://www.leadersdirect.com/leadstyle.html#

Intensive leadership development experience.   There is widespread agreement among California library leaders, Stanford Institute participants, library

educators, and experts in the leadership development field that an intensive leadership program or event can be a powerful transforming experience – the literal turning point in someone's career. The Stanford Institute is an example of such an event. Intensive programs allow prospective leaders to focus on leadership for an extended period and to experience their own leadership qualities in new ways. To be most effective, an intensive leadership development experience should

> Extend over at least three days;
> Involve full time commitment and participation by the attendees;
> Challenge attendees to stretch and explore the limits of their capabilities;
> Take place in a setting that is free of workplace or other day-to-day distractions;
> Allow time for reflection upon and internalization of the experience as it unfolds; and
> Facilitate the kinds of one-on-one interactions that lead to the development of a lasting bond with other attendees.

The specific subject content of the leadership experience is less important than its intensity. It is also interesting to note that the intensive leadership experience need not be positive to be effective. Many of the leaders interviewed for this study indicated that their greatest professional growth and strongest bonds with their colleagues had come in response to intensive negative or difficult experiences.

Exposure to new perspectives. A key component in the development of the vision required for effective leadership is exposure to new and unfamiliar perspectives. Prospective library leaders need opportunities to learn about

> New and emerging theories, techniques, and technologies in a variety of fields;
> "Real world" social phenomena and trends;
> Values and tools from other disciplines;
> Values and perspectives from other cultures;
> Techniques for questioning assumptions and exploring ambiguities; and
> Techniques for stimulating creativity and new ideas.

Distributed and follow-up training. Not all prospective leaders are ready or able to commit to the time away from home required for participation in an extended, intensive leadership experience. Nor can all who might be qualified to participate in such an event be easily accommodated at a single place and time. And those who have participated in such an experience can still benefit from ongoing, follow-up training as they grow and progress in their careers. Leadership training opportunities that are widely distributed throughout the state and throughout the year can reach a broader audience of prospective leaders and build upon the impact of a single, more intensive program or event.

Some library leadership programs have begun to explore follow-up programs designed to further the work initiated at an intensive leadership event. For example, the Aurora Leadership Institute (Australia) is organizing a three and a half day Recall Meeting, open to all mentors and participants in the previous Aurora Leadership Institutes. Institute trainers will also be present. The intention is to allow the maximum opportunity for continued vigorous debate and a significant use of case study methodologies

Late career refresher training. Most leadership training focuses on the need to produce new leaders. However, many of the individuals surveyed for this study indicated a strong desire for training that would refresh and re-energize librarians who are in the final stage of their careers.

This desire is not limited to California librarians. In Canada, the Northern Exposure to Leadership program is exploring a new concept they call *Ten to Go,* a self-selected Institute for those who wish to stay energetic and productive in the last years of their career, and who wish to make a life-long commitment to creating and sustaining the libraries and the librarians of the future.

Recommended Approach to Meeting California's Library Leadership Training Needs

Based on all of the data collected and analyzed in the course of this study, the consultants recommend that the State Library take the following actions to meet the leadership training needs of California librarians:

Components of Leadership Training	Year	Recommended State Library Actions
Career management	1	Sponsor development of career management information and make it available on the State Library Web site or a State Library-related Web site
	2	Initiate liaison with Library Schools to encourage them to incorporate career management in their curricula
	3	Sponsor Webcasts on career management for library personnel
Leadership assessment	1	Sponsor the identification, evaluation, and dissemination of information about existing leadership assessment tools
	2	Sponsor development of a distance education course on leadership assessment
	3	Sponsor development of leadership self-assessment tools and make them available on the State Library Web site or a State Library-related Web site
Intensive leadership development experience	1	Explore alternative model(s) of delivering an intensive leadership development experience
	1	Sponsor the identification, evaluation, and dissemination of information about existing intensive leadership development programs and events
	2	Fund scholarships for library personnel to participate in such programs and events Sponsor intensive leadership development

Intensive experience, cont.	2	event based on an alternate model, designed specifically for California library personnel
	3	Evaluate effectiveness of alternative model(s)
Exposure to new perspectives	1	Sponsor the identification, evaluation, and dissemination of information about existing programs and events that can expose library personnel to new perspectives
	1	Sponsor library conference programs on cutting-edge topics and views from outside the library profession
	2	Fund scholarships for library personnel to participate in such existing programs and events
	3	Sponsor Webcasts on cutting-edge topics and views from outside the library profession
Distributed and follow-up leadership training	1	Sponsor the identification, evaluation, and dissemination of information about existing leadership training opportunities throughout the state
	3	Sponsor the development and delivery of library leadership courses throughout the state
Late career refresher training	1	Assess specific need(s) for late career training
	2	Sponsor development and delivery of one or more "refresher" events aimed at late career librarians

Next Steps

The consultants recommend the following next steps to move the leadership training initiative forward:

- ✓ Review and evaluation of consultant recommendations;

- ✓ Validation of survey results for all of California by sampling responses from other types and sizes of libraries;

- ✓ Articulation of a statewide leadership development strategy in the context of an overall approach to continuing education; and

- ✓ Development of a leadership training implementation plan, with costs.