

## Mapping the residency program landscape

By: [LaTasha Velez](#), Jason Alston, Nataly Blas, Kathy Bradshaw, Orolando Duffus, Denelle Eads, [Gerald Holmes](#), and Olivia Patterson

Velez, L., Alston, J., Blas, N., Bradshaw, K., Duffus, O., Eads, D., Holmes, G., & Patterson, O. (2021). Mapping the residency program landscape. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 47(5), 102389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102389>

© 2021 Elsevier Inc. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

### **Abstract:**

When properly structured, library residencies introduce recently graduated Master of Library and/or Information Science (MLIS) professionals to librarianship, allow recent graduates to apply the knowledge and skills learned during their MLIS studies, and infuse host institutions with new, innovative ideas, including the latest technology and theory being taught in library and information science (LIS) programs. Unfortunately, rather than realizing their potential, residencies are often hampered by miscommunication and a lack of organization that cause real harm to the new resident and the current employees by creating a tense, sometimes even hostile, work environment. This can negate the potential benefits of a residency program, leaving the resident unhappy and disillusioned by the library profession. Understanding the current landscape of residency programs is a necessary first step toward evaluating the efficacy of this form of early career employment in retaining an innovative and engaged next generation of library professionals. Using survey research, this study answered the questions: What are the characteristics of residency programs? How is success measured in residency programs? What are some specific best practices that residency programs are currently implementing? The findings from this survey indicate that there is no one-size-fits-all residency program structure, from the mission and goals of the programs to how a program measures its ultimate success, responses were varied. While there are positive trends, like residencies lasting for at least two years, there is still much work to be done. Notably, most programs still only have one resident per cohort and residency cohorts do not overlap leading residents to feel isolated. While we concede there are likely many concerns (including budgetary) that may make two or more residents per cohort or overlapping cohorts unfeasible, it is an issue that should be addressed because many residents themselves have asked for this change. We also detail several suggestions for building and maintaining buy-in among stakeholders in the residency program, a necessary step toward ensuring each resident feels welcome in an institution and is ultimately successful. It is our hope that this research provides residency program coordinators with a roadmap to follow when planning or re-evaluating their residencies.

**Keywords:** Library residency programs | Diversity residency programs | Best practices | Communication with stakeholders | Suggestions for residency program coordinators/supervisors

### **Article:**

## Introduction

When properly structured, library residencies introduce recently graduated Master of Library and/or Information Science (MLIS) professionals to librarianship, allow recent graduates to apply the knowledge and skills learned during their MLIS studies, and infuse host institutions with new, innovative ideas including the latest technology and theory being taught in library and information science (LIS) programs. They also frequently introduce different perspectives to the institution that can help the library re-evaluate existing policies and procedures that may have become entrenched over time, and they prepare residents for advancement, or even leadership, within the field. At a moment in time when a global pandemic has caused libraries to re-evaluate how they provide services and allocate spending, library residency programs are uniquely positioned to offer recent graduates early career opportunities to network and make themselves visible in ways that may otherwise be dwindling in such an uncertain library environment. Residency programs teach skills such as adaptability and relationship building to both new employees and longtime library professionals. Within this group of residency programs are “diversity residency programs,” which are designed to increase the number of underrepresented and marginalized people within librarianship. Because of all of these important aspects, residency programs are, and will continue to be, a valuable tool in reinvigorating the library profession.

Unfortunately, rather than realizing their potential, residencies are often hampered by miscommunication and lack of organization. This causes real harm to the new resident and the current employees by creating a tense, sometimes even hostile, work environment, in effect negating the potential benefits of a residency program and leaving the resident unhappy and disillusioned by the library profession (Rutledge, Colbert, Chiu, & Alston, 2019, p. 3). Diversity initiatives in particular, including diversity residency programs, have been criticized for not, in fact, changing the demographics of the profession and being performative anti-racist efforts rather than true attempts to change librarianship by incorporating minoritized, silenced voices (Alabi, 2018; Hankins, Saunders, & Situ, 2003; Hathcock, 2014; Hu & Patrick, 2006). Considering the valid criticisms leveled against residency programs, the dearth of research into mapping the current state of these programs and the efficacy of using them to retain recently graduated LIS professionals and diversify librarianship is particularly concerning. While there is literature from residents describing their experiences and from residency coordinators that provide individual case studies and best practices of their own programs, larger scale research on residencies that collect data from a number of different residency programs is lacking. Brewer undertook such a study in 1998 as did Boyd et al. in 2017, but both studies emphasized diversity residency programs rather than all residencies generally. Because of the potential benefits of this form of early career employment, residencies should not be abandoned; rather, residency program coordinators need clear guidelines on best practices that can be implemented to improve residency programs. There is a need for a more complete picture that includes all residencies, not just those that explicitly target librarians from underrepresented populations, in order to aid future residency program coordinators in planning successful programs. Insights from other residency programs may also help current residents articulate what they want and need from their residency, as well as arm future residents with important things to look for when selecting and interviewing for residency programs.

This study extends previous literature in the field by adding research that answers the following questions: What are the characteristics of residency programs? How is success measured in residency programs? What are some specific best practices that residency programs are currently implementing? It is our hope that answering these questions will provide residency program coordinators with a roadmap to follow when planning or re-evaluating their residencies. Understanding the current landscape of residency programs is also a necessary first step toward evaluating the efficacy of this form of early career employment in retaining an innovative and engaged next generation of library professionals.

## **Literature review**

### History of residency programs

There is less information regarding residency programs than diversity residency programs. However, research shows that post-master's employment programs originated in the 1940s, with the oldest programs beginning in the Library of Congress and the National Library of Medicine. Their goal was “to recruit highly talented graduates from library education programs and to prepare them for accelerated careers in academic and research libraries” (Brewer, 1998, p. 528). The literature indicates that library residency programs benefit institutions by increasing organizational effectiveness and providing flexibility due to residencies' temporary nature (Brewer, 2010). However, early library residency programs were frequently asked to prove their worth by demonstrating that these programs benefited not only the residents, but the parent institutions (Brewer, 2010; Lanier & Henderson, 1999; Scherrer, 2010). This pressure to demonstrate a furthering of institutional missions and strategic goals is often tied to budgetary concerns (Brewer, 2010, p. 23; Lanier & Henderson, 1999, p. 194; Scherrer, 2010, p. 300). For example, an administration may feel that “providing early-career development may not be enough of a rationale to start or continue a residency program when library budgets are being reduced” (Brewer, 2010, p. 23).

In 1980, residency programs received a little more guidance about how to structure a program from the director of a residency program at the University of Illinois at Chicago, John B. Berry. His draft statement, “Recommended Guidelines for a Post-Master's Internship Program,” was not accepted by either of the associations he presented it to, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and the American Association of Library Schools (AALS, now the Association for Library and Information Science Education, ALISE), but it still provided useful tips for residencies and spawned a 1984 revision entitled “Guidelines for Post-Master's Degree Resident Programs” (Lanier & Henderson, 1999, p. 193). In 1992 and 1996, ALISE published its own “Guidelines for Practices and Principles in the Design, Operation, and Evaluation of Post-Master's Residency Programs” (Lanier & Henderson, 1999; Puente, 2007).

ALISE now defines residencies as “the post-degree work experience designed as an entry level program for professionals who have recently received the MLS degree from a program accredited by the American Library Association” (Perez, 2008). ALISE's definition allows the library and information science (LIS) field to distinguish between “residencies” and “internships”: residencies specifically entail “post-degree” work experience that is professional in nature, while internships in LIS are not necessarily performed after earning a master's degree

in library science (MLIS) and do not necessarily entail professional-level librarian duties (Alston, 2015).

### Diversity residency programs

While increasing diversity was not the main emphasis of many early library residency programs, it was often still a goal that was not as explicitly expressed as with today's diversity residencies (Brewer, 2010; Scherrer, 2010). Because diversity was not the driving factor, these goals were often not met (Scherrer, 2010). Diversity residencies in academic libraries have conceptually existed at least since 1984, when the University of Delaware implemented a “one-year, post-master's internship program” (Brewer, 1998, p. 529). Now known as the Pauline A. Young Residency program, this initiative was reportedly the first of its kind to “emphasize the recruitment of librarians new to the profession from under-represented groups,” and it had “become a model program for other research libraries starting similar programs in recent years and has received much national recognition for its success” (*Program History*, 2017). Though the University of Delaware initiative was originally referred to as an “internship,” we include it here as an early example of a diversity residency program as it fits the aforementioned ALISE definition.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau's QuickFacts tool, the estimated U.S. population in 2019 was 76.5% White, 13.4% Black or African American, 5.9% Asian, 2.7% Bi- or Multiracial, 1.3% American Indian or Alaska Native, and 0.2% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. Additionally, 18.3% of the U.S. population was estimated to be Hispanic or Latino in 2019 (United States Census Bureau, 2019). Although the White non-Hispanic/non-Latino population remains the majority, the U.S. Census Bureau predicts that this will change by 2050, with Whites eventually becoming the minority (United States Census Bureau, 2015). The results of the 2020 U.S. Census will likely provide even more evidence supporting this trend.

It is well known that librarianship is a predominantly White, particularly White female, profession. The American Library Association's (ALA) 2017 Demographic Study found that ALA members self-reported as being 86.7% White, 4.4% Black or African American, 3.6% Asian, 1.2% Native American or Alaska Native, 0.2% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and 4% Other (Rosa & Henke, 2017). Further, the same survey found that 4.7% of ALA members identify as Hispanic or Latino. There are clearly disparities between the racial and ethnic demographics of the general U.S. population and the librarian population. For example, there is a 10% difference between the number of Black or African Americans in the U.S. population versus in the librarian population. Additionally, over 18% of the U.S. population is Hispanic or Latino, but only 4.7% of librarians identify as Hispanic or Latino. This could, of course, be attributed to the historically White and exclusive nature of librarianship and LIS master's programs. However, it is also important to acknowledge that the data from the ALA is a self-reported survey, meaning that not every single member of the ALA participated in the survey. As such, these numbers are likely impacted by response bias. Additionally, not everybody who works in librarianship is a member of the ALA. Therefore, it is nearly impossible to have precise demographic data about librarianship, but it is abundantly clear that there are racial and ethnic disparities in the profession.

Diversity residencies theoretically work to help ameliorate that gap, though they are dependent on people of color already being in the profession and/or having their master's degree. While not always specifically called diversity “residencies,” diversity focused post-MLIS temporary entry-level librarian positions that behave similarly to today's diversity residencies have existed for over 35 years and have been or are being attempted at over 35 libraries (Alston, 2017). Yet data from the American Library Association suggests that these positions have had a negligible effect on the overall ethnic diversity numbers in the field. Additionally, while these programs have existed for over three decades and have grown tremendously in popularity, even leading to the creation of a “Residency Interest Group” within the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) (*Residency Interest Group*, n.d.), little empirical research has been published examining the effectiveness, shortcomings, best practices, common challenges, or evolution of these programs (Alston, 2015, p. 74). Much of what has been published about diversity residency programs has come from anecdotal recaps of experiences published by current or former diversity residents (Alston, 2017, p. 7). However, as Beilin (2017) points out, “their absence would presumably make things much worse” (p. 78).

The ACRL Taskforce on Recruitment of Underrepresented Minorities identified a number of potential stumbling blocks associated with minority residency programs in its 1990 final report. For example, “A primary concern was that minority graduates selected for these programs would be stigmatized as underprepared, lacking skills, or otherwise unqualified for permanent entry-level professional positions” (Brewer, 1998, p. 529). Unfortunately, the stigma that Brewer feared in 1998 is ongoing in diversity residency programs. Hu and Patrick (2006) reported believing at times that their residency at their host institution was more about politics than retaining practitioners of color. Hankins et al. (2003) asserted that residency programs are often responses to accreditation threats and that they “take newly graduated students, insert them into often hostile environments, and expect them to address all the problems of diversity that continue to simmer and stew among faculty” (p. 309). Alston (2010) wrote about being mischaracterized as an “intern” during his residency experience. Other works from current and former diversity residents, however, either focus on the positives of the resident's experiences (Goss, 2003; Taylor, 2005) or concentrate on tips and strategies for improvement without detailing actual challenges or negative experiences that residents encounter (Pickens & Coren, 2017; Sheldon & Alston, 2015). Anecdotal works written by librarians who were involved in planning, coordinating, or supervising diversity residencies but were not diversity residents themselves tend to offer helpful guidance in establishing and improving diversity residencies (Bayard, 2009; Brewer, 2010; Fontenot, 2010), but are generally not candid about challenges or negative experiences that diversity residents face. Alston (2015, pp. 73–74) reported hearing complaints and concerns about diversity residencies from former and then-current diversity residents at the National Diversity in Libraries Conference in 2008 and noted that these complaints and concerns were not described much in written professional literature. By tweet, Alston claimed that libraries have retaliated against former residents who shared their experiences with other professionals (Alston, 2019).

However, diversity residency programs, when done well, can prove valuable to both the resident and the host institution. Boyd, Blue, and Im (2017) interviewed residents and residency coordinators and/or supervisors. They found that the overwhelming majority of residents they surveyed strongly agreed that following their residency, they were more knowledgeable about a

particular academic topic or area, they had developed marketable skills, and they had more professional connections. Residency coordinators mirrored the responses from residents by saying that those were the skills they strongly believed residents attained. Former residents Hu and Patrick (2006) describe their overall residency experience as “positive,” explaining that they attained a greater understanding of library operations; a better idea of the areas of librarianship they wanted to specialize in; and skills, knowledge, and experiences that make them more marketable in the profession (p. 300). Sheldon and Alston (2015), another pair of former diversity residents, presented an article explaining the importance of buy-in from stakeholders. Explaining that “challenges often arise as these programs do not always have complete buy-in from faculty and staff at hosting institutions. In some cases, even support for residencies from the administrations that implement them is lacking” (2015, p. 6). They explain that when buy-in is lacking, library personnel may feel hostility toward the resident themselves or the residency program. This hostility is often felt by residents, leaving them with feelings of “discomfort and alienation” (2015, p. 6). However, the authors stressed that they were not suggesting diversity residency programs were not viable or should be discontinued. To the contrary, they were writing to help host institutions create a rewarding experience for both the institution and resident (2015, p. 8).

### Residency program best practices

There are valuable works that offer advice to multiple stakeholders, including job seekers, such as Julie Brewer's (1998) research and Hu and Patrick's (2006) work. Our study was sent to residency program coordinators and supervisors, so this section focuses on recommendations for them and will not include author advice to job seekers or current residents. Brewer's (1998) research details the results of a survey sent to former library residents. Many respondents used the opportunity to write in suggestions for residency programs. Suggestions for residency program coordinators and supervisors included:

“emphasize big picture”; “provide broad exposure”; “appreciate different background and interests of residents and try to design parts of their program to match those areas”; “provide more opportunities for projects that will benefit the library and challenge the residents”; “encourage mentoring relationships”; “clearly define goals of the program”; “be accessible”; “be flexible.” Numerous responses emphasized the need to make programs two years long, with at least one peer resident (p. 535).

Hu and Patrick (2006), writing about their own personal experiences as diversity residents, also offered several suggestions for residency program coordinators to improve residency programs. Echoing the sentiment expressed in Brewer's (1998) survey suggesting at least one peer resident, Hu and Patrick suggest that residency programs hire more than one resident per cycle and note that other residents have suggested this as well (p. 299). They also advise residencies to have a well-defined and organized structure but warn against “pigeonholing residents into areas related to diversity and multicultural issues” (p. 299).

Similarly, Perez's (2007) master's thesis examining intersectionality between the librarian and nursing professions established its own recommendations for improving library residency programs. Among Perez's suggestions were to develop a web page for the residency program and

to employ “standardized terminology” (p. 47), such as referring to these programs as “residencies.” This relates to another key theme that emerged from the literature: residency programs must be clearly defined and differentiated from internships, and this distinction must be understood by stakeholders in order to fully capitalize on the potential benefits of such programs (Dougherty & Lougee, 1983; Hepburn, 2001).

Im, Boyd, and Blue (2013) surveyed 29 current and former residency coordinators and 118 current and former resident librarians, and also provided recommendations for coordinators. The study focused largely on collecting descriptive statistics on mentoring and capstone projects in residencies. The “Recommendations” section of the poster suggested, among other things, that residencies should provide “structured mentoring to provide scaffolding for residents” and should require a capstone project (Im et al., 2013). Sheldon and Alston agree that mentorship is important and specify that mentors should not be the resident's direct supervisor, as this may hinder open and honest communication (2015, p. 8). They suggest reviewing library associations with a history of supporting underrepresented populations, that are geared toward past residents, or that are known to be “established allies in the field” both for mentorship guidance and contacting potential mentors (2015, p. 8). Sheldon and Alston also stress the importance of communication and cultural climate. Writing specifically about academic diversity residencies, they suggest that prospective host institutions perform a cultural climate assessment before implementing a residency program. Institutions should not stop there but should communicate about the results of the assessment and attempt to address pre-existing diversity-related issues before hiring a diversity resident. Such early conversations should define what a resident is, discuss how a resident may benefit the institution, and seek to mitigate any misconceptions and hostilities (2015, p. 7). Sheldon and Alston also suggest that host institutions implement and lead diversity trainings both in their specific location and in the broader campus community (2015, p. 7).

Rutledge et al. (2019) penned a book entitled *Developing a Residency Program: A Practical Guide for Librarians* that includes recommendations for residency programs throughout their lifecycle, spanning from the initial development of a program through how to support the resident after the residency ends. The authors executed a small survey of current and former residents and current and former residency coordinators to determine if coordinators and residents had compatible views regarding whether residents were adequately supported, whether coordinators were assessing residency programs, and other factors thought to impact the success of a residency experience. Among their recommendations, consistent, well-thought-out, and clear communication is stressed. Such communication must be present throughout all aspects of the residency program from the initial stages of writing a proposal through discussing the possibility of continuing to mentor the resident after they have completed the program. Rutledge et al. also mention the potential benefits of hiring more than one resident at a time or designing residency cohorts that overlap with each other.

Alston's chapter in the *Where Are All the Librarians of Color? The Experiences of People of Color in Academia* (Alston, 2015) and Alston's, 2017 doctoral dissertation both collected data regarding the experiences of past and then-current diversity resident librarians, but neither of these works gathered any data on residency coordinators. Alston suggests that institutions that host residency programs should make a concerted effort to educate stakeholders (including

administration, faculty, and staff of the library) about the differences between an intern and a resident. It should be made very clear that residents have already received their graduate degree and should be treated as equal, albeit new, professionals and not as students or volunteers (Alston, 2015, p. 90). Alston's dissertation added empirical evidence to support the idea that good program assessment can increase a resident's satisfaction with the residency program. He found that the perceived quality of assessment positively correlated to the perceived quality of the residency program overall (2017, p. 186). Alston also found that the type of work assigned to the resident (i.e., professional or “busywork”) and the “perceived effectiveness of the residency in preparing the diversity resident for his or her next professional appointment” were positively correlated to the resident's overall view of the residency's efficacy (2017, pp. 187–188). This finding suggests that designing a program in a way that arms residents with marketable job skills by giving them meaningful professional duties is necessary for creating a successful residency program.

Other suggested best practices include implementing “a well-coordinated on-boarding process” (Pickens & Coren, 2017); establishing opportunities for the resident to network with other librarians through active participation and memberships in local, state, national, and international library organizations (Crumpton & Holmes, 2016); and preparing residents to be successful in their future job search by introducing them to others in the profession, thereby increasing the visibility of both the program and residents themselves (Dewey, Smith, & Berray, 2015).

## **Methodology**

The researchers developed a survey questionnaire to understand more about the full lifecycle of residency programs and to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the characteristics of residency programs?
2. How is success measured in residency programs?
3. What are some specific best practices that residency programs are currently implementing?

A survey design was chosen over other methodologies like focus groups or one-on-one interviews to allow us to reach the greatest number of residency programs, although it may be beneficial as a future step to contact participants for more in-depth conversation. The researchers sought out residency program coordinators or those who had some responsibility for planning or administering the residency program, as well as residency participants. The researchers intentionally used open-ended questions (see Appendix A) to facilitate objective responses from participants.

The survey was designed in Qualtrics and was distributed through appropriate channels such as listservs and direct emails to deans, directors, and coordinators at institutions with known diversity residency programs. The ACRL Diversity Alliance website's 2018 list of “Member Institutions” (Payne, 2021) served as a partial directory of residency programs. Calls to participate in the survey were also sent to targeted listservs like the ACRL Residency Interest Group (RIG), to the Jesse listserv hosted by Wayne State University, and to select individuals who were involved with residency programs.



The survey was first distributed in December of 2018 with a 45-day deadline. The survey was later extended by another 30 days due to a low completion rate of 24% (45 participants started the survey but only 11 completed it). Participants were asked between 14 and 20 questions, including four to eight short-answer demographic questions. The survey was designed to use branch logic, which customizes a survey based on the respondents' answers to prior questions. The survey was divided into two categories: institutions that currently have a residency program, and those in the beginning stages of creating one. The actual number of current residency programs is unknown and can fluctuate annually as institutions either launch or fold programs. There has also been a focus on studying diversity residency programs as a means of balancing the demographic inequities in the library profession, which has led to more information on those types of residencies but less on other programs that are not specifically geared toward increasing racial and/or ethnic representation in librarianship. Rutledge et al. (2019) identified 37 diversity residency programs believed to be active in 2018, and Boyd et al. (2017) also included a useful list at the end of their article. However, there is no definitive number of library residency programs in the United States, so we were unable to determine the survey response rate. Extending the deadline netted an additional three completed surveys, for a total for 14. We also received seven surveys that included demographic information, which we included in the “Characteristics” section. This gives us a total of 21 respondents who at least provided information regarding how long their institution had a residency program, how many residents completed that program, in what year did their most recent cohort began, how many residents they had per cohort, and how many years each resident works for the institution. However, two of the respondents were from the same university, so while we have at least demographic data from 21 individual respondents, we have a total of 19 different universities represented.

Of those 19 unique universities, 16 belonged to the ACRL's Diversity Alliance in 2018 and 2019, the 2 years in which the survey was disseminated. Looking at the 14 participants who completed the survey beyond the demographic section, 11 institutions belonged to ACRL's Diversity Alliance in 2018 and 10 in 2019. One state institution provided a university name but not enough information to determine which member institution they are from; one member institution from this state is part of the alliance and one is not. Regardless, although we did not solely target diversity residencies, a majority of our respondents were from institutions that are members of the ACRL Diversity Alliance.

We used a manual coding method employing both inductive and deductive coding to categorize the open-ended questions. Two investigators independently pulled themes from the responses to the open-ended questions, and they both noted similarity and overlap in the themes. After using inductive coding to identify themes, each of the two researchers compared the themes to create one set of codes. This newly created code scheme was provided to a third person, who then coded each response. The initial two researchers reviewed the final coded responses to ensure final agreement.

## **Findings and implications**

### Characteristics

The demographics section of the survey, entitled “Reframing the Narrative for Residency Programs,” was completed by 21 participants from various libraries across the United States. In order to allow researchers to note differences in responses between early residency programs and those that have been in existence for a few years, a demographic question was asked early in the survey to subdivide the survey responses by respondents in the planning stage of their library residency program, those who have had a program for up to 3 years, and those who had a residency program for longer than 3 years. Of the 21 participants, 13 indicated the current age of their library residency program was “Greater than 3 years” (11 different institutions), and eight said their program was between “First month through first 3 years of the program.” The residency programs in our study ranged in age from less than 1 year old to a program that has been in existence for 61 years. Residency programs have been hosted in library systems that range in size from 40 full time equivalent (FTE) staff members to over 800 FTE staff. The combined number of residents who have completed a program from one of our responding institutions is approximately 420. Of these, one institution reported that each of their three residents left before their 3-year residency term was completed. Each of these 420 residents comes from a program that has been in existence for over 3 years. Researchers urge residency programs to have residency periods of at least 2 years (Boyd et al., 2017; Brewer, 1998), and it appears that newer residency programs are heeding this advice, with each program hiring residents for a term of 2 to 3 years. Ten programs that have been in existence for greater than 3 years also offer 2-to-3-year residency periods. Contrary to best practices, two of the more established residencies still have residency terms of only 1 year, with one of those having an option to extend to 2 years.

Eleven residency programs only have one resident at a time, and residency periods do not overlap, which the literature indicates can lead to a sense of isolation among residents (Brewer, 1998; Hu & Patrick, 2006; Rutledge et al., 2019). Only one of the respondents whose programs are 3 years old or less indicated that their residency cohorts overlap, with one respondent not answering that question at all and the others responding “no.” Most residency cohorts in the 3 years and older category do not overlap cohorts either—only two out of 13 reported overlap, however those two are from the same institution, leaving 11 institutions that do not have overlapping cohorts. Although most respondents indicated that residency cohorts did not overlap, they still indicated ways in which the previous cohort(s) assisted the incoming residents. Some programs mitigate having a sole resident or no resident overlap by asking prior residents to assist incoming residents. Among those who responded, three mentioned that previous cohorts assisted new residents by leaving behind helpful documentation or providing feedback to aid in improving the program. One respondent explained, “The previous cohort writes/updates a guide document for the new Resident and curates a Google Drive folder of resources for the incoming Resident.” Two respondents said that previous residents also attend events for new residents. One respondent each said that previous residents send welcome emails, serve as escorts during the interview process for incoming residents, participate in phone calls in which they advise new residents on project selection, attend meetings with the new resident, and in one instance, two former residents are currently employed at the same library and assist the current resident informally. While possible for respondents in the “less than 3 years” category to be entering their second cohort (particularly if residency programs lasted for 2 years), each of the three respondents from this category who answered this question were still experiencing their first

cohort. As such, only respondents with older residency programs were able to describe the ways that previous residents assist current residents (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Describe how the previous cohort assists the incoming Resident(s) in being successful in their role. (N = 11).

Coded responses	N
Send welcome emails to new residents	1
Serve as escorts during the interview process for new residents	1
Participate in advisory phone calls	1
Attend meetings with the new resident(s)	1
Former residents are currently employed at the same library and informally assist the current resident	1
Attend events for new residents	2
Leave behind helpful documentation or providing feedback to aid in improving the program	3
N/A	5

### Mission and goals

As librarianship grapples with how to infuse the profession with more equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI), residency programs have shifted to recruiting from underrepresented groups. The ALA names EDI as “fundamental values of the association and its members” (American Library Association, 2008). Although we did not specifically target diversity residencies, eight respondents cited recruitment and support of members of underrepresented groups as the mission of their program.

**Table 2.** What is the mission of your residency program? (N = 15).

Coded responses	N
Encourage dynamism and innovation in the profession	1
Provide mentorship for the resident	1
Provide financial support for professional activity and engagement	1
No formal mission statement has been established	1
Meet resident's goals and interests	2
Bring new ideas and perspectives to the host institution	2
Meet the operational goals or filling an existing gap in institutional needs	3
Support professional development (Encouraging networking, training, conference attendance, and preparing residents for leadership roles)	5
Recruit and support members of underrepresented groups	8
Offer academic library experience (Free exploration or specific exposure to certain academic library specializations)	9

Other repeated mentioned themes that emerged from the 15 responses to residency missions included: offering academic library experience by either allowing the resident the freedom to explore or exposing residents to specific academic library specializations; supporting professional development via encouraging networking, trainings, and conference attendance, and preparing residents for leadership roles; meeting the operational goals or filling an existing gap in the needs of the institution; bringing new ideas and perspectives to the host institution; and meeting the resident's goals and interests. Although mentioned by only one respondent each, encouraging dynamism and innovation in the profession, providing mentorship for the resident, and providing financial support to professional activity and engagement were also cited as

residency program missions. Additionally, one respondent specifically said that “No formal mission statement has been established.” One respondent from a state university that has had a residency program for more than 3 years explained (Table 2):

The purpose of the Residency program is to attract recent graduates of master's degree programs in Library and Information Sciences from historically underrepresented groups, providing them with transferable professional early work experiences that will prepare them for future leadership roles in the field of academic librarianship.

Residency program goals had some overlap with the programs' mission (13 total responses). The most common goal cited by participants was to provide a space for professional exploration and/or development. Six respondents specifically mentioned that a goal of the residency program was to give the resident experience and opportunities in an academic library setting, and three respondents added a goal of providing the resident with experience working in a higher education setting generally. Although only one respondent mentioned supplying mentorship as a mission of the residency program, five respondents considered it a goal of their program. Four respondents said that a goal of the program was to support diversity efforts, and one added that supporting inclusion was also a goal. Also mentioned by multiple respondents as a goal was providing opportunities to research and publish. Another goal cited was for residents to complete a capstone program or project. Interestingly, only three respondents specifically said that one of the goals of their program was to meet the residents' personal goals, although that could be because this was an understood but unstated aspect of other goals. Three respondents named career success for the resident or residency cohort as a goal, although we cannot be sure what “success” means without further research. One interesting response from the respondent with the longest-running residency program in our survey (over 60 years) included space for the resident to engage in self-reflection:

Create an engaged and successful cohort of Associate Fellows; provide mentorship and guidance on a successful career; develop self-awareness in each Associate Fellow through behavioral assessment workshops, self-reflections, and the use of leadership exercises; and the provision of project and experiential opportunities for professional achievement, growth, and development.

Only two respondents specifically mentioned helping residents transition into a full-time, permanent position. Considering that residencies are time-limited, it is interesting that only two respondents specifically named this as a goal. Additionally, two respondents mentioned career support more generally as a goal of their residency program. Again, without further information, we cannot be sure what “career support” means to those respondents. Other residency program goals mentioned by respondents included adding benefit to the institution and/or resident, providing leadership opportunities, providing meaningful work and professional experience, providing opportunities for self-evaluation, bringing new ideas to the host institution, and providing networking opportunities (Table 3).

**Table 3.** What are the goals of your residency program? (N = 13)

<b>Coded responses</b>	<b>N</b>
Have the resident engage in self-reflection	1
Provide meaningful work and professional experience	1
Bring new ideas to the host institution	1
Provide networking opportunities	1
Provide leadership opportunities	2
General career support	2
Help residents transition into a full-time, permanent position	2
Resident career success	3
Meet the resident's personal goals	3
Have the resident complete a capstone program/project	3
Provide opportunities to research and publish	3
Provide experience working in a higher education setting generally	3
Add benefit to the institution and/or resident	4
Support diversity & inclusion efforts	5
Provide mentorship for the resident	5
Give the resident experience and opportunities in an academic library setting	6
Provide a space for professional exploration and/or development	8

**Table 4.** Overview of suggested best practices from the literature and survey.

<b>Suggested best practices from literature</b>	<b>Most frequently mentioned best practices from survey</b>
Have a well-defined and organized structure	Measure the resident's contributions to the institution
Incorporate flexibility so residents are not pigeon-holed and have input in the program	Communication via meetings, forums, newsletters, and emails
Employ standard terminology such as consistently referring to programs as "residencies" rather than internships or other term	Actively encourage staff involvement with the resident
Clearly articulate the professional nature of the residency program to ensure stakeholders understand that residents are professional librarians, not students	Ensuring that residents do meaningful, professional-level work
Provide structured mentorship from professionals other than the residency coordinator or a direct supervisor	Mentorship
Honestly assess the cultural climate of your organization	Solicit feedback and answer staff questions, including voicing concerns or evaluating how the resident is performing
Educate stakeholders regarding residency programs, particularly diversity residency programs to help avoid hostility and micro aggressions directed toward the resident	Introduce residents to other stakeholders and professionals at all levels from the host library, the greater institution the library serves, and at the professional level. Schedule regular meetings with some stakeholders including the residency coordinator or departmental supervisors

### Best practices

Most suggestions from the literature boil down to informative, clear communication with stakeholders, be it by explaining that a resident is a professional librarian and not a student, to creating a well-structured program and sharing that information (Alston, 2015; Rutledge et al., 2019; Sheldon & Alston, 2015). As such, we asked several questions in the survey regarding communication, like how program coordinators mitigated staff concerns, how they built and

maintained buy-in during the planning process, as well as how they maintained that buy-in throughout the course of their residency programs (Table 4).

*Mitigating staff concerns*

While there was no consensus from our participants regarding methods for mitigating staff concerns about hosting a residency program, the most common strategy was to solicit feedback and answer staff questions, including voicing concerns or evaluating how the resident is performing. Making the resident's work visible, such as by having leadership communicate the resident's contributions, was another idea. Aligning residents' projects with institutional goals, having staff take part in mentoring the resident, clearly communicating the benefits of a residency program, and creating mechanisms to address concerns were other tips for mitigating staff concerns that were each mentioned by two respondents. Other methods listed by respondents included having a clear program mission and goals, designating staff responsible for the residency, ensuring that staff understand their role in a successful residency, being transparent about funding and travel, as well as being “transparent about addressing valid concerns.” Institutions tried other ideas as well, like having residents participate in the Human Library program, encouraging staff participation in residency activities, providing staff trainings, creating a steering committee, communicating with staff that residents are professional librarians, and respecting the resident's wishes regarding anonymity (although it is unclear what this may be referring to without further research). Another strategy was to discuss the benefits of diversity and inclusion (Table 5).

**Table 5.** List 3 or more ideas for mitigating any staff concerns with the residency program and/or the resident. (N = 11).

<b>Coded responses</b>	<b>N</b>
Have clear program mission and goals	1
Designate staff responsible for the residency	1
Ensure that staff understand their role in a successful residency	1
Have leadership communicate the resident's contributions	1
Be transparent about funding and travel	1
Be transparent about addressing valid concerns	1
Have residents participate in the Human Library program	1
Encourage staff participation in residency activities	1
Provide staff trainings	1
Create a steering committee	1
Communicate with staff that residents are professional librarians	1
Respecting the resident's wishes regarding anonymity	1
Discuss the benefits of diversity and inclusion	1
Create mechanisms to address concerns	2
Clearly communicate the benefits of a residency program	2
Have staff participate in mentoring the resident	2
Align resident's projects with institutional goals	2
Make the resident's work visible	2
Solicit feedback and answer staff questions, including voicing concerns or evaluating how the resident is performing	4

*Creating buy-in*

The most common way of building buy-in during the creation of libraries' residency programs was communication, which respondents reported was done via meetings, forums, newsletters, and emails. Understanding that, anecdotally, residents have felt undervalued because other staff did not realize they were professional librarians who had already obtained their master's degree rather than interns or other student employees, some institutions reported creating buy-in for their residency program by promoting understanding of the job and the job title, making it clear that residents are professional librarians. Other strategies that respondents reported to build buy-in included securing funding; offering diversity professional development via trainings, workshops, and webinars; inviting guests or speakers; providing activities hosted by the Diversity Committee; incorporating diversity into the strategic plan; providing ongoing staff training; and articulating clear program goals. Additionally, one respondent stated that buy-in for their residency program was still in progress. Two respondents asserted that building buy-in is unnecessary because the institutional culture is such that buy-in already exists, while three respondents did not know or marked the question as not applicable (Table 6).

**Table 6.** Please describe the activities that you are using with your library staff to build buy-in during the creation of the residency program. (N = 14).

Coded responses	N
Activities hosted by the Diversity Committee	1
Articulate clear program goals	1
Buy-in is still in progress	1
Diversity professional development via trainings, workshops, and webinars	1
Incorporate diversity into the strategic plan	1
Provide ongoing staff training	1
Buy-in already exists in the institutional culture	2
Invite guests or speakers	2
Secure funding	2
Promote understanding of the job and the job title, making it clear that residents are professional librarians	3
Unsure, or N/A	3
Communication via meetings, forums, newsletters, and emails	7

### *Maintaining buy-in*

Only respondents who were from institutions whose residency programs were at least 3 years old were able to offer insight to what measures their institutions take to *maintain* buy-in for their residency programs. Communiqués, which may include newsletters, meetings, and/or emails, were solutions provided by four respondents. Some of these communications expressly remind staff to keep the resident in mind for upcoming or new projects. Three respondents also mentioned having presentations from the resident, as well as putting effort into making resident contributions visible to the staff, with one respondent explaining, “We make a point of encouraging residents to get actively involved in ongoing projects and to join at least one committee (often our active Communications committee). This provides connections with other staff and an opportunity for the resident's contributions to be visible to colleagues.” Hosting welcome and/or farewell events is another tool three respondents used for maintaining buy-in for the residency program. Institutions also reported actively supporting staff involvement with the resident, requesting feedback about the residency program, and encouraging the resident to be

involved with the library and/or the broader campus community. One respondent said their program does not do anything to maintain buy-in because it is not an issue, and one respondent did not list any activities to maintain buy-in (Table 7).

**Table 7.** If applicable, please describe the activities that you plan to use with your library staff to maintain buy-in for the residency program. (N = 6).

<b>Coded responses</b>	<b>N</b>
Request feedback about the residency program	1
Buy-in is not an issue	1
N/A	1
Encourage the resident to be involved with the library and/or the broader campus community	2
Host welcome and/or farewell events	3
Make resident contributions visible to the staff	3
Have the resident do presentations	3
Actively encourage staff involvement with the resident	4
Communicates, including newsletters, meetings, and/or emails	4

**Table 8.** List 3 or more approaches that your library plans to use to measure sustained support for your residency program. (N = 10).

<b>Coded responses</b>	<b>N</b>
Active involvement from library leadership or administration, including conducting relevant evaluations	1
Summative assessment	1
Formative assessment	1
Statewide outreach	1
Expectations of research deliverables	1
Using a steering committee	1
Mentorship	1
Staff training	1
Evaluating post-residency job placement either within or outside of the institution	1
Means of measuring success currently in development	1
Measuring the resident's contributions to the institution	2
No approaches have been planned or discussed yet	5

### *Measuring sustained support*

Offering information and programming to build buy-in during the initial planning and throughout the residency are only one part of the equation. Assessment to determine if these approaches are working is an important second step. We asked how respondents measured support of the program, and respondents mentioned several broad approaches to measuring sustained support for their library's residency program. Here again, there was no assessment method that was used more often than any other. Problematically, five of the 10 respondents stated that no approaches have been planned or discussed yet to measure sustained support. One respondent reported active involvement from library leadership or administration, including administration stepping in if support for the residency waned, and conducting evaluations that the administration finds relevant. Two institutions also reported measuring sustained support by measuring the resident's contributions to the institution. Other approaches to measuring sustained support included summative assessment, formative assessment, statewide outreach, and expectations of research deliverables, as well as using a steering committee, mentorship, and staff training. Although it



does not directly pertain to the level of buy-in and may be more indicative of the overall effectiveness of the program, one respondent mentioned evaluating post-residency job placement either within or outside of that institution. Finally, one institution reported that they are developing means to measure success in collaboration with their current resident (Table 8).

### *Creating a welcoming, inclusive environment*

Research on diversity residencies in particular highlights how hostile and unwelcoming a host institution can feel to some residents (Alston, 2019; Brewer, 1998; Hankins et al., 2003; Hu & Patrick, 2006; Rutledge et al., 2019). This is a particular problem as it can cause these residents to become so disillusioned with librarianship that they may leave the profession altogether. Alston went so far as to say some residents fear retaliation if they share their bad experiences (Alston, 2019). One of the issues Alston, 2015, Alston, 2017 and Perez (2008) found was a confusion in the role of the resident, with people erroneously believing them to be students or interns. This led to residents feeling like they were being looked down on or talked down to. Another possibly related issue arose when the residency program itself did not have a clear structure (Hu & Patrick, 2006; Rutledge et al., 2019). While we cannot speak to the efficacy of their tips or whether they are really implementing them, we can say that our respondents were at least able to offer suggestions for creating a welcoming and inclusive environment, several of which are tips that are also found in the literature. The most often mentioned strategy was to introduce the resident to other professionals at all levels from the host library, the greater institution the library served, and at the professional level. Three respondents specifically mentioned introducing residents to people outside of the library, while others spoke about informal opportunities for residents and other professionals to get to know each other better. Encouraging staff to collaborate with resident(s) was also mentioned by two participants. Other respondents talked about removing the word “resident” from the job title and changing the title to something more commensurate with the other titles in the library or with a title that indicates the actual job duties being performed by the resident librarian. Title changes were meant to alleviate/mitigate any misunderstandings surrounding the professional nature of residency programs and to clearly delineate them from internships. As a way of ensuring the professional status of residents was clear in their titles, four respondents also talked about ensuring that residents did meaningful, professional-level work. One respondent also specifically called attention to the fact that residents, even diversity residents, may not want to do diversity work and that their institution allowed for that. Supplying mentors and having a comprehensive onboarding process were two other ways that respondents said their libraries create welcoming and inclusive spaces for residents. Interestingly, only three respondents specifically mentioned asking for resident feedback or asking the resident what they needed to feel supported.

Other institution-level strategies used to create a welcoming and inclusive space for residents included a library-wide understanding of the program and quick responses to issues of inequity. At the resident level, another tip included regularly engaging with stakeholders. More general strategies included encouraging staff to collaborate with the resident and/or invite them to participate in library activities, assigning residents to library committees, ensuring that the resident has their own workspace, building cohorts, and creating a website about the residency program (Table 9).

**Table 9.** List 3 or more ideas for creating a welcoming and inclusive space for new Residents. (N = 11).

<b>Coded responses</b>	<b>N</b>
Allow residents, even diversity residents, not to do diversity work if so desired	1
Library-wide understanding of the residency program	1
Quickly respond to issues of inequity	1
Encourage staff to collaborate with the resident(s)	1
Assign residents to library committees	1
Ensure that the resident has their own workspace	1
Cohort-building	1
Create a website about the residency program	1
Have residents regularly engage with stakeholders	2
Encourage staff to collaborate with resident(s)	2
Ask for feedback from the resident	3
Have a comprehensive onboarding process	3
Supply mentors	3
Remove the word “resident” from the job title	3
Introduce residents to people outside of the library, and create informal opportunities for residents to meet other professionals	3
Ensuring that residents do meaningful, professional-level work	4
Introduce residents to other professionals at all levels from the host library, the greater institution the library serves, and at the professional level	4

### *Resident success*

Possibly the most important measurement of a residency program's success is the success of its resident. As such, we asked respondents to provide us with the strategies and techniques they used to assist with resident success. The most often identified strategy for helping the resident succeed was to schedule meetings with various stakeholders. Such meetings may be with individual members of the library staff, the residency coordinator, or department supervisors. One program has an advisory committee comprised of new librarians who the resident can meet with and get advice from, both about librarianship and about useful information for someone new to the town. Also mentioned by one respondent were meetings with the larger campus community and with outside peer and support communities. Six individuals responded that residents are provided with mentors to aid in their success. Three talked about the existence of a comprehensive onboarding program, while two others stressed goal setting as a means to aid in the resident's success. Offering financial support for professional development, ensuring that residents join library committees, and providing opportunities to work on meaningful and collaborative projects were each mentioned by two respondents. Other strategies included being as flexible as possible, professional and skills development programming, conference attendance, and statewide outreach. Finally, although only one respondent specifically mentioned having a well-structured program in place, it was evident from the specificity outlined in two other responses that they also had a clearly structured program. One response from a college library with a program that has lasted for over 14 years was indicative of this well-defined program:

Onboarding/early residency activities including: - Multiple meetings with head of department, with whom the resident works closely - Joining Communications Committee to begin meeting staff from across departments in the library - Having different library

staff members help the resident with necessary logistics (opportunity to get to know them) Weekly 1-1 meetings with supervisor, including: - the usual checking in about status of projects, etc. - discussion of any concerns or issues the resident has - regular time for reviewing how the residents' projects are contributing to their learning and professional goals (and making any changes as needed) Periodic check-in meetings with supervisor about longer-term planning and goals.

One respondent stated that this question was not applicable, possibly because they were from an institution that had only recently begun their residency program, although the literature suggests implementing a well-thought-out program before the resident begins (Hu & Patrick, 2006; Rutledge et al., 2019). Ensuring that there is a system in place to aid the resident in performing their role successfully is arguably one of the most important aspects of creating a residency program (Table 10).

**Table 10.** Describe the strategies and techniques that you are creating to assist the Resident in being successful in their role. (N = 14).

<b>Coded responses</b>	<b>N</b>
Be as flexible as possible	1
Conference attendance	1
Statewide outreach	1
Meet with the larger campus community and with outside peer and support communities	1
N/A	1
Provide opportunities to work on meaningful and collaborative projects	2
Have residents join library committees	2
Financial support for professional development	2
Set goals	2
Have a well-structured residency program	3
Comprehensive onboarding program	3
Provide mentors	6
Schedule meetings with various stakeholders	11

## Limitations

Due to the nature of the information we were soliciting, there were several open-ended questions. The number of open-ended questions may have had a negative impact on survey completion rates. Future researchers may want to consider employing a mixed methods approach, including using a survey with more closed questions and possibly supplementing that data with interviews or focus groups. It also would have been useful to follow up on responses that were vague to ensure that we coded them according to the respondent's actual intention with the answer, rather than based on a possibly erroneous interpretation.

There is no definitive number of residency programs with which to calculate response rate. While this means responses cannot be generalized, we feel this research will still provide libraries with useful themes, trends, and best practices for residency programs. We also hope to spur more conversation and continued research into the viability of such positions for introducing early career librarians to the field, diversifying librarianship, and creating future leaders in the profession. We may also have an over-sampling of academic library positions,

either because this truly is where most residency positions are located or because of the primary audience for the listservs where calls for participation were sent out.

## **Conclusion**

Our study attempted to address a gap in the literature by providing a better picture of the current residency program landscape, as well as highlighting several suggestions that program coordinators and supervisors can use to improve their residency programs. It also provided some indication of whether residency program coordinators and supervisors are incorporating best practices that have already been suggested in previous literature. This survey is just a first step in determining whether residencies are viable methods for preparing new librarians for long-term employment in the profession. Particularly important is checking with residents themselves to see if the best practices mentioned by respondents are, in fact, implemented successfully. The authors are well aware that the intentions of host institutions and the experiences of the residents themselves may be vastly different, as the work of Rutledge et al. (2019) attempts to illustrate. It was not the purview of this survey to look at post-residency employment trends, but that is an area ripe for continued research. It is also important to know if these librarians are employed or under-employed post-residency. For those who immediately find a permanent position in the profession, can we point to specific reasons why? For those who do not, is this indicative of employment opportunities in particular areas, an inability to relocate, or a lack of desire to stay in the library profession post-residency?

The findings from this survey indicate that there is no one-size-fits-all residency program structure. From the mission and goals of the programs to how a program measures its ultimate success, responses varied. While there are positive trends, like residencies lasting for at least two years, there is still much work to be done. Notably, most programs still only have one resident per cohort and residency cohorts do not overlap leading residents to feel isolated. While we concede there are likely many concerns (including budgetary) that may make two or more residents per cohort or overlapping cohorts unfeasible, it is an issue that should be addressed because many residents themselves have asked for this change.

One call that is being heeded and that may mitigate some of the isolation that some residents can feel is the incorporation of mentorship into residency programs. Half of our respondents specifically mentioned mentorship as something they offer the resident, and several others at least encourage the resident to meet with other librarians at the host institution.

Another area that still needs work is assessment. Sheldon and Alston (2015) recommend assessment before a program to gauge whether a host institution has a welcoming climate, and Rutledge et al. (2019) devoted an entire chapter in their book to developing an assessment strategy. None of our respondents reported doing this as part of their approach to create a welcoming environment for the resident, and although they suggested several strategies for building and maintaining buy-in throughout the residency program, half of them had no way to measure if those strategies worked.

While there are many positive trends, it is clear that more work needs to be done to ensure that residency programs and residents themselves are successful. Although residency studies is an

area that would benefit from more research, there are existing research studies, accounts from former residents, and case studies that provide valuable insight. Residency program organizers would benefit from a thorough review of the extant literature during the planning phases of their programs. We hope that this study provides residency program coordinators and supervisors with useful information that they can use to improve their programs and benchmark themselves against other residency programs.

### **CRedit authorship contribution statement**

LaTasha Velez: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Formal analysis, Data Curation, Writing- Original Draft, Supervision, Project Administration. Jason Alston: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing- Original Draft. Nataly Blas: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Data Curation, Writing- Original Draft. Kathy Bradshaw: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing- Original Draft. Orolando Duffus: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Curation, Writing- Original Draft. Denelle Eads: Conceptualization, Methodology. Gerald Holmes: Conceptualization, Methodology. Olivia Patterson, Validation, Formal analysis, Data Curation, Writing- Original Draft.

### **Declaration of competing interest**

None.

### **Appendix A**

Pre-survey question to direct to the appropriate survey:

QA. Please select the current stage of your library residency program:

- Planning your first residency program but resident has not started yet (skips to Section 1)
- First month through first 3 years of the program (skips to Section 2)
- Greater than 3 years of the program (skips to Section 2)

Section 1: Library Directors and Coordinators in the beginning stages of creating a Residency Program

#### *Demographic data*

D1. Name of the institution

D2. How large is your institution?

D2a. How many FTE staff and faculty members are employed by your campus library system?

D3. How many Residents do you plan to have in your program?

D4. How many years do you plan for each residency program cohort to last?

**Q1.** What are the mission and goals of your residency program? Please detail both the mission and the goals of your residency program separately.

**Q1a.** What is the mission of your residency program?

**Q1b.** What are the goals of your residency program?

**Q2a.** Please describe the activities that you are using with your library staff to build buy-in during the creation of the residency program. (e.g. forum to solicit program feedback).

**Q2b.** If applicable, please describe the activities that you plan to use with your library staff to maintain buy-in for the residency program. (e.g. quarterly reports on the residency's progress).

**Q3** List 3 or more approaches that your library plans to use to measure sustained support for your residency program.

**Q4.** Describe the strategies and techniques that you are creating to assist the Resident in being successful in their role. (e.g. 1-on-1 meetings with specific library staff in the initial phase of the residency program).

**Q5a.** List 3 or more ideas for creating a welcoming and inclusive space for new Residents.

**Q5b.** List 3 or more ideas for mitigating any staff concerns with the residency program [and/or Resident?].

**Q5c.** How did the 3 or more ideas listed in both 5a and 5b frame conversations about what a residency program can do for the library, institution and profession as a whole?

**Q6.** Do you have any other comments or questions related to Reframing the Narrative for Residency Program?

## Section 2: Library Directors and Coordinators who currently have a Residency Program

### *Demographic data*

D1. Name of the institution.

D2. How large is your institution?

D2a. How many FTE staff and faculty members are employed by your campus library system?

D3. How long has your library had a residency program?

D4. How many Residents have completed your residency program in total?

D5. In What year did your most recent cohort begin?

D6. How many Residents do you have in each cohort?

D7. How many years does each resident work for your library?

D8. Does the incoming cohort overlap with the prior cohort?

D8a. If yes, by how long?

**Q1.** What are the mission and goals of your residency program? Please detail both the mission and the goals of your residency program separately.

**Q1a.** What is the mission of your residency program?

**Q1b.** What are the goals of your residency program?

**Q2a.** Please describe the activities that you used with your library staff to build buy-in during the creation of the residency program. (e.g. forum to solicit program feedback).

**Q2b.** If applicable, please describe the activities that you use with your library staff to maintain buy-in for the residency program. (e.g. quarterly reports on the residency's progress).

**Q3** List 3 or more approaches that your library plans to use to measure sustained support for your residency program.

**Q4** Describe the strategies and techniques that you are using to assist the Resident in being successful in their role. (e.g. 1-on-1 meetings with specific library staff in the initial phase of the residency program).

**Q4a.** Describe how the previous cohort assists the incoming Resident(s) in being successful in their role.

**Q5a.** List 3 or more tips or ideas for creating a welcoming and inclusive space for new Residents.

**Q5b.** List 3 or more tips or ideas for mitigating any staff concerns with the residency program [and/or Resident?].

**Q5c.** How did the 3 or more ideas listed in both 5a and 5b frame conversations about what a residency program can do for the library, institution and profession as a whole?

**Q6.** If applicable, list any new projects, activities, or programs that have been created by the current and former Residents that benefited the library and/or campus community.

**Q7.** Do you have any other comments or questions related to Reframing the Narrative for Residency Program?

## References

- Alabi, J. (2018). From hostile to inclusive: Strategies for improving the racial climate of academic libraries. *Library Trends*, 67(1), 131–146.  
<https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2018.0029>
- Alston, J. K. (2010). Minerva's first born: My experiences as UNCG's first diversity resident librarian. *North Carolina Libraries*, 68(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.3776/ncl.v68i1.303>
- Alston, J. K. (2015). *Interns or professionals? A common misnomer applied to diversity resident librarians can potentially degrade and divide*. In *Where are all the librarians of color*: Library Juice Press.
- Alston, J. K. (2017). Causes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction for diversity resident librarians – A mixed methods study using Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory [University of South Carolina]. <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/4080>.
- Alston, J. K. (2019, October 25). <https://twitter.com/SoulCitySigma/status/1187841625961058304>.
- American Library Association. (2008, June 13). *Equity, diversity, and inclusion [text]*. legislation & issues: Advocacy. <http://www.ala.org/advocacy/diversity>.
- Bayard, L. (2009). Notre Dame's librarian-in-residence program. *Indiana Libraries*, 28(2), 16–19.
- Beilin, I. G. (2017). The academic research library's white past and present. In *In Topographies of whiteness: Mapping whiteness in library and information science* (pp. 77–96). LLC: Litwin Books. <https://doi.org/10.7916/D82F94R2>
- Boyd, A., Blue, Y., & Im, S. (2017). Evaluation of academic library residency programs in the United States for librarians of color. *College & Research Libraries (C&RL)*, 78(4 (2017)), 472–511.

- Brewer, J. (1998). Post-master's residency programs: Enhancing the development of new professionals and minority recruitment in academic and research libraries. *College & Research Libraries*, 59(6), 528–537. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.59.6.528>
- Brewer, J. (2010). Understanding the organizational value of post-master's degree residency programs. *Research Library Issues*, 272, 23–27. <https://doi.org/10.29242/rli.272.4>
- Crumpton, M., & Holmes, G. (2016). Fueling the profession with diversity. *Public Libraries*, 55(1), 22–24.
- Dewey, B. I., Smith, R. A., & Berray, M. (2015). Penn State diversity residency program celebrates first graduates. *Pennsylvania Libraries: Research & Practice*, 3(1), 9–13. <https://doi.org/10.5195/palrap.2015.95>
- Dougherty, R. M., & Lougee, W. P. (1983). Research library residencies. *Library Journal*, 108(13), 1322.
- Fontenot, M. (2010). Diversity: A task force, survey of the literature and some possible trends for academic libraries. *Louisiana Libraries*, 73(1), 8–11.
- Goss, H., Jr. (2003). Diversity at AU Libraries: A resident's perspective. *Alabama Librarian*, 53(2), 11–12 (53.2 (2003): 11–12).
- Hankins, R., Saunders, M., & Situ, P. (2003). Diversity initiatives vs. residency programs: Agents of change? *College & Research Libraries News*, 64(5), 308–315.
- Hathcock, A. (2014). White Librarianship in Blackface: Diversity Initiatives in LIS. In the Library with the Lead Pipe <http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2015/lis-diversity/>.
- Hepburn, P. (2001). Residency programs as a means of nurturing new librarians. *Feliciter*, 47(3), 142.
- Hu, S. S., & Patrick, D. E. (2006). Our experience as minority residents: Benefits, drawbacks, and suggestions. *College & Research Libraries News*, 67(5), 297–300.
- Im, S., Boyd, A., & Blue, Y. (2013, August 19). *Library residency programs: Investing in the future of libraries [poster]*. Singapore: IFLA World Library and Information Congress.
- Lanier, D., & Henderson, C. L. (1999). Library residencies and internships as indicators of success: Evidence from three programs. *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association*, 87(2), 192–199. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC226558/>.
- Payne, A. (2021, April 14). ACRL diversity alliance: Member institutions. <https://acrl.libguides.com/da/members>.
- Perez, M. (2007). *From new graduate to competent practitioner: Rethinking the architecture of post-MLS residency programs in ARL libraries*.
- Perez, M. (2008, January 17). Guidelines for residency practices and principles. Residency Interest Group. <https://acrl.ala.org/residency/guidelines-for-residency-practices-and-principles/>.



- Pickens, C., & Coren, A. D. (2017). Diversity residency programs: Strategies for a collaborative approach to development. *Collaborative Librarianship*, 9(2), 104–108.
- Program History. (2017, March 7). Pauline A. Young residency. <https://library.udel.edu/residency/history/>.
- Puente, M. A. (2007). *Synergy: News from ARL Diversity Programs* (p. 2). <https://arl.secure.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/publications/synergy-issue-2.pdf>.
- Residency Interest Group. (n.d.). Retrieved January 17, 2020, from <https://acrl.ala.org/residency/>.
- Rosa, K., & Henke, K. (2017). 2017 ALA Demographic Study (p. 2). ALA Office of Research and Statistics. <http://www.ala.org/tools/sites/ala.org.tools/files/content/Draft%20of%20Member%20Demographics%20Survey%2001-11-2017.pdf>.
- Rutledge, L., Colbert, J. L., Chiu, A., & Alston, J. K. (2019). *Developing a residency program: A practical guide for librarians*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Scherrer, C. S. (2010). Evaluating a health sciences library residency program: What have we learned? *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 98(4), 300–302. <https://doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.98.4.006>
- Sheldon, M., & Alston, J. K. (2015). *Post-MLS roadblocks: Removing the barriers from diversity residency programs*. *Synergy: News from ARL Diversity Programs*. 12 pp. 6–9). <https://www.arl.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/synergy-issue-12.pdf>.
- Taylor, T. (2005). Changing the faces of librarianship: The Dr. Henrietta M. Smith residency at USF. *Florida Libraries*, 48(2), 12–14.
- United States Census Bureau. (2015, March 3). *New Census Bureau report analyzes U.S. population projections*. The United States Census Bureau. <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2015/cb15-tps16.html>.
- United States Census Bureau. (2019, July 1). U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US>.