

# Library Residency Working Group

Meeting Minutes  
2008 ALA Annual Meeting  
Friday, June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2008  
1:00-3:00 PM  
Anaheim Marriot Suites  
Harbor Room

Attendees: Megan Perez (chair), Julie Brewer, Kawanna Bright, Shantrie Collins, Gerald Holmes, Susan Marks, Rebecca Richardson, Yasmin Morais, Tracy Sutherland, Kim Burhop, Khanh Nguyen.

## Reports:

1. Megan, Gerald, Kawanna, Shantrie, and Rebecca reported on the Library Residency Working Group table last night at the Spectrum Scholars Professional Options Fair (POF). It was one of the most popular tables with traffic all evening. Most Spectrum Scholars did not know of residency programs. Some thought a second masters was required. The event coordinators felt the residency table was a surprising success and have recommended to next year's POF planning committee that we be present at next year's POF as well. Some comments from the participants:
  - a. "The Professional Options Fair was one of the most influential sessions during my 2007 Spectrum Leadership Institute. Transitioning from library school can be intimidating as well as difficult when deciding which area of librarianship has the most appeal. Residency programs are a viable option for those interested in academic or special librarianship. We were successful in giving the scholars an introduction to the different types of residency programs. Many scholars left our table excited about newfound possibilities for their future."
  - b. "I really enjoyed participating. My participation helped me to a better planner as Diversity Coordinator for our Diversity Residency program at UNC at Greensboro. Talking to students who are considering their options for their 1st position was tremendous for me. Thank you for the opportunity!"
  - c. "I thought the event overall was successful. We had a constant flow of interested folk sitting down and inquiring about the residency programs. One thing I noticed was that many of the current SLIS students and a few who were recent grads didn't know much about library residency programs, which means we need to focus on promoting the programs to SLIS programs. I also thought it was a great idea to have a variety of representatives present: past residents, current residents, program coordinators. By having this representation, almost all of the questions posed were able to be answered."

It was suggested the Group create a FAQ for the LRWG website and connect with LIS programs to share information with library educators.

2. Megan reported on the potential of moving the Library Residency Working Group to become an ACRL Interest Group. He reviewed the pros and cons of being an interest group vs. a section. See Appendix A for a comparison chart. Attendees preferred the interest group option and encouraged Megan to continue that initiative. Megan will follow up with Mary Jane Petrowski at ACRL and find out what are the next steps.
3. Julie provided an update on plans for the post-conference on Managing, Maintaining, and Creating Residency Programs on October 4, 2008 at the University of Kentucky Libraries. Megan distributed save the date postcards. PDF versions of the postcards are

available in the Docs section of our website. Attendees are encouraged to register for the National Diversity in Libraries Conference very soon.

4. Shantrie reported on the residency database project she is working on with Damon Campbell. Attendees discussed how to clarify and communicate the purpose of the database as well as how to increase the number of participants. See Appendix B for a summary table of the project thus far.
5. Kawanna reported on curriculum project she is working on with Rebecca. She identified a number of curricular software products. They hope to have a prototype ready to demonstrate at the October 4<sup>th</sup> post-conference.
6. Shantrie announced poster session entitled, "Evaluating Post-Masters Diversity Residency Programs: Model for Assessment" from 1:00-2:30pm on Monday, June 30, 2008 in Exhibit Hall. The poster session will report the results of a survey of current and former residents and their assessment of their experiences.
7. Megan announced the social for residents and participants in the Minnesota Institute at the House of Blues on Sunday, June 29, 2008.

#### Residents Small Group:

Megan facilitated two workplace exercises for the residents: one in active listening ("Get the Picture"), and the other in conflict resolution. Instructions for each are available in Appendix C and Appendix D. Images of the drawings produced during the active listening exercise are available on our website. Search for "Get the Picture".

#### Program Coordinators Small Group:

Program coordinators discussed funding concerns, organizational dynamics and possible topics for the program coordinators break-out session at the October 4<sup>th</sup> post-conference. Attendees suggested that recruitment and organizational dynamics should be the focus of the time set aside at the post-conference for program coordinators.

# Library Residency Working Group

Meeting Minutes  
2008 ALA Annual Meeting  
Friday, June 27<sup>th</sup>, 2008  
1:00-3:00 PM  
Anaheim Marriot Suites  
Harbor Room

Attendees: Megan Perez (chair), Julie Brewer, Kawanna Bright, Shantrie Collins, Gerald Holmes, Susan Marks, Rebecca Richardson, Yasmin Morais, Tracy Sutherland, Kim Burhop, Khanh Nguyen.

## Reports:

1. Megan, Gerald, Kawanna, Shantrie, and Rebecca reported on the Library Residency Working Group table last night at the Spectrum Scholars Professional Options Fair (POF). It was one of the most popular tables with traffic all evening. Most Spectrum Scholars did not know of residency programs. Some thought a second masters was required. The event coordinators felt the residency table was a surprising success and have recommended to next year's POF planning committee that we be present at next year's POF as well. Some comments from the participants:
  - a. "The Professional Options Fair was one of the most influential sessions during my 2007 Spectrum Leadership Institute. Transitioning from library school can be intimidating as well as difficult when deciding which area of librarianship has the most appeal. Residency programs are a viable option for those interested in academic or special librarianship. We were successful in giving the scholars an introduction to the different types of residency programs. Many scholars left our table excited about newfound possibilities for their future."
  - b. "I really enjoyed participating. My participation helped me to a better planner as Diversity Coordinator for our Diversity Residency program at UNC at Greensboro. Talking to students who are considering their options for their 1st position was tremendous for me. Thank you for the opportunity!"

It was suggested the Group create a FAQ for the LRWG website and connect with LIS programs to share information with library educators.

2. Megan reported on the potential of moving the Library Residency Working Group to become an ACRL Interest Group. He reviewed the pros and cons of being an interest group vs. a section. See Appendix A for a comparison chart. Attendees preferred the interest group option and encouraged Megan to continue that initiative. Megan will follow up with Mary Jane Petrowski at ACRL and find out what are the next steps.
3. Julie provided an update on plans for the post-conference on Managing, Maintaining, and Creating Residency Programs on October 4, 2008 at the University of Kentucky Libraries. Megan distributed save the date postcards. PDF versions of the postcards are available in the Docs section of our website. Attendees are encouraged to register for the National Diversity in Libraries Conference very soon.
4. Shantrie reported on the residency database project she is working on with Damon Campbell. Attendees discussed how to clarify and communicate the purpose of the database as well as how to increase the number of participants. See Appendix B for a summary table of the project thus far.

5. Kawanna reported on curriculum project she is working on with Rebecca. She identified a number of curricular software products. They hope to have a prototype ready to demonstrate at the October 4<sup>th</sup> post-conference.
6. Shantrie announced poster session entitled, "Evaluating Post-Masters Diversity Residency Programs: Model for Assessment" from 1:00-2:30pm on Monday, June 30, 2008 in Exhibit Hall. The poster session will report the results of a survey of current and former residents and their assessment of their experiences.
7. Megan announced the social for residents and participants in the Minnesota Institute at the House of Blues on Sunday, June 29, 2008.

#### Residents Small Group:

Megan facilitated two workplace exercises for the residents: one in active listening ("Get the Picture"), and the other in conflict resolution. Instructions for each are available in Appendix C and Appendix D. Images of the drawings produced during the active listening exercise are available on our website. Search for "Get the Picture".

#### Program Coordinators Small Group:

Program coordinators discussed funding concerns, organizational dynamics and possible topics for the program coordinators break-out session at the October 4<sup>th</sup> post-conference. Attendees suggested that recruitment and organizational dynamics should be the focus of the time set aside at the post-conference for program coordinators.

7/7/2008 [MP & JB]

**APPENDIX A**  
**ACRL Section & Discussion Group policies/procedures**  
**compared to proposed policies/procedures for Interest Groups**

Procedures	For Sections (existing)	Procedures for Interest Groups--Proposed	Procedures for Discussion Groups (existing)								
Dues	Two Sections included in ACRL dues; \$5 charge for each additional Section.	As part of their dues, each ACRL member could pick one of the following combinations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three interest groups</li> <li>• Two sections, 1 interest group</li> <li>• One section, 2 interest groups</li> </ul> Additional memberships in sections or interest groups are \$5 each. ACRL would maintain membership lists for Interest Groups.	No extra dues required.								
<a href="#">4.1 Current list of members</a>	Yes	Yes, will create list as Interest Groups form.	No list of members is kept by headquarters. Member volunteers may keep informal lists.								
<a href="#">4.2 Formation</a>	Any group of twenty-five or more members of ACRL, representing a field of activity in general distinct from those of existing Sections, and within the scope of ACRL's field of interest, may organize a Section upon receiving approval from the <a href="#">Board of Directors</a> . Sections shall be composed only of ACRL members.	Petition request approved by the Board. Petition requires 25 ACRL member signatures.	Petition request approved by the Board. Petition requires 10 ACRL member signatures.								
<a href="#">4.3 Bylaws</a>	Currently required. Propose allowing Sections to change to less formal policies/procedures.	No bylaws; policies/procedures only.	No bylaws; minimal policies/procedures.								
<a href="#">4.4. Funding</a>	<table border="1" data-bbox="415 1000 980 1203"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="415 1000 779 1073">Membership Section levels</th> <th data-bbox="783 1000 980 1073">Allocation amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="415 1076 779 1117">Small—under 1,000</td> <td data-bbox="783 1076 980 1117">\$750</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="415 1120 779 1161">Medium—1,001 to 2,499</td> <td data-bbox="783 1120 980 1161">\$1,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="415 1164 779 1203">Large—2,500 and over</td> <td data-bbox="783 1164 980 1203">\$2,250</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="415 1206 980 1317">Basic services funding provided by census count. Also lots of procedures/policies around brochures, special events, contracts, reimbursement, membership lists.</p>	Membership Section levels	Allocation amount	Small—under 1,000	\$750	Medium—1,001 to 2,499	\$1,500	Large—2,500 and over	\$2,250	<p data-bbox="999 995 1472 1138">Can apply for action plan funding and Annual Conference Program funding. If there is a large increase in programs, the Board can increase the allocation for action plans and for AC programs.</p> <p data-bbox="999 1157 1472 1352">At this time Interest Groups would receive the same budgetary allocation as ACRL Committees (\$150/year). The same policies used for Sections would apply to Interest Groups if they received any money, e.g., contracts handled by staff, etc.</p>	No funding. Space is provided at the ALA Midwinter Meeting and Annual Conference to hold meetings.
Membership Section levels	Allocation amount										
Small—under 1,000	\$750										
Medium—1,001 to 2,499	\$1,500										
Large—2,500 and over	\$2,250										
<a href="#">4.5 Council/Assembly</a>	Type-of-activity and type-of-library Sections are represented on the Sections Council, established in 1998	A new Communities of Practice Assembly shall consist of the chairs and vice-chairs of each Community of Practice, including Sections and Interest Groups, but	Since Discussion Groups exist to discuss content areas in face- to-face meetings, an additional communication channel such as an								

		excluding Discussion Groups. The function of this assembly is to facilitate the exchange of ideas among the various Communities of Practice.	assembly does not exist.
<a href="#">4.6 Committee appointments</a>	Sections may establish standing and ad hoc committees in accordance with their bylaws. When establishing a committee, care should be taken not to usurp the jurisdiction held by another ALA division or another unit of ACRL.	Interest Groups can create whatever working groups they need within their approved scope. These do not go through formal appointment process and do not get listed in the handbook.	No formal structure is required and the only appointment needed (done by the group) is to appoint a chair or convener.
<a href="#">4.7 Newsletters</a>	Each Section may expect to receive funding for production and distribution of two newsletters a year of up to 8 pages each.	Electronic only newsletters. Space provided on ACRL Website. No funding for print newsletters, mailings, etc.	No support for newsletters.
<a href="#">4.8 Liaisons to other groups</a>	ACRL Sections may appoint liaisons to other groups of related interest. It is understood that such appointment is for informational purposes and does not constitute official representation of ALA, ACRL, or the section, and that no financial support is implied in such an appointment.	Could use same policy as applies to Sections if the issue arises.	No liaisons to other groups.
<a href="#">4.9 Officers' responsibilities</a>	Detailed lists of responsibilities for chair, vice-chair, past chair. Selected by election on ALA official ballot. Appear in ALA Handbook.	General responsibilities for convener, incoming convener and past convener. Convener selected in manner the Interest Group chooses. These are the only individuals that appear in the ALA Handbook. Convener responsible for scheduling any face-to-face meetings.	Members annually appoint a leader and other positions as appropriate. In addition to the regular duties of the office, the leader shall insure that the group's activities are limited to discussion of common concerns within the purpose of the group and that the Association's bylaws are observed by the group.
<a href="#">4.10 Dates and deadlines</a>	Detailed lists exist	May need to develop a few related to scheduling face-to-face meetings at ALA	There has been no archive of the face-to-face meetings.
<a href="#">4.11 Archiving Web sites</a>	To assist in maintaining an historic record of Section activities, each Section is responsible for the archiving of their Section's Web site by following the ACRL guidelines. Paper copies of the Web site should be mailed to the ACRL Associate Director each year by August 15 though ACRL staff are not requiring this action and await an ALA digital archive solution.	Await an ALA digital archive solution.	
4.12 Dissolution	Per Article XVI, Section 4 of the ACRL Bylaws [link], "A section may be dissolved at its request by the Board of Directors of the Association and shall be so dissolved if it becomes inactive or fails to comply with the provisions of [Article XVI]." Such efforts will follow the process below:	3-year sunset or renewal rule (3-years ties to the incoming, current, and past convener 3-year leadership cycle)	A Discussion Group may be dissolved at its request by the Board of Directors of the Association and shall be so dissolved if it becomes inactive (as evident by failure to meet at three consecutive ALA conferences) or fails to comply with the provisions of this article.

## APPENDIX B

**Library Residency Working Group: Database Project**  
**Shantrie Collins and Damon Campbell, University of Tennessee Libraries**  
[RWG.resident.database@gmail.com](mailto:RWG.resident.database@gmail.com)

### Information Collected

Name	Permanent Email
Degree Granting Institution	Residency Location (Institution Name)
Title/Rank during Residency	Years of Residency (From-To)
Residency Experience(s)/Rotations	Projects
Current Position (Title and Employer)	Professional Associations and Memberships

Responding Residency Programs (16 out of approx. 25)	Number of Residents
Ohio State University	5
Cornell University	7
University of Notre Dame	2
University of Tennessee	8
Purdue University	3
Duke University	1
University of Arkansas	1
University of Iowa	1
University of Minnesota	1
Miami University, OH	4
University of New Mexico	2
University of Buffalo	2
University of South FL Tampa Library	2
Georgetown University Law Center	1
North Carolina State University	4
University of Delaware, Morris Library	1
<b>Total (as of June 20, 2008)</b>	<b>45 (out of 116)</b>

**Degree Granting Institutions (# of Residents)**

University of Arizona (3) Dominican University GSLIS (3)  
Drexel University (1) Kent State University (3)  
Louisiana State University (1) NC Central University (1)  
University of Tennessee Knoxville (1) Simmons College (4)  
SUNY Albany (1) UNC-Chapel Hill (1)  
University of CA, Los Angeles (1) University of Cape Town in South Africa (1)  
University of Iowa (1) University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (2)  
University of Kentucky (1) University of Michigan (2)  
University of Oklahoma (1) University of Pittsburgh (3)  
University of Rhode Island (1) University of South Florida (3)  
University of Washington, iSchool (1) University of Toronto (2)  
Wayne State University (3) University of Wisconsin-Madison (MLIS) (2)  
Syracuse University (1) UNC - Chapel Hill (1)

**Current Position**

<b>Still in Residency</b>	<b>Academic</b>	<b>Public Services</b>	<b>Technical or Technology Services</b>	<b>Special Collections</b>
17	23	18	2	2

## APPENDIX C

### Get the Picture?

*Purpose: An ice breaker to help participants understand the need for active listening to create understanding during communication.*

*Time: The instructions, completing the activity, and discussion take about 5-7 minutes.*

#### Facilitator instructions

1. Inform the class you are going to have them participate in a communication exercise.

Give the following instructions –

- What I/we would like you to do is find a partner.
- You and your partner will need to seat yourselves back to back.
- I/we will be giving one of you a picture.
- The person with the picture will describe the picture to their partner.
- Your partner is going to draw the picture – exactly how you’ve described it.
- The catch is...the *person drawing* the picture cannot ask the *person describing* the picture any questions – you must draw only what you heard your partner say.
- Once you’ve found a partner, decide who is going to talk (describe the picture) and who is going to draw. If you are talking/describing, please raise your hand so I/we can give you your picture.

As you hand out the pictures, let people know they can begin when they get their picture. You may also wish to note to the group that all the pictures are the same, so “please don’t look at your neighbors’ pictures”.

Tip: It’s a good idea to walk around and observe how people are interacting during the exercise. You may have some useful observations to share to move the discussion along when debriefing later.

Once you see people finishing, you can let them know they may share the drawings with their partners and compare to the actual picture. This usually promotes laughter and discussion.

2. When everyone is done, ask –

- So, how did it go? What happened? (Be sure to let pairs share their interactions without interruption from others so everyone can hear. People have different experiences - it helps if everyone can hear them).
- For those who got the picture exactly, or were close, ask the person drawing – What did your partner say that made it easy for you? (they may say their partner was specific, gave points of reference, used terms they understood, etc.)

- For those of you who were drawing – was it hard not to ask questions? (most people will say “yes”).
- Make the statement – “Consider how often each day we receive information, do not ask questions to clarify what we’ve heard, and imagine that we are perceiving information the way the sender intended it to be perceived/understood. We often *assume* we are looking at the same picture they intend for us to see.” (This leads to the importance of active listening, and the presentation on effective/active listening skills)

## APPENDIX D

### Legos Exercise

---

Illustrates the importance of having a clear collective aim (or understanding of each parties' interests) for any group, and how poorly a team or organization functions when individuals (or teams within the whole) have different agendas.

- Provide blocks or Legos with various colors and dimensions.
- The group task is to build a wall of certain dimensions (the facilitator states height, dimensions, time...as desired...simple with few instructions is best).
- Issue each group member their own hidden agenda.
- Each agenda is kept "hidden" – kept secret
- Hidden agendas can be anything that conflicts with other hidden agendas – which will create conflict while the main task of building the wall is under way.

Facilitator's Instructions to the team: Build four connecting walls, using as many of the bricks as possible. Do not read your agenda to anyone else.

---

Ensure there are 3 red bricks on each row.

Ensure no red brick touches a yellow one.

Ensure a blue brick touches a yellow brick on each row.

Ensure every row contains two yellow bricks.

Ensure no row contains more than three different colored bricks.

Ensure the walls are no more than 5 rows high.

You have no hidden agenda.

You have no hidden agenda.