

---

# ARL's Leadership and Career Development Program: An Incubator and Catalyst for Leadership Development

Carlette Washington-Hoagland  
University of Iowa, USA

Mark A. Puente  
Association of Research Libraries, USA

---

## Abstract

For many years, library literature has been predicting a mass exodus of positional leaders from the library and information science (LIS) workforce as a product of age demographics and impending retirements. Furthermore, the seemingly intractable problem of the lack of diversity in the LIS workforce has resulted in numerous programs and strategies that aim to increase the number of individuals from historically underrepresented or marginalized populations in the professional workforce. Most of these efforts, however, have focused on entry-level professionals and increasing the number of diverse individuals within professional ranks of the workforce. The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Leadership and Career Development Program (LCDP), established in 1997, has been unique in its approach since its inception in that it has focused on mid- to late-career LIS professionals from historically underrepresented groups. In its earliest years, the goal of the LCDP was to develop and encourage these professionals to consider pursuing leadership (director) roles in ARL member libraries. Later program iterations focused on mid-career professionals and on the development of leadership skills across multiple dimensions with additional focus on areas of strategic importance for the Association.

In October 2014, ARL initiated a comprehensive, longitudinal assessment of the LCDP with the goal of ascertaining the effect of the program on its participants and on the research library community. This yearlong process involved determining and evaluating multiple scales—using both quantitative and qualitative data—as indicators of the efficacy of the training methodology and the perceived impact of the experience on former participants. This paper describes the principle drivers behind the assessment as well as the methodology used to

measure the program's success. The results of the assessment will help to inform the design of future iterations of the LCDP, and will provide a framework by which other leadership development trainings can be developed and assessed. Historically, assessing the effect of leadership development training in any context has been difficult at best. The LCDP assessment offers a systematic approach to measuring the efficacy of specific program components in spite of design changes to the program made through the history of the program. Moreover, the instrument allows for a comprehensive assessment of the program based on perceptions about the experience, as well as external factors.

## Introduction

### Program History

The history of the ARL's Leadership and Career Development Program (LCDP) extends nearly two decades. The program began as a yearlong pilot project in 1997, funded by a grant award from the US Department of Education (Higher Education Act Title II-B) and the Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS). The pilot project was highly successful and garnered association-wide support; membership dues were slightly increased to partially fund the continuance of the program. As a result, the LCDP was officially added to ARL's cadre of diversity programs and resources the following year.

Over the years, the program has continued to evolve to keep pace with the changing demands and expectations of library users, the landscape of higher education, and changing strategic priorities of the Association. Modifications were made to both program goals and structure based on feedback from fellows and supporters of the program (i.e.,

the program selection committee, speakers, ARL Diversity Committee members, library directors who supported participants from their home institution, and mentors). In 2007, a number of modifications were made to the program design: (a) the timeline was extended from one year to 18 months; (b) instructional components were broadened to provide opportunity for meaningful exposure to and experience with the strategic issues shaping the future of research libraries; and (c) the mentoring component was expanded to include a personalized site visit to an ARL institution.

### **Current Program Components**

Initially, the goal of the LCDP was to prepare more senior librarians from traditionally underrepresented racial and ethnic minority groups to take on top-level roles in ARL libraries. Today, the program continues as a leadership incubator or catalyst designed to prepare mid-career librarians from culturally diverse backgrounds to serve increasingly diverse learning communities in libraries. The latest iterations (2011 and 2013) of the LCDP contained the following core components:

1. Orientation: Introduction to the program, cohort building, self-evaluation, and personal career planning
2. Two multi-day institutes
  - a. Training on identifying, developing, and conducting research
  - b. Major strategic issues currently shaping the future of research libraries
3. Career-coaching relationship: each fellow is paired with an ARL library director or a senior staff member
4. Supplemental support: online discussions and webinars related to the ARL strategic directions
5. Site visit to career coach home institution: opportunity to see firsthand the inner workings of a complex organization
6. Closing event and poster session: opportunity to share research findings with library directors, senior staff members and the broader ARL community

The program was designed to provide a diverse set of developmental experiences and opportunities for participants: mentoring by leaders in the

profession; pursuit of a research project and the opportunity to present and/or publish the results; increased visibility in the profession; and a cohort of supporters invested in the future success of their classmates. Over the last 18 years, ARL has graduated 150 LCDP fellows.

### **Drivers for and Goals of the Study**

This assessment of the LCDP is part of a more comprehensive review of all ARL diversity programs and their impact on the Association's diversity recruitment and leadership development efforts.

This is the third overall assessment of the LCDP: 1998, 2007, and 2015. The goals of this project were:

1. To assess graduates' overall perception of the program
2. To assess the overall impact of the program on graduates' career development over time

### **Success Indicators**

1. Long lasting professional and personal relationships
2. Access to a range of career development resources
3. Development of individual leadership attributes and methods for their implementation
4. A growing pool of racially diverse librarians prepared and challenged to take on new leadership roles in research libraries

A timeline was created for the project that details the steps in the development and implementation of the assessment and is provided in Appendix A. LCDP graduates were invited to participate and given two weeks to respond to the survey. A screenshot of the opening page of the survey, developed in SurveyMonkey, is provided in Appendix B. The text to the e-mail invitation to participate in the assessment is found in Appendix C. Tables containing the quantitative data (survey results) can be found in the final appendix (D).

### **Methodology**

#### **Study Population**

The survey was distributed to the total population of 140 LCDP graduates with a loss of ten in the population due to attrition.

**Distribution of LCDP graduates by cohort**

Sequence	Class/Cohort	Year	# Graduates
First	Inaugural	1997–1998	21
Second	Millennial	1999–2000	18
Third	New Century	2001–2002	20
Fourth	Intentional Visionaries	2003–2004	22
	No program	2005–2006	
Fifth	Renaissance Class	2007–2008	20
Sixth	Vanguard Class	2009–2010	10
Seventh	Luminary Class	2011–2012	18
Eighth	Phoenix Class	2013–2014	21
<b>TOTAL Number of LCDP Graduates</b>			<b>150</b>
<b>(Less attrition/10)</b>			<b>140</b>

**Instrument Design: Online Survey**

ARL recruited a visiting program officer (VPO)—an alumnus of the LCDP—to conduct the assessment in fall of 2014. The first drafts of the survey were developed with the input from Dr. Dorothy Persson, a retired librarian at the University of Iowa with subject specialty in psychology and education. The instrument was later reviewed by Dr. Tim Ansley, associate professor and DEO of Psychological and Quantitative Foundations at the University of Iowa. The survey is composed of 30 quantitative questions and six qualitative questions, broken down into the following categories:

**Operationalization of Variables***Profile of Population*

- General information (Q1–Q11)
- Demographics (Q33–Q35)
- Post-graduate education (Q12–Q13)
- Professional engagement (Q23–Q29)

**Overall Perception of Program**

- Relevance/importance of program components and activities (Q14)

- Relevance/importance of structured learning activities (Q22)
- Relevance of career coach/mentoring relationship (Q14c; Q19–Q21)

**Career Development**

- Career status (Q10–Q11)
- Post-graduate education (Q12–Q13)
- Professional engagement (Q25–Q26 and Q28)

**Program Impact**

- Overall impact (Q15–Q16; Q30)
- Research project (Q14c; Q17–Q18)
- Program components and activities (Q14)
- Career coach/mentoring relationship (Q14d; Q19–Q21)

**Pretest: Online Survey and Follow-up Discussion**

The survey was pretested online by 11 LCDP graduates on June 11, 2015, followed by a focus group discussion with a subset of those program alumni held on June 27, 2015. A representative from seven (minus 2001–2002) of the eight cohorts participated in the pretest activities.

*Pretest Participants***Pretest Participants**

1 representative	Inaugural, 1997–1998
1 representative	Millennial, 1999–2000
0 not represented	New Century, 2001–2002
1 representative	Visionary, 2003–2004
NA no program	2004–2005
2 representatives	Renaissance, 2007–2008
3 representatives	Vanguard, 2009–2010
2 representatives	Luminary, 2011–2012
1 representative	Phoenix, 2013–2014
<hr/>	
11 (8 of 9 cohorts)	

Revisions were made to the survey based on feedback from the pretest. The finalized survey was distributed to 140 LCDP graduates on September 19, 2015, and closed on October 19, 2015. A total of 72 surveys was completed, representing a 51.4% response rate. Perhaps not surprising is the fact that the distribution of data is overrepresented by the more recent Vanguard (2009–10) and Phoenix (2013–14) graduates; and unrepresented by Millennial (1999–00) and New Century (2001–02) graduates. See Appendix D, Table 3.

**Findings****Respondent Profile***Pre-LCDP*

Eighty-one percent of the respondents learned about the LCDP via word of mouth—from past LCDP participants (30%), a library dean/director (26%), a colleague from another library or profession (25%), or e-mail/Listserv (24%). However, when asked who initially encouraged their application to the program, 31% self-nominated. Fewer were encouraged to participate in the program by their library director/dean (25%) or their supervisor (14%). See Appendix D, Tables 1–2.

When respondents applied for the fellowship, they self-identified as female (83%), black/African American (43%), Asian/Asian American (25%) or Hispanic/Latino (21%). They had 4–7 (46%) or 8–11 (32%) years of library experience in an academic library (94%) and of those, 78% were employed in ARL member libraries. While participating in the program, they held mid-career non-management (68%) or mid-career management positions (21%);

fewer worked in upper management (11%) or administration (0%). See Appendix D, Tables 11, 12, 6, 7, and 5.

Although most had no postgraduate education (53%) beyond the Master of Library Science degree (MLS), 47% had completed a second master's degree (26%), a PhD (6%), graduate course work without a degree objective (15%), a certificate program (3%), or engaged in other postgraduate work (7%). Respondents were also professionally very active or active (68%) and engaged in a variety of activities for advancement—service to home institution (93%), service to professional organizations (83%), delivered presentations (85%), and produced scholarly publications (58%). However, fewer engaged in scholarly research (44%). See Appendix D, Tables 8–10.

*Post-LCDP*

Today, 42% of the respondents work in upper management (24%) or administration (18%); fewer respondents (36%) are in mid-career non-management (28%) or mid-career management positions (8%). They have continued to be professionally very active or active (69%) and engage in a variety of activities for advancement—service to home institution (92%), service to professional organizations (79%), deliver presentations (79%), and produce scholarly publications (54%). Interestingly, their engagement in scholarly research (44%) has remained unchanged, and low relative to all other activities. See Appendix D, Tables 7 and 9–10. Respondents fell into three categories relative to years of library experience: 8–11 (24%), 12–15 (25%) or 16+ (49%). However, 11% fewer

are employed in an ARL member library (67%) but rather, public (3%), community college (1%) or special libraries (7%). And 6% are no longer employed in a library setting. See Appendix D, Tables 4–6.

### **Goal 1: Perception of Program**

#### *Core Program Components and Activities*

Unlike online activities (44%), respondents identified the following program components as very important or important to their overall development: (1) multi-day institutes (94%), (2) site visit (82%), (3) self-assessment (77%), (4) mentoring relationship (72%), and, to a lesser degree, the (5) research project (56%). See Appendix D, Table 14.

#### *Program Curriculum*

Overall, respondents strongly agree or agree that the curriculum was well developed (89%) and adeptly delivered (94%). The variety of learning activities (92%) and cohort structure helped them to better engage in the learning process (92%). One LDGP alumnus commented, “It was a great opportunity to connect and create relationships with academic librarians; I am renewed by their presence and perspectives, [which collectively], is of benefit to the entire cohort.” Respondents noted that “[the curriculum] provided opportunities for deeper understanding; I rely often on skills and knowledge gained through the fellowship; and I still refer to my notebook.” See Table 15.

#### *Issues/Concerns*

The respondents clearly viewed the mentoring relationship as a key component of the fellowship. Some notable comments include:

[A] tremendous mentor; great learning and reflective experience; wouldn’t change anything about it; excellent relationship; great mentor; always responsive; extremely pleased with [my] coach; we got along well; mentoring extremely positive—we discussed each other’s expectations at the beginning of the program; mentor was great; really great career coach; my mentor was actively engaged with helping me get tenure; always responsive when I needed help; made our time together a priority; always there for me.

Conversely, some of the more notable comments were not favorable:

My mentor was too busy to meet with me; I had almost no contact with my

mentor; my mentor spent extremely little time interacting with me; mentors need to carve out time to meet on a periodic basis; ...the program organizers should ensure that both career coach and mentor have [adequate] time to commit [to] the mentoring relationship.

Only 53% of the respondents strongly agree or agree that their mentor was invested in their success, while even fewer indicated that their career coach continues to support their success (27%). Nevertheless, 54% of the respondents strongly agree or agree that their career coach provided constructive feedback and was available when needed for support (62%). See Appendix D, Table 16.

In particular, respondents indicated confusion with regard to their role in and responsibilities associated with the mentoring relationship:

I had no idea of what to ask my mentor or what to expect from him; I tried many strategies but never had the coaching relationship I wanted or needed; I don’t recall any parameters or expectations of the relationship being set. I had no idea of how to get the most out of our [career coach/mentoring] relationship—[needed] more formal instructions or guidelines for both parties with concrete examples of ways to interact or goals to work toward.

Others recognized a need for cultural competency training: “I was the one to challenge my mentor to recognize diverse perspectives; [my] mentor needed cultural competency training.”

#### *Solutions*

Respondents recommend “...periodic check-ins” with the career coach and mentee throughout the fellowship; this could expedite the identification of problems and hopefully bring about timely intervention and/or resolution that might otherwise undermine the entire fellowship experience. Others suggested the possibility of “engaging members of the cohort” in the problem-solving process. Respondents strongly agree or agree that the mentoring relationship could benefit from: (1) a facilitated workshop on the mentoring relationship (68%)—where expectations of both parties are discussed—and, (2) more structured time to interact with their career coach: more consistent interaction (59%) and more dedicated time set aside to interact

(58%). See Appendix D, Table 17. Respondents voiced a need for some assurance that the career coaches truly value diversity, and suggested the addition of content on race and gender to be added to the curriculum. Participants would also like the mentors to be more engaged in the research component of the program and to extend the curriculum to include an online intensive workshop on survey design and research methods between institutes.

## **Goal 2: Impact of Program**

### *Origin of Impact and Advancement*

Seventy-six percent of the respondents capitalized on their experience as fellows to advance their careers during the program (50%) or soon after (26%) they graduated. They could recount many examples of accomplishment, including, but not limited to: “A promotion; my first management position at a library; took on a more advanced position at my library; enrolled in graduate school; developed new programs; and became dean or AUL.” See Appendix D, Table 21.

Forty-four percent of the respondents indicated that their research project led to opportunities that extended beyond the fellowship (i.e., formal presentations; workshops; poster sessions; scholarly publications; advance degrees, tenure, faculty collaborations; successful grant applications; promotions; new research opportunities; and a new job). See Appendix D, Table 19. Others credited their research project for “heightening their professional standing among colleagues with regard to their area of study; and that it enabled them to speak more authoritatively about emerging trends in ARL libraries.” Respondents expressed appreciation for their ability to make important connections through networking—“it increased my involvement in professional associations; and it has helped me find a trajectory for my career, which may not translate into a higher level position but [rather] finding ways to lead from where I am.”

### *Impact on the Fellow*

Sixty-nine percent or more of the respondents point to certain personal experiences as a fellow to demonstrate the impact of the LCDP. For example, when asked, participants strongly agree or agree the fellowship helped: “me to step out of my comfort zone (78%); deepen my commitment to long and short term personal and professional development (78%); see life as a journey and pursue new opportunities as they arise (76%); achieve one

or more of my career goals (72%); discover untapped leadership skills (71%); become more confident in my leadership ability (75%), become more confident in my ability to lead from any position in an organization (69%); become more self-aware (75%), become more reflective in the decisions I make (75%), build a useful knowledge base I can readily access at any point to facilitate my career development (69%), and to form a strong network of colleagues (76%).” One LCDP fellow summed up the experience in the aggregate by saying, “The networking opportunities have been phenomenal and access to them have proved invaluable.”

However, fewer respondents strongly agree or agree the fellowship helped to establish connections that helped them achieve one or more of their career goal/s (57%). See Appendix D, Table 18.

### *Issues and Concerns*

More than half (56%) of the respondents’ research projects did not lead to opportunities beyond the fellowship. See Appendix D, Table 19. When asked for an explanation, “respondents pointed to a need for additional training on how to conduct scholarly research and a dedicated support person (and/or career coach) to help navigate the research process.”

Since completing the LCDP, 56% of the respondents indicated that one or more major life-changing events—an experience that changes a person’s status or circumstances—had an impact on their career development. Top barriers included: relocation/new job/transferred; marriage; divorce; birth of child/custody; death; illness (self or loved one); graduate school; and layoff. See Appendix D, Table 20. Others pointed to “significant reductions in library budgets that led to limited funding allocated to professional development.” A need was expressed for greater support or more of a commitment from their sponsoring institution by way of a bridging component to facilitate the transition back to the home institution, one that takes advantage of newly acquired skills.

## **Final Thoughts**

Overall, respondents learned transferrable skills—personal, intellectual and experiential—that they leveraged throughout their career for advancement, be it along a traditional career trajectory or at the individual level for personal development. The LCDP was an empowering experience. It provided a unique opportunity for self-reflection—the discovery, recognition, or awareness of personal strengths—the

confidence to take on more challenging leadership opportunities, and a dedicated group of colleagues invested in their success. The cohort structure was fundamental to this experience. It provided a sense of belongingness for the fellows: unquestionable acceptance, and the opportunity for motivation and renewal through sharing experiences and working through issues. Even though some respondents questioned the mentors' commitment to diversity, the vast majority viewed the mentoring relationship to be an essential component of their leadership

development, and suggested a variety of ways to enhance it. There is no accounting for when a major life event will occur or its subsequent impact. However, the respondents persevered and were able to reengage in their continued development. In summary, the LCDP provided respondents with lifelong skills, a network of supporters, and confidence to succeed.

—Copyright 2017 Carlette Washington-Hoagland and Mark A. Puente

Appendix A: Project Timeline

October 1, 2014	VPO Appointment, Diversity and Leadership Programs
October 29, 2014	Orientation, ARL, Washington, DC
November–January, 2015	<p><b>Program Review Process</b>            LCDP documentation review process, 1997–2014 (8 cohorts; 18 years; 150 fellows)  <b>GOAL 1:</b> Identify core areas of focus and began preliminary draft of questions  <b>Survey design and re-design process</b>  <b>GOAL 2:</b> Develop draft survey and pretest instrument</p>
Feb. 1, 2015	Developed draft survey (Draft #6)
March 1, 2015	Draft #6 of the survey was reviewed by Dr. Dorothy Persson, Retired Librarian, specialty in psychology and education
April 10, 2015	Project submitted to IRB (Institutional Research Board) for review (Draft #7)
April 12, 2015	Draft #7 of survey sent to Mark Puente for review and comment
April 14, 2015	Draft #8 of the survey was reviewed by Dr. Tim Ansley, Associate Professor and DEO of Psychological and Quantitative Foundations at the University of Iowa
April 16, 2015	UI Institutional Review Process complete
April 17, 2015	Sent Draft #9 of survey to Mark Puente for review and to ARL associate to convert Word document into survey form
<b>Survey Description</b>	<p>Perception-based assessment of: program components— Leadership, Career Coaching, Engagement: 38 closed-ended Questions; 2 open-ended questions  <b>Survey Pretest Activities</b>  <b>GOAL 3:</b> Pretest survey and debrief participants via focus group discussion</p>
April 23, 2015	Solicited volunteers to pretest survey (ideally, 8–10 participants; at least one fellow from each of the 8 cohorts)
June 11, 2015	Distributed pretest Reviewed pretest results and modified survey
June 27, 2015	Facilitated focus group discussion (debriefing) during ALA annual in San Francisco
August 2015	Further refined the survey based on knowledge gained from focus group discussion
September 3, 2015	Sent Draft # 10 of revised survey to Mark Puente for final review
<b>*Revised Survey Description</b>	<p>Perception-based assessment of: program structure and delivery; mentoring relationship, professional engagement and overall impact: 30 closed-ended questions and 6 open-ended questions.  <b>Survey Distribution and Data Collection Process</b>  <b>GOAL 4:</b> Finalize design, distribute survey, and collect responses</p>
September 11, 2015	Completed final revisions to survey

## 2016 Library Assessment Conference

---

September 15, 2015	Deployed survey (n=140)
September 30, 2015	Original date to close survey
October 1, 2015	VPO appointment officially concluded
October 4–7, 2015	ARL Membership Meeting
October 5, 2015	Survey Closed (72 respondents; 51.4% response rate)
	<b>Analyze data</b>
	<b>Goal 5:</b> Review data, analyze findings and draft report
October 8– Dec. 10, 2015	Reviewed data and drafted report
December 19, 2015	Submitted draft report to Mark Puente for review



## ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES®

### Association of Research Libraries

#### Leadership and Career Development Program Survey, 2015

This survey is part of a comprehensive review of the Association of Research Libraries' diversity initiatives and their impact on diversity recruitment and leadership development efforts.

You are receiving this survey because you are alumni of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Leadership and Career Development Program (LCDP). It is important to note that the structure of the LCDP and goals have evolved over the years to maintain its relevance. The LCDP was launched in 1997 to prepare more senior librarians from traditionally underrepresented racial and ethnic minority groups to take on increasingly demanding leadership roles (top leadership positions) in ARL libraries. The LCDP continues today as an 18-month fellowship with the goal of developing a cadre of future leaders equipped to serve increasingly diverse learning communities in libraries.

This survey was designed to determine your **overall** perception of the LCDP and its impact on your career development over time. For that reason, the survey will require you to reflect on your individual experience as a fellow—before, during and after graduation. We acknowledge that time has an impact on memory; the LCDP was established some 18 years ago. Given that understanding, for each question please select the response which **best** reflects your answer.

It will take you approximately 15 minutes to complete this survey. Your participation is confidential—no names are associated with individual responses. Your participation, although voluntary, is vital to the future of the LCDP.

Please complete the survey only once and, if possible, use only one device.

The survey will close on **September 30, 2015**.

## General Information

1. How did you find out about the LCDP? Select all that apply.

- Co-worker
- Colleague from another library or profession
- Supervisor
- Dean/Director
- Past LCDP graduate
- LCDP facilitator/speaker
- Professional association
- E-mail/listserv
- ARL website
- Other (please specify)

## Appendix C: Survey Invitation

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Dear colleagues,

You are receiving this survey because you are alumni of the Association of Research Libraries' (ARL) Leadership and Career Development Program (LCDP). This survey was designed to assess your overall perception of the LCDP and its impact on your career development over time. Your participation is confidential—no names will be associated, in any way, with individual responses. Your participation, although voluntary, is vital to the future of the LCDP. Please complete the survey by **Wednesday, September 30, 2015**.

As an incentive for your participation in this study, you will be eligible to register for a drawing for an iPad Mini. At the end of the survey, you will be provided a link to a separate registration form for the drawing. The winner of the drawing will be announced on the LCDP listserv two weeks after the close of the survey.

If you have any questions about the survey, please contact me (contact information in the email signature line) or the principal investigator of the assessment, [Carlette Washington-Hoagland](#).

With sincere thanks!

Mark

Mark A. Puente  
Director of Diversity and Leadership Programs  
Association of Research Libraries  
21 Dupont Circle, NW

Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)296-2296

[mpuente@arl.org](mailto:mpuente@arl.org)  
<http://www.arl.org/diversity/>  
<http://www.arl.org/leadership/>

## Appendix D: Tables with Survey Data

<b>Table 1: How did respondents learn about the ARL LCDP (Q1)?*</b>		
<b>Source</b>	<b>Total Respondents</b>	<b>%</b>
Past LCDP Participant	22	30.5%
Dean/Director	19	26.3%
Other Colleague	18	25.0%
E-mail/Listserv	17	24.0%
*Select all that apply		

<b>Table 2: Who initially encouraged your application (Q2)?</b>		
<b>Source</b>	<b>Total Respondents</b>	<b>%</b>
Self-nomination	22	30.6%
My Dean/Director	18	25.0%
My Supervisor	10	13.9%
Past LCDP Participant	9	12.5%

<b>Table 3: LCDP Cohorts (Q3)</b>				
<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Total Graduates</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total Respondents</b>	<b>%</b>
1997/98 (Inaugural)	21	14.0%	8	11.0%
1999/00 (Millennial)	18	12.0%	6	8.0%
2001/02 (New Century)	20	13.0%	6	8.0%
2003/04 (Intentional Visionaries)	22	15.0%	10	14.0%
2007/08 (Renaissance)	20	13.0%	8	11.0%
2009/10 (Vanguard)	10	7.0%	8	11.0%
2011/12 (Luminary)	18	12.0%	9	13.0%
2013/14 (Phoenix)	21	14.0%	17	24.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Note: Survey distributed to 140 active e-mail addresses

Type of Library	Pre-LCDP	%	Current	%
Academic	68	94.4%	60	83.3%
Public	0	0.0%	2	2.8%
School (K–12)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Community College	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
Special	4	5.6%	5	6.9%
Not in a Library	0	0.0%	4	5.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Y/N	Pre-LCDP	%	Current	%
Yes	56	77.8%	48	66.7%
No	16	22.2%	24	33.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Years	Pre-LCDP	%	Current	%
1–3	5	6.8%	0	0.0%
4–7	33	45.8%	2	2.8%
8–11	23	31.9%	17	23.6%
12–15	9	12.5%	18	25.0%
16+	2	2.8%	35	48.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>99.8%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Status	Pre-LCDP	%	Current	%
Mid-Career/N-S	49	68.1%	29	40.3%
Mid-Career/S	15	20.8%	9	12.5%
Upper Management	8	11.1%	17	23.6%
Administration	0	0.0%	13	18.0%
Non-Librarian	0	0.0%	4	5.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Pre-LCDP</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Currently</b>	<b>%</b>
Second Master's	19	26.4%	5	6.9%
Doctorate/PhD	4	5.6%	8	11.1%
Certificate	2	2.8%	4	5.6%
Graduate/No Degree	11	15.3%	10	13.9%
Other	5	6.9%	10	13.9%
None	38	53.0%	41	57.0%
*Select all that apply				

<b>Level of Activity</b>	<b>Pre-LCDP</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Currently</b>	<b>%</b>
Very Active	18	25%	22	30%
Active	31	43%	28	39%
Somewhat active	18	25%	11	15%
Not very active	5	7%	9	13%
Not active at all	0	0%	2	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>Type of Activity</b>	<b>Pre-LCDP</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Currently</b>	<b>%</b>
Service to Home Institution	67	93%	66	92%
Presentation	61	85%	57	79%
Service to Professional Organizations	60	83%	57	79%
Scholarly Publication	42	58%	39	54%
Scholarly Research	32	44%	32	44%
Other	5	7%	13	18%
*Select all that apply				

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Total Graduates</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>%</b>
Male	27	18.0%	12	17.0%
Female	106	70.7%	60	83.0%
Missing	17	11.3%	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Total Graduates</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>%</b>
Black/African American	66	44%	31	43%
Asian/Asian American	32	21%	18	25%
Hispanic/Latino	18	12%	15	21%
Biracial/Multiracial/Other	4	3%	15	21%
American Indian/Native American	2	1%	6	8%
Missing	28	19%	0	0%
*Select all that apply				

<b>Range</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>%</b>
≤ 30	0	0.0%
31–37	2	2.8%
38–43	16	22.2%
44–49	22	30.5%
50–55	21	29.2%
56–61	8	11.1%
62 ≥	3	4.2%
Total	72	100%

<b>Program Component and Activities</b>	<b>Very Important and Important</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total Respondents*</b>
Multi-day Institutes	66	94.3%	70
Site Visit	51	82.3%	62
Career Coach/Mentoring	48	71.6%	67
Self-assessment	54	77.1%	70
Research Project	39	55.7%	70
Online Activities	24	44.4%	54
Note: Does Not Apply responses were subtracted from the total.			

<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Strongly Agree or Agree</b>	<b>%</b>
Adept delivery of program?	68	94.4%
Dedicated time with cohort away from workplace facilitated engagement?	66	91.7%
Variety of learning activities was essential to engagement?	66	91.7%
Well-developed curriculum?	64	88.9%

<b>My Career Coach:</b>	<b>Strongly Agree or Agree</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Somewhat Agree</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree or Disagree</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>*Total</b>
Challenged me to view issues from diverse perspectives	31	45%	19	27%	19	27%	69
Provided constructive feedback	37	54%	18	26%	14	20%	69
Was invested in my success	37	53%	21	30%	12	17%	70
Made time when I needed support	43	62%	11	16%	15	22%	69
Helped to broaden my professional visibility	29	42%	9	13%	31	45%	69
Provided a firsthand perspective of the inner workings of a complex organization	49	68%	7	11%	13	20%	69
Continues to support my success	18	27%	8	12%	40	61%	66
Helped me to successfully navigate the research process	16	25%	11	17%	38	58%	65

<b>The mentoring relationship could have benefited from:</b>	<b>Strongly Agree or Agree</b>	<b>%</b>
A facilitated workshop on the mentoring relationship	49	68%

More consistent interaction with career coach	43	59%
More dedicated time with career coach	42	58%
Resource material on the mentoring relationship	41	57%
A dedicated person to contact when problems occurred in the mentoring relationship	36	50%
An opportunity to discuss the mentoring relationship with cohort	37	51%

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Strongly Agree or Agree</b>	<b>%</b>
Deepen my commitment to long- and short-term personal and professional development	56	78%
Step out of my comfort zone	56	78%
Form a strong network of colleagues	55	76%
See life as a journey and pursue new opportunities as they arise	55	76%
Become more confident in my leadership ability	54	75%
Become more reflective in the decisions that I make	54	75%
Become more self-aware	54	75%
More readily embrace new challenges	54	75%
Achieve one or more of my career goals	52	72%
Discover untapped leadership skills	51	71%
Re-evaluate my career objectives and develop an implementation strategy for success	51	71%
Become more confident in my ability to lead from any position in an organization	50	69%
Build useful knowledge base I can readily access at any point to facilitate my career development	50	69%
Become more deliberate at building new professional relationships	48	67%
Acquire new knowledge that was immediately relevant to my work	45	63%
Established connections that helped me achieve one or more of my career goal/s	41	57%

<b>Table 19: Research project led to new opportunities (Q17)</b>		
<b>Y/N</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	32	44%
No	40	56%

<b>Table 20: Major Life Changing Event Impact on Career Development (Q31)</b>		
<b>Y/N</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	40	55.6%
No	32	44.4%

Note: A major life changing event is defined here as an experience that changes a person's status or circumstances, such as the birth of a child, marriage, divorce, death of a loved one, loss of a job, relocation due to spouse/partner's job or family responsibilities, etc.

<b>Table 21: At what point did your experience as a fellow coalesce in a meaningful way that led to action? (Q15)</b>		
<b>Point of Impact</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>%</b>
During the program	36	50%
Soon after	19	26%
Years after	8	11%
Not yet	5	7%
Other	4	6%
Total	72	100%