

MINUTES

AAHSL FUTURE LEADERSHIP COMMITTEE

November 5, 2010

Washington, DC

PRESENT: Dave Boilard, Brian Bunnett, Colleen Cuddy, Barbara Epstein, Cynthia Henderson, Jerry Perry, Cynthia Robinson; Judy Consales, Co-Chair; Lynn Kasner Morgan, Co-Chair Designate; Carolyn Lipscomb, Program Manager

ABSENT: Elaine Martin, Co-Chair; M.J. Tooey, Board Liaison; Jim Shedlock

Committee changes/workflow

Jim Shedlock has been appointed to regular committee status; Cynthia Robinson is a new member. Lynn Kasner Morgan will serve as co-chair, along with Elaine Martin; Barbara Epstein is the new co-chair designate. Thanks were extended to outgoing members Cynthia Henderson and Co-Chair Judy Consales for their service. Committee work is structured so that work is assigned to subcommittees to do at certain times. A call for volunteers for assignments will be sent out. Committee members are also invited to make suggestions on overall direction when requested or at any time.

Leadership Fellows Program

The program has concluded its overlap phase, when one class is completing its year and the Capstone, and the next class is beginning its year with the Orientation; back-to-back events were held prior to the annual meeting to take advantage of the Washington location. One unique circumstance was that two fellows were appointed director in 2009-10 before the program year began; new directors are not eligible to apply to the program but sometimes fellows are appointed during their fellowship. NLM has extended its financial support for years 10 through 12.

Jerry and Brian reflected on their experience as part of the selection subcommittee. They found the process, conducted through conference calls and email, thorough and fair. They had concerns about two questions on the application concerning career goal and diversity leadership. Attention is paid to the applicant's explicit statement of a goal to be a director, and they suggested that the question be reworded in case some assume that is the purpose of the program and don't state it as a career goal. They also felt that awareness and appreciation of and engagement with diversity would be more appropriate than asking about leadership in the area. Some applicants evidence an expectation that the program will meet current, practical needs and need coaching about the broader purpose. Personal knowledge and observation of candidates factored into selection. Repeat applicants were not necessarily at an advantage or disadvantage; there is not a limit on the number of times someone can apply. A mix of ethnicity, gender and geography is a goal, within the priority of choosing the best candidates. New directors were steered to the New Directors Symposium. Some feedback for applicants not selected is provided. They found the matching process much more difficult than the selection, with the need to provide new experiences for fellows among other factors.

A statistical analysis of the applicant pools was discussed. The number of fellow applicants (17 this year, 16 last year) is down somewhat (average of 23.5 and range 16 to 35), but the quality remains high. Of the new fellows, 4 of 5 were repeat applicants; between 1 and 4 selected fellows have been repeat applicants each class, except for years 1 and 2. This is not necessarily bad: candidates can strengthen their applications through longer experience, new responsibilities, or improved presentation. It is, in general, evidence of committed interest and perceived value. We started asking for voluntary self-identification of ethnic/racial status in 2006-07. In the 5 classes since, 27% of applicants and 28% of selected fellows have indicated minority status. The first minority mentor has been paired. The mentor pools are a challenge, since they are by definition limited in size and 37 AAHSL directors have already served as mentor. The focus has been on pairing first-time mentors if the right match can be found. The size of the pools typically ranges from 7 to 15. Fabulous as the new mentors for 2010-11 are, we need to continue to find ways to encourage participation. A possible wave at some point of new directors who have tenure of 5 years may help.

New Directors Symposium

Barbara and Cynthia reviewed the symposium. The contrast of the formats of the first and second symposiums offered intensity of experience vs. time for reflection and continuity. Each had advantages. The 2009-10 symposium helped directors acclimate into AAHSL and was exceedingly well done. The committee discussed when to offer again and the impact on the organization. It was decided to monitor the number of new directors and to offer again when there is a core group; this should be examined at least every other year. A planning subcommittee should be appointed. The location of the annual meetings (MLA and AAMC) will be a factor in the format. Without the advantage of DC locations, a stand-alone meeting of about two days may be preferable. Cynthia offered to host the symposium at Howard.

CE course

Jim, Carol Jenkins and M.J. Tooey continue to serve as the instructor team. The 2010 course received the highest marks in the evaluation. The course was not selected for the 2011 CE roster. Application will be made for the 2012 MLA annual meeting in an extended 6-hour version. The committee suggested the possibility of an open house/discussion in years when the course is not offered; it could profile all AAHSL leadership programs.

Scholarships

Dave reported on the 2010 scholarship awards and factors considered in reviewing applications. The committee agreed to consider applications on a case-by-case basis, rather than specifying all priorities such as prior fellow experience.

Marketing

Elaine made an invited presentation at the ARL membership meeting in October to the diversity leadership committee on the Leadership Fellows Program and the evaluation study. This was very well received. The committee was reminded of the articles published in the Journal of Library Administration in December 2009.

Recruitment guide

The guide needs to be revised to take into account the current environment. Under the ideal distribution, the executive director contacts outgoing directors for a contact (e.g. search committee chair) to whom to send the guide. Other recommendations of the guide are often made.

Reflections on program assessment and future directions

Assessment is carried out through evaluation and outcomes measurement. The Leadership Fellows Program has on-the-spot feedback on components and annual evaluations. Promotions of fellows are another indicator. AAHSL involvement (50% of U.S. full members) is a measure. We are still reaping the benefits of the formal qualitative evaluation study in 2006-07. Other leadership programs are also evaluated by participants. The overall continuum has not been studied.

The “unintended consequences” of the Leadership Fellows Program were noted: AAHSL has benefited from the energy of the program and its complexion as an organization has been influenced.

The question of the relative return and value to the association from the scholarship program was raised, beyond individual chance for improvement. Recipients write reports that are posted to the AAHSL website. There should be an expectation of branding in the publication stream. Suggestions included sending reports to the list, a cohort statement on the list from persons participating in the same program, or a panel publication in *MLA News*. A fellows cohort legacy project (such as undertaken by the second year Leadership Fellows Program fellows) could also be pursued.

Another direction for Leadership Fellows Program curriculum content could be executive leadership instead of library leadership training. Questions include the balance of individual coaching and cohort interaction, use of limited time, interests expressed by fellows, and the charge of the committee/program. The role of the director and the director’s external functions are an important area of emphasis in the program.

12/8/10