

Reframing the Library Residency Narrative

LaTasha Velez and Michelle Rosquillo

We must reframe deficit-based residency narratives and provide welcoming, inclusive, and productive working environments to make library residencies an enriching experience for our new colleagues. This research reports survey responses asking how residency supervisors and coordinators communicate with stakeholders to ensure residents work in a welcoming and inclusive environment. We also asked how staff concerns are mitigated and how conversations are framed to avoid miscommunications and microaggressions. Responses echoed issues raised in existing literature, such as suggesting residents' titles be changed to ones that more accurately describe their job duties and make it clear that residents are not students.

Introduction

This paper is designed to aid residency programs by sharing the experiences of current residency supervisors and coordinators. It builds on research previously reported by Velez et al.¹ Specifically, we report survey responses indicating if and how residency programs are reframing difficult conversations surrounding ways to make the resident feel welcome and to temper any concerns felt by library staff. We also asked respondents to offer insight into the innovations residents have brought to host institutions. Conversations surrounding residencies need to be reframed to focus on what residents and host institutions can teach each other. Residents bring valuable new talent and innovation to host institutions, while host institutions can offer mentorship and professional development guidance. Much of the professional literature, as well as informal resident reflection, tends to evoke a chorus of sentiment on the myriad benefits and equally myriad challenges of post-graduate programs. It remains to be seen whether these often-voiced critiques are finding a receptive audience, and whether program coordinators and institution administrators are responding to the primary issues of concern.

Library residents have expressed frustration over their misunderstood role in the library profession. Residencies, designed to provide valuable work experience to early-career librarians, have existed since around 1940,² but former residents continue to point out unaddressed flaws in the infrastructure of these programs. One notable example is when library faculty and staff mistake residents for students and treat them as such, forcing residents to ask their hosting institutions to clarify their role to library staff. The firsthand account of Hu and Patrick³ reveals such struggles with institutional politicization and lack of organizational buy-in: they report being repeatedly referred

*LaTasha Velez is an Assistant Professor at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Library and Information Science Program; email: lmvelez@uncg.edu. Michelle Rosquillo is a Research Manager at The Medicus Firm; email: mrosquillo@themedicusfirm.com. ©2023 LaTasha Velez and Michelle Rosquillo, Attribution-NonCommercial (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) CC BY-NC.

to as “interns” and regarded as less qualified than non-resident entry-level staff, a discrepancy commonly discussed by former residents.⁴ Residents also suffer from the lack of a clear program structure and being pigeonholed into projects that do not align with their professional interests.⁵ Hu and Patrick mention that the lack of a clear framework in which to pursue their professional interests and a reliance on their program supervisor to facilitate communication with colleges led to “step[ping] into ...colleagues’ territories.”⁶ They also note that colleagues more frequently invited their participation on projects related to underrepresented populations, saying, “Inevitably, we felt that our existence was more about politics rather than an honest attempt to recruit and retain minorities...[W]e felt that we were often asked to take on tasks not because of our interests or strengths, but merely due to our physical appearances.”⁷ They conclude by advising administrators not to pigeonhole diversity residents this way, a sentiment echoed by Sheldon and Alston⁸, and to create programs with a well-defined structure that offsets the tensions of adding a newly graduated, term-limited staff member into an established organizational culture.

In her reflection on the increasing tendency toward term-limited contracts in librarianship, Alaniz⁹ summarizes much of the discourse that is currently taking place regarding the future of residencies. She points out that the inflated view hosting institutions have of their programs’ success contributes to the continued failure to improve residencies and diversity in LIS. In a personal blog post, Hathcock¹⁰ underscores the term-limited nature of early-career appointments, including diversity residencies. She suggests that part of the blame for low retention rates among underrepresented library personnel is because institutions intentionally structure early career appointments as temporary.¹¹ Hathcock’s claim that institutions “aren’t serious” about diversity initiatives and are “just not ready”¹² to dismantle power structures is echoed by Alston’s¹³ assertion that institutions “retaliate” against residents who speak out about negative experiences. Residents entering a program with a lack of stakeholder buy-in can experience hostile work environments, causing them to leave librarianship altogether.¹⁴

Despite the hurdles, it is possible to reimagine residencies in a way that supports the recruitment and retention of a talented, diverse library workforce. Although Brewer¹⁵ acknowledges the persistent demographic skew towards whiteness in librarianship, evidenced by current data from ALA member demographics, she advocates for early-career appointments as a model of institutional policy and practice. Brewer asserts that “[w]ell-established residencies represent dynamic organizations that value diversity and professional development for all positions. They visibly communicate the nature and priorities of the library’s organizational culture to prospective employees and to the research library community at large.”¹⁶ This is a constant refrain in the literature surrounding diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives in residency programs, particularly the success stories.¹⁷

Another potential benefit of residencies is the possibility of mentorship for new graduates and early career librarians.¹⁸ Boyd et al.¹⁹ and Pickens and Coren²⁰ published concurrent findings that a significant benefit to residencies is the proximity of residents to established career professionals who can offer mentorship, guidance, and feedback. Alston’s contemporary doctoral research emphasizes that adequate communication with and preparation and assessment of the resident weigh heavily into the mentoring duties of hosting institutions,²¹ which Pickens and Coren²² also emphasize. Other former residents also stress the positive impact of formal support and mentorship structures.²³ It is the authors’ hope that sharing information from current residency programs will aid existing and future programs as they endeavor to make the structural changes necessary to ensure that residents are successful and valued.

Literature Review

Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Librarians

Most of the residency program coordinators who responded to this survey were members of the ACRL Diversity Alliance, which aims to increase the ethnic and racial diversity of librarianship by using residency programs as a recruitment tool for minority librarians.²⁴ Researchers have explored the history of hegemonic practices within libraries that often render DEI initiatives, including diversity residency programs, ineffective.²⁵ While mentorship and networking are marketed as some of the most significant rewards of a residency program, some residents report that receiving such localized attention is enough to cause friction among more established library staff. Some residents mention institutional practice and culture that devalues the strengths and pursuits of diversity residents, including “being on the bottom of the institutional hierarchy”²⁶ and “[fighting] an uphill battle trying to create real change.”²⁷

Alston’s dissertation²⁸ found that residencies suffered from a lack of organizational buy-in, inadequately structured or adaptable programs, and persistent misunderstanding of the role and responsibility of a resident, particularly a diversity resident. Alston further suggests²⁹ that attending to these areas will directly affect retention rates for librarians of color by enhancing their professional experience.

Surveys conducted by Boyd, Blue, and Im³⁰ lend support to Alston’s ideas by addressing the issue of retention of diverse librarians. They acknowledge key problems such as lack of organizational buy-in, systemic racism, and barriers to advancement as having a continual effect on institutional efforts to recruit and retain librarians of color. Boyd et al. note that even institutions that secure staff buy-in and accountability are not adequately preparing diversity residents for subsequent work environments where such a culture may not be present. Alston reiterates this point, stating that retention “hinges on providing the new librarians serving in diversity residencies with experiences that are satisfying and rewarding to the resident, as well as preparatory for the resident’s next professional appointment.”³¹

Probably the most concerning trend that may impact the well-being and retention of diverse librarians was the “othering” and microaggressions residents face. One respondent stressed deemphasizing a resident’s “otherness,” while another thought that the title “resident” itself was problematic. Boyd et al.³² expressed how the otherness of a diversity residency first necessitates formal support systems for a staff member placed in this role, then exacerbates inculcated organizational resistance by singling out the resident for special training and opportunities. Alston’s work cites such “rumblings”³³ as a significant cause for dissatisfaction with residency experiences and suggests that they may result from courting buy-in only from faculty or permanent staff members without extending efforts to include paraprofessional staff as well.³⁴ Such “rumblings” can contribute to impostor syndrome among residents,³⁵ and are frequently reported through anonymous submissions on the Tumblr blog *Microaggressions in LIS*.

Organizational Buy-In and Assessment

Sheldon and Alston³⁶ recommend that hosting institutions conduct cultural climate assessments to combat staff ignorance and confusion, encourage communication with residents, and support mentorship of residents. They also suggest ongoing diversity training. Fontenot³⁷ further stipulates that climate assessment should be used to secure staff buy-in long before establishing a residency. Not only are residents able to sense resistance and a lack of sincerity

in diversity efforts,³⁸ but microaggressions can have a cumulative negative impact. Alston³⁹ and Barrientos⁴⁰ lament that institutions that do not educate staff or conduct climate assessments result in a trend wherein residents are responsible for keeping institutions answerable for providing the training, development, and support they need.

Fontenot⁴¹ suggests that assessment is necessary to maintain the integrity of residency programs and maximize organizational buy-in, points that Barrientos⁴² also makes in reflections on his residency. Perez adds that giving the resident verbal feedback, annual appraisals, and performance analysis “demonstrates an ongoing investment in the development of the resident.”⁴³ Alston⁴⁴ reports that the lack of assessment is one of the six emergent themes for dissatisfaction among residency program participants. Donaldson lists assessment as one of four major components to a successful residency.⁴⁵

Cohort Structure and Work Rotation

The rotation model, where residents spend a set amount of time working in various departments in the library, is a common way that residency programs are structured.⁴⁶ Fontenot⁴⁷ describes a two-year appointment of one to two residents rotating through several departments as the traditional residency model. Dewey et al.⁴⁸ mention having the freedom to craft their work rotations during the inaugural diversity residency at Penn State. Taylor⁴⁹ also mentions rotational styles, noting that residents at the University of South Florida select a “home” department from which they rotate through others. However, some researchers fear that the rotational style is not the best for creating a successful residency. Barrientos⁵⁰ finds department rotation less efficient and productive for the short-term nature of a residency. Dougherty and Lougee⁵¹ point out the ability of medical residencies to link theory and practice, suggesting library residencies can learn by example. Albuero et al.⁵² echo this sentiment, saying the medical residency framework is a necessary intersection of graduate and professional work that enhances the education provided by degree programs. Perez revisits this idea by comparing workforce and demographic issues between LIS and nursing residencies, and ultimately concludes that the former may benefit from incorporating the practices and principles of the latter.⁵³

It is clear that researchers are discussing residency best practices ranging from how programs should be structured to how to create a welcoming climate for residents. However, what is less clear is the impact these works have on existing residency programs, which is the focus of our research.

Methodology

The researchers used an online survey administered via Qualtrics to evaluate how residency directors and coordinators communicate with stakeholders to ensure a welcoming, inclusive, fruitful residency program experience for everyone involved. We also wanted to discover how program coordinators and supervisors framed conversations with stakeholders to avoid some of the miscommunications and microaggressions mentioned above.

The survey collected data from twenty-one residency program coordinators and administrators representing nineteen unique universities. Programs in the planning stages that had no residents at the time of responding to the questionnaire skipped questions that did not apply, such as “How many residents have completed your residency program in total” and “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.” Consequently, there were fourteen open-ended questions for those still in the planning stage and twenty for respondents with existing programs. Inductive and deductive coding methods were employed to categorize the open-ended responses. Two research team members independently extracted themes from these data, noting where similarity and overlap occurred before comparing results to compile a single value set. A third researcher used this schema to code each response, at which point the initial two researchers verified the final coding set generated.

The online questionnaire was circulated to institutions with residency programs via listservs and direct email. Although these calls did not specifically target diversity residency programs, one of the sources used to identify respondents was the list of residencies that participated in the ACRL Diversity Alliance. Researchers also targeted listservs including the ACRL Residency Interest Group (RIG), Wayne State University’s Jesse listserv, and individuals with experience in residency programs. This resulted in a large number of diversity residencies programs being surveyed. Sixteen out of the nineteen universities represented were part of the ACRL’s Diversity Alliance. We also had a large number of respondents mention diversifying librarianship as part of their mission or goals. Because no definitive number can be determined for active library residencies in the United States, whether general or specifically diversity related, the researchers could not calculate the survey response rate against aggregate numbers.

This paper focuses on the responses to three open-ended questions related to communication with stakeholders:

- How did the three or more ideas listed in both 5a (List 3 or more ideas for creating a welcoming and inclusive space for new residents) and 5b (List 3 or more ideas for mitigating any staff concerns with the residency program [and/or resident?]) frame conversations about what a residency program can do for the library, institution, and profession as a whole?
- 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.
- Do you have any other comments or questions about Reframing the Narrative for Residency Program?

Of the twenty-one survey respondents, eleven provided responses for creating a welcoming space and mitigating concerns; five told researchers how these ideas informed conversations with stakeholders and described new projects, activities, or programs that have been created by current and former residents; and three provided other comments.

Findings

The literature surrounding problems with residency programs indicates that some programs suffer from hostile working environments and misunderstandings about the role of both the residency program and the resident. Believing that some of the microaggressions residents face came from miscommunications, our survey included questions to elicit ideas for reframing conversations with stakeholders. We asked respondents to offer suggestions for creating a welcoming and inclusive space for residents and how they mitigated staff concerns about the residency. Following those questions, we asked how ideas for creating a welcoming space and mitigating staff concerns shaped conversations with residency program stakeholders. We also invited respondents to detail projects the resident worked on and to offer any other comments they desired.

How did the three or more ideas listed in both 5a (List 3 or more ideas for creating a welcoming and inclusive space for new residents) and 5b (List 3 or more ideas for mitigating any staff concerns with the residency program [and/or resident?]) frame conversations about what a residency program can do for the library, institution, and profession as a whole?

Although there were eleven responses for creating a welcoming space and mitigating concerns, less than half of those respondents, five, told researchers how these ideas informed conversations with stakeholders. We will briefly review responses to creating a welcoming space and mitigating concerns to contextualize the suggestions for reframing conversations. Although responses for creating a welcome space varied,⁵⁴ four of the eleven respondents suggested introducing residents to other professionals and ensuring that residents are doing “meaningful, professional-level work.”⁵⁵ One respondent said, “Involve residents in real work that they can take ownership of, and that other staff members can recognize as a meaningful contribution.” Other ideas mentioned by at least three of the respondents included asking the resident for feedback, having an onboarding process, mentorship, introducing residents to other professionals outside of librarianship, and changing the resident’s job title to one that did not include the word “resident.” Acknowledging some of the issues residents have faced, one responded answered, “We used to have ‘Diversity Residency Librarian’ as a title and now are using the title of what they are doing. For example, ‘Special Collections Cataloging Librarian.’ This was primarily to counter treatment like ‘an intern,’ as well as to give them [the residents] confidence in their position as a professional.”

The most frequently cited means for mitigating staff concerns was by getting feedback from staff and responding to staff questions and concerns.⁵⁶ One respondent suggested having “an open space or forum or invite staff that have concerns” followed by “closed meetings to address concerns.” There were fewer suggestions for how to turn such tips into conversations with stakeholders.

When asked how ideas for creating a welcoming space and mitigating staff concerns helped reframe conversations about the residency program, suggestions from each of the five respondents varied. One respondent suggested deemphasizing the “otherness” of the resident. Two respondents asserted that the residency program aids in the library’s goal of training leaders; one elaborated that the residency program is part of “creating and informing a learning organization culture,” while the other stressed that these conversations were ongoing but that they included emphasizing the new skills and innovations residents bring to the library. The fourth respondent said that conversations focused on defining what a successful residency looks like and reminded library personnel that residents are graduates and full-time professionals. The fifth respondent admitted that those conversations were happening in some groups, but not library-wide, acknowledging that discussions are “a work in progress.”

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.

As a follow-up to questions about reframing conversations, and in an attempt by the researchers to focus on the assets library residencies bring, we asked respondents to share any new projects, activities, or programs that have been created by current and former residents. Although only five separate respondents answered, these respondents mentioned multiple projects or activities. Residents from one institution completed a group project about “computational reproducibility,” suggested changes in the structure of the residency program and implemented a mindfulness program. Another respondent told us about innovations in

instruction suggested by their resident. Innovations include using a flipped classroom model and creating a curriculum tool to map future projects. That same respondent told us residents created a sustainable process for depositing student organization records to the university archives and cataloged several collections, making them more accessible to the public. This respondent called all of those innovations “a drop in the bucket” of what their residents have brought to the library. Another respondent who provided a long list of wide-ranging resident contributions mentioned a similar program, saying that a resident archived materials from student organizations strengthening on-campus collaborations. That respondent also said residents helped the library raise the quality of their exhibits to the point that they became a major library program involving student and faculty-curators, which directly connected to the library’s core mission of supporting teaching and research. Another resident researched first-year student orientation practices and suggested a game-based approach that the library continued to use for years. One resident had a background in educational psychology that helped the library “significantly improve the curriculum for our peer reference assistants program.” That respondent elaborated that the library increased its emphasis on building a strong peer reference cohort identity, which enhanced that program’s campus profile.

Do you have any other comments or questions about Reframing the Narrative for Residency Programs?

The final survey questions allowed respondents to add other comments or questions about reframing the narrative for residency programs. One respondent thanked the researchers for conducting this survey and explained that they think residencies exist to increase the inclusion of underrepresented groups in academic librarianship, insightfully noting that “we should also be having a conversation about hiring practices and why residency programs are needed in the first place.” Another echoed an earlier response surrounding “othering” residents. The respondent stressed the struggle to devise an appropriate job title, explaining that they use the term resident when they recruit applicants; once hired, the resident’s title is changed to one that is appropriate to their functional work area. This respondent claimed their institution still grapples with how to refer to a cohort, elaborating that calling them residents “further the insinuation that they are not qualified to be full-fledged librarians.” They went on to explain that “We are trying to change that rhetoric but are struggling with the language.” Finally, one respondent suggested that future residency program supervisors and coordinators remain flexible about the idea of a rotational residency structure because not every resident will necessarily benefit from rotating departments. They pointed out that some residents would rather stay in a home department and work with other departments on special projects.

Discussion

The responses to questions asking for tips to create a welcoming environment and mitigating staff concerns suggest that residency supervisors and coordinators are thinking about some of the issues described in the literature. Unfortunately, those responses did not translate into concrete ways to reframe difficult residency conversations. The response rate was low for questions related to reframing the residency narrative to one that highlights the assets a resident brings to institutions and the profession. As such, we cannot claim that the results are generalizable. The low response rate itself could indicate that supervisors and coordinators may not understand the importance of facilitating such discussions, or that they are still

grappling with how to navigate these conversations. However, the authors still chose to share the results, hoping to prompt others to examine conversations surrounding their own current or prospective programs. We wanted to share information from current residency-hosting institutions.

In reviewing the last thirty years of literature, several themes emerge, indicating areas that require attention and revision. Several respondents echoed these themes. One respondent cited the importance of flexibility in work structures. In particular, they noted that a rotational design might not be the best fit for each resident. The topic of how residencies should be structured—that is, whether to implement rotational, project-based, or another model—is understudied. However, a work structure that more explicitly offers experiences to enhance what was formally learned in school, similar to medical residencies, may help residents get the most out of their program.⁵⁷

Three out of the five programs that offered responses about reframing conversations to make their program more welcoming and to mitigate staff concerns explicitly include the recruitment of underrepresented people as part of the mission of its residency program. Still, there is little research on the retention rates of underrepresented populations post-residency. Unfortunately, we can see from current professional demographic information that librarianship, particularly its disproportionate whiteness, has not changed. This may indicate a multitude of things, including a resident's inability to find permanent work after the residency program has ended, too few diversity residencies to make a material impact on the profession, a problem with specific residencies or the profession as a whole that makes a program or librarianship a hostile environment for minorities, or any combination of reasons.

It is worth noting that many of the thematic elements found in the literature regarding diversity residencies were repeated by respondents whose programs function as a diversity initiative for the hosting institution. We know from residents that microaggressions regarding professional qualifications and legitimacy occur. Examples include the implication that “diversity hires” are a matter of quota rather than qualifications,⁵⁸ as well instances of residents not being given meaningful work projects⁵⁹ or having their training and expertise questioned by colleagues,⁶⁰ among other actions and assumptions that “other” the resident's status. It is therefore telling that respondents spoke about emphasizing the innovations a resident brings and explaining that residents have graduated and are professionals. Our respondents also mentioned ensuring that residents are given worthwhile, professional-level work. These responses and conversations feel like attempts to explain the value and worth of a resident by reminding colleagues that residents are fully qualified librarians and pointing out how a resident's skills can benefit the library. Regardless of the uphill battle against microaggressions they faced, it is evident that residents make meaningful contributions to their host institutions—so many that some respondents clearly stated that there were too many contributions to list.

Conclusion

Participants in library residencies have begun to call for structural change in the implementation of post-MLIS employment programs for early-career librarians. Diversity residents like Hu and Patrick⁶¹ frequently acknowledge the challenges of adjusting to a charged institutional culture. The profession is at a point in residency programs where some fear even the title “resident” holds negative connotations. Alaniz asserts that the public face of residency hosting institutions is “disingenuous at best,” with too many “placing the onus on early career-

professionals to 'innovate' and bring fresh perspectives to archival and library work [that] effectively absolves career-staff from responsibility for changing organizational culture and attitudes."⁶² This harmonizes with Hathcock's⁶³ demand to end exploitative labor structures and Alston's⁶⁴ predictions of retaliatory measures.

This article is not meant to add to the narrative of the new professionals' responsibility to innovate, but rather to share ways that institutions have made residents feel welcome enough to explore their own professional goals and passions. It is also our intention to provide a critical discussion of unaddressed problems residents still face in the hope it will have a transformative impact on future residency programs.

One respondent from a university with a newly established residency program commented:

Thank you for conducting this research.... I'm glad that this research is being done to address the concerns about residency programs and the fact that information and the conversation about residency programs needs to be changed. Though I believe the goal of most residency programs is achievable and admirable, I also believe that the inconsistency of how each program is run and what it means to the institution and to the resident needs to change.

Much more research needs to be done and many more residency programs need to engage in honest conversations with each other about eliminating the toxicity in some residency programs. We must reframe deficit-based residency narratives and provide truly welcoming, inclusive, and productive working environments for our new colleagues.

Appendix

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 (skip to section 1)

First month through first 3 years of the program (skip to section 2)

Greater than 3 years of the program (skip 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., one-on-one 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., one-on-one 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?

Notes

1. LaTasha Velez et al., "Mapping the Residency Program Landscape," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 47, no. 5 (September 2021): 102389, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102389>.

2. Julie Brewer, "Post-Master's Residency Programs: Enhancing the Development of New Professionals and Minority Recruitment in Academic and Research Libraries," *College & Research Libraries* 59, no. 6 (1998): 528–37, <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.59.6.528>.

3. Sylvia S. Hu and Demetria E. Patrick, "Our Experience as Minority Residents: Benefits, Drawbacks, and Suggestions," *College & Research Libraries News* 67, no. 5 (May 2006): 297–300, <https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=502983390&site=ehost-live>.

4. Examples include Jason Kelly Alston, "Interns or Professionals? A Common Misnomer Applied to Diversity Resident Librarians Can Potentially Degrade and Divide," in *Where Are All the Librarians of Color?: The Experiences of People of Color in Academia*, ed. Rebecca Hankins and Miguel Juarez (Sacramento, UNITED STATES: Litwin Books, 2015), 71–93, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uncg/detail.action?docID=482365>; Q. Barrientos, "Library Residency Programs: The Pros and Cons of Residency Positions as Written by a Current Resident," *ACRLog* (blog), October 24, 2016, <https://acrlog.org/2016/10/24/library-residency-programs-the-pros-and-cons-of-residency-positions-as-written-by-a-current-resident/>; T. Dankowski, "The Reality of Residency Programs," *The Scoop* (blog), 2018, <https://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/blogs/the-scoop/jclc2018-reality-residency-programs/>.

5. Sylvia S. Hu and Demetria E. Patrick, "Our Experience as Minority Residents: Benefits, Drawbacks, and Suggestions," *College & Research Libraries News* 67, no. 5 (2006): 297–300, <https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=502983390&site=ehost-live>; Mad-

eline Sheldon and Jason Kelly Alston, "Post-MLS Roadblocks: Removing the Barriers from Diversity Residency Programs," *Synergy: News from ARL Diversity Programs* 12 (July 2015): 6–9, <https://www.arl.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/synergy-issue-12.pdf>.

6. Hu and Patrick, "Our Experience as Minority Residents," 298.
7. Ibid., 299.
8. Sheldon and Alston, "Post-MLS Roadblocks," 6–9.
9. Des Alaniz, "Reflections on Temporary Appointments and Innovation/Diversity Culture in Libraries and Archives," Attendee Post, *Collective Responsibility: National Forum on Labor Practices for Grant-Funded Digital Positions*, August 14, 2019, <https://laborforum.diglib.org/2019/08/14/reflections-on-temporary-appointments-and-innovation-diversity-culture-in-libraries-and-archives/>.
10. April Hathcock, "Why Don't You Want to Keep Us?," *At The Intersection* (blog), January 18, 2019, <https://aprilhathcock.wordpress.com/2019/01/18/why-dont-you-want-to-keep-us/>.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. Alston, *Twitter*, October 25, 2019, <https://twitter.com/SoulCitySigma/status/1187841625961058304>.
14. Examples include Alston, "Causes of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction for Diversity Resident Librarians – a Mixed Methods Study Using Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory" (University of South Carolina, 2017), <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/4080>; Alston, "Recommendations for Diversity Residency Programs," *Library Diversity and Residency Studies* 1, no. 1 (May 13, 2020), <https://librarydiversityinstitute.org/2020/recommendations-for-diversity-residency-programs/>; Angela Boyd, Yolanda Blue, and Suzanne Im, "Evaluation of Academic Library Residency Programs in the United States for Librarians of Color," *College & Research Libraries (C&RL)* 78, no. No 4 (2017) (May 1, 2017): 472–511, <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/79q3q3z9>.
15. Julie Brewer, "Understanding the Organizational Value of Post-Master's Degree Residency Programs," *Research Library Issues*, no. 272 (October 1, 2010): 27, <https://doi.org/10.29242/rli.272.4>.
16. Ibid.
17. Examples include Jade Alburo et al., "Looking beyond Libraries for Inclusive Recruitment and Retention Practices: Four Successful Approaches," in *Advances in Library Administration and Organization*, ed. Samantha Schmehl Hines and David H. Ketchum (Emerald Publishing Limited, 2020), 85–109, <https://doi.org/10.1108/S0732-067120200000041009>; Laura Bayard, "Notre Dame's Librarian-in-Residence Program," *Indiana Libraries* 28, no. 2 (2009): 16–19; Michael Crumpton and Gerald Holmes, "Fueling the Profession with Diversity," *Public Libraries* 55, no. 1 (February 1, 2016): 22–24; H. Goss, Jr., "Diversity at AU Libraries: A Resident's Perspective," *Alabama Librarian* 53.2 (2003): 53, no. 2 (2003): 11–12.
18. Examples include Megan Z. Perez, "From New Graduate to Competent Practitioner: Rethinking the Architecture of Post-MLS Residency Programs in ARL Libraries" (2007); T. Taylor, "Changing the Faces of Librarianship: The Dr. Henrietta M. Smith Residency at USF," *Florida Libraries*, 2005.
19. Boyd, Blue, and Im, "Evaluation of Academic Library Residency Programs in the United States for Librarians of Color," 472–511.
20. C. Pickens and A. D. Coren, "Diversity Residency Programs: Strategies for a Collaborative Approach to Development," *Collaborative Librarianship* 9, no. 2 (April 1, 2017): 104–8.
21. Alston, "Causes of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction for Diversity Residents."
22. Pickens and Coren, "Diversity Residency Programs," 104–8.
23. Examples include Barrientos, "Finishing Up a Library Residency: My Final Thoughts," 2018, <https://acrlog.org/2018/05/11/finishing-up-a-library-residency-my-final-thoughts/>; Mallary Rawls, "My Experience as a Diversity Resident at a PWI," *WOC+Lib*, May 10, 2019, <https://www.wocandlib.org/resident-voices-2/2019/5/10/my-experience-as-a-diversity-resident-at-a-pwi>.
24. Velez et al., "Mapping the Residency Program Landscape."
25. Examples include Hathcock, "White Librarianship in Blackface: Diversity Initiatives in LIS," *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*, October 7, 2014, <http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2015/lis-diversity/>; Bharat Mehra and LaVerne Gray, "An 'Owning Up' of White-IST Trends in LIS to Further Real Transformations," *The Library Quarterly* 90, no. 2 (April 2020): 189–239, <https://doi.org/10.1086/707674>.
26. George Martinez, "Resident of the Month: Taylor Hixson – Residency Interest Group," Residency Interest Group, August 5, 2019, <https://acrl.ala.org/residency/resident-of-the-month-taylor-hixson/>.
27. George Martinez, "Resident of the Month: Preethi Gorecki – Residency Interest Group," Residency Interest Group, February 10, 2020, <https://acrl.ala.org/residency/resident-of-the-month-preethi-gorecki/>.
28. Alston, "Causes of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction for Diversity Resident Librarians."
29. Alston, "Recommendations for Diversity Residency Programs."
30. Boyd, Blue, and Im, "Evaluation of Academic Library Residency Programs in the United States for Librar-

ians of Color," 472–511.

31. Alston, "Recommendations for Diversity Residency Programs."

32. Boyd, Blue, and Im, "Evaluation of Academic Library Residency Programs in the United States for Librarians of Color," 472–511.

33. Alston, "Interns or Professionals?," 83.

34. Alston, "Recommendations for Diversity Residency Programs."

35. Martinez, "Resident of the Month: Anastasia Chiu – Residency Interest Group," Residency Interest Group, December 21, 2018, <https://acrl.ala.org/residency/resident-of-the-month-anastasia-chiu/>.

36. Sheldon and Alston, "Post-MLS Roadblocks."

37. Michael Fontenot, "Diversity: A Task Force, Survey of the Literature and Some Possible Trends for Academic Libraries," *Louisiana Libraries* 73, no. 1 (2010): 8–11.

38. Ibid.

39. Alston, "Interns or Professionals?,"

40. Barrientos, "Finishing Up a Library Residency."

41. Fontenot, "Diversity," 8–11.

42. Barrientos, "Finishing Up a Library Residency."

43. Perez, "From New Graduate to Competent Practitioner," 43.

44. Alston, "Causes of Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction for Diversity Resident Librarians."

45. K. S. Donaldson, "Recruiting Diverse Librarians: Residency Programs as an Entry Point to the Academic Librarian Profession in the United States" (Kuala Lumpur, 2018), <http://library.ifa.org/2223/1/218-donaldson-en.pdf>.

46. Velez et al., "Mapping the Residency Program Landscape."

47. Fontenot, "Diversity: A Task Force, Survey of the Literature and Some Possible Trends for Academic Libraries," 2010.

48. B. I. Dewey, R. A. Smith, and M. Berray, "Penn State Diversity Residency Program Celebrates First Graduates," *Pennsylvania Libraries: Research & Practice* 3, no. 1 (Spring 2015): 9–13, <https://doi.org/10.5195/palrap.2015.95>.

49. Taylor, "Changing the Faces of Librarianship."

50. Barrientos, "Finishing Up a Library Residency."

51. Richard M. Dougherty and Wendy P. Lougee, "Research Library Residencies," *Library Journal* 108, no. 13 (July 1, 1983): 1323, <https://login.libproxy.uncg.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=lxh&AN=7529383&site=ehost-live>.

52. Albuero et al., "Looking beyond Libraries for Inclusive Recruitment and Retention Practices."

53. Perez, "From New Graduate to Competent Practitioner."

54. Velez et al., "Mapping the Residency Program Landscape." Page 8 provides a complete list of the coded responses for ideas for creating a welcoming and inclusive space.

55. Ibid.

56. The full table of coded responses can be found in Velez et al., "Mapping the Residency Program Landscape," 13–14.

57. Examples include Albuero et al., "Looking beyond Libraries for Inclusive Recruitment and Retention Practices"; Dougherty and Lougee, "Research Library Residencies"; Carol S Scherrer, "Evaluating a Health Sciences Library Residency Program: What Have We Learned?," *Journal of the Medical Library Association : JMLA* 98, no. 4 (October 2010): 300–302, <https://doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.98.4.006>; Perez, "Guidelines for Residency Practices and Principles," Residency Interest Group, January 17, 2008, <https://acrl.ala.org/residency/guidelines-for-residency-practices-and-principles/>.

58. lismicroaggressions, "Got My Job on Merit, Kthanks," Tumblr, *Microaggressions in Librarianship* (blog), March 28, 2014, <https://lismicroaggressions.com/post/81012211747/got-my-job-on-merit-kthanks>; "'Diversity Hires,' or 'WTF?'," Tumblr, *Microaggressions in Librarianship* (blog), April 14, 2014, <https://lismicroaggressions.com/post/82719475632/diversity-hires-or-wtf>.

59. lismicroaggressions, "Pseudo-Diversity Initiatives in Academic Libraries," Tumblr, *Microaggressions in Librarianship* (blog), May 14, 2014, <https://lismicroaggressions.com/post/85765126458/pseudo-diversity-initiatives-in-academic-libraries>.

60. lismicroaggressions, Tumblr, *Microaggressions in Librarianship* (blog), October 6, 2014, <https://lismicroaggressions.com/post/99330084263/a-non-reference-department-head-would-frequently>.

61. Hu and Patrick, "Our Experience as Minority Residents."

62. Alaniz, "Reflections on Temporary Appointments and Innovation/Diversity Culture in Libraries and Archives."

63. Hathcock, "Why Don't You Want to Keep Us?"

64. Alston, *Twitter*.