

Snowbird Leadership Institute: A Survey Of The Implications For Leadership In The Profession

Teresa Y. Neely and Mark D. Winston

Introduction

This research reflects the results of a study of the individuals who have participated in the Snowbird Leadership Institute (Institute) from its inception in 1990 to 1998. The Institute participants were asked about their career backgrounds and career progression since they participated in the Institute, the level and type of involvement in leadership and professional activities, and about their perceptions regarding the impact of the Snowbird experience on their career paths and progression. They were also asked about their perceptions regarding the importance of the other participants and the program mentors on the value of the experience, and a number of demographic factors.

Background and Review of the Literature

The review of the literature reflects the increased emphasis on leadership in library and information science. In an environmental scan of leadership development programs, the Association of Research Libraries Office of Leadership and Management Services (ARL/OLMS)

identified a number of such programs that met a number of guidelines for inclusion, such as the following:

[T]he leadership program is a continuing offering, held regularly.

[T]he focus of the program is on leadership development, not technical skills or policy analysis.¹

The results of the environmental scan indicate the following:

In addition to ARL/OLMS programs, a wide variety of learning events are being offered by diverse organizations. Three North American residential programs, the Senior Fellows Program at the Long Island University's Palmer School of Library and Information Science [although the future location of the program appears to be in question], the Snowbird Leadership Institute, and Northern Exposure to Lead-

Teresa Y. Neely is interim personnel librarian/ staff development and training coordinator, Colorado State University and Mark D. Winston is assistant professor, Department of the Library and Information Studies, Rutgers University.

ership, offer comprehensive opportunities for growth and development at different stages of librarians' professional careers. These events effectively combine experiential and theoretical learning in order to engage participants in discussion/dialogue of current leadership issues.²

It is important to note that a number of other organizations sponsor leadership development programs, as well.

The American Library Association (ALA), through the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and Library Administration and Management Association (LAMA), offer a number of programs geared to provide participants with an overview of leadership and the skills required to foster individual development. These events are shorter in duration than residential programs and offer varying levels of expert advice, theoretical learning, and practical application.

Library consortia, state library associations, library schools, and individual universities also offer varying levels of leadership development programs. While there are similarities in program content, the defining factors seem related to instructional approach, duration of learning experience and depth of exploration.³

As has been suggested, leadership programs may focus on individuals in different stages of their careers. For example, the Senior Fellows program, "a biennial leadership and executive development experience,"⁴ and the new ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute, which has been "Developed for directors of libraries and those who report directly to them,"⁵ represent offerings for those who are currently in senior administrative positions.

In contrast, programs for those who are relatively new to the profession include the Snowbird Leadership Institute and the Northern Exposure to Leadership program. Donna Brockmeyer-Klebaum, Coordinator of the Northern Exposure to Leadership Institute, and a 1993 participant in the Snowbird Leadership Institute has noted that

Junior professionals often look to senior colleagues for leadership, for guidance, and for role

models. While we may have energy, creativity, enthusiasm and good intentions, we may lack vision and confidence based on experience. We lack not in our ability to contribute, not in our ability to do things right, but sometimes in our instinct to do the right thing.⁶

Certainly, the changes that are being encountered with regard to the advent and proliferation of information technology and changing organizational structures that allow new professionals to take on leadership responsibilities early on in their careers create the need for, as Brockmeyer-Klebaum suggests "a skill set never before required. We need to be quick, nimble, flexible and able to deal with constant ambiguity in an ever-changing environment."⁷

The Snowbird Leadership Institute provides a leadership development opportunity for individuals who are relatively new to their careers. Snowbird "is a five-day residential, primarily experiential, program of leadership training for people who are at a relatively early point in their library careers. This event takes place in August at a ski resort called Snowbird in the Wasatch Mountains rising above Salt Lake City."⁸

The Canadian equivalent of Snowbird, the Northern Exposure to Leadership, is a "five-day experiential and theoretical learning institute held at spectacular Emerald Lake Lodge in Yoho National Park, B.C."⁹

According to F. William Summers and Lorraine Summers, who have been involved actively with the Institute since its inception in 1990,

It is the brainchild of J. Dennis Day, [then] director of the Salt Lake City Public Library. Day was a strong supporter of 1987-88 American Library Association President Margaret Chisholm's call for special training for young leaders, and when ALA's proposal for a much broader project to carry this out was not funded, he decided to do something on his own.¹⁰

Since its inception, the Institute has been funded in large measure by Ameritech (formerly, Dynix), under the leadership of President, and now CEO, Paul Sybrowsky.

In an article regarding the first of the Institutes, Nancy Tessman, then Institute Coordinator, described the program as "a series of experiences that encouraged self-exploration and discovery."¹¹ The program is struc-

tured around a number of learning activities, group activities, and interaction with mentors.

The mentors have included “library school deans and faculty, directors of major public and academic libraries, and state librarians. The role of the mentors is to share their wisdom and experience with participants. They work and interact with learning groups and in one-on-one situations throughout the [I]nstitute.”¹²

According to the Summers, “If there is a key identifying concept of the Snowbird Leadership Institute it is probably the belief that being a leader depends as much as anything else upon knowing and being comfortable with who you are and having confidence in yourself.”¹³

With thirty or so participants, normally with less than five years of experience since completion of the MLS degree, there is also the provision of “plenty of time for personal reflection and evaluation.”¹⁴

According to Marilyn Miller, who has served as one of the program mentors,

The profession is empowered by Snowbird, because year after year a small group of emerging leaders joins a developing cadre of librarians who have had a vital leadership experience at a crucial time in their career and who are committed to professional growth. Snowbird also empowers the profession because it brings together librarians across all types of libraries and types of library functions and responsibilities to explore common interests, concerns, and opportunities.¹⁵

In their December 1991 article, F. William Summers and Lorraine Summers posed a significant question about Snowbird. “Will the annual output of thirty to thirty-five early to mid-career young people with special training make a difference in the quality and quantity of leadership in the field over time?”¹⁶ They suggest that with only two institutes having been completed, “it is too early to tell in any real sense.”¹⁷

The data and analysis presented here are intended to begin to answer that question.

General Methodology

This paper presents the findings of a research study of individuals who have participated in the Snowbird Leadership Institute. The primary focus of this original research is analyze the impact of the knowledge and in-

sight gained on the career progression and professional activities of the participants, as well as specific knowledge and skills gained as a result of participation. Survey methodology was used and data collection was completed by direct mailing the questionnaire to each known Snowbird participant.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used in this study is designed to address issues related to demographics, educational background, work experience prior to entering librarianship, and professional experience prior and subsequent to participating in the Institute. This instrument was adapted from an instrument used in a 1997 research study, and one used in a 1997 dissertation. In the November 1997 issue of *College and Research Libraries*, Julie Brewer reported on a study designed by the American Library Association Office for Library Personnel Resources (OLPR)¹⁸ on post-master’s residency programs. The instrument used was designed to “gather information about residency experiences from the perspective of former program participants.”¹⁹ The second instrument used was from Mark Winston’s 1997 dissertation which investigated the role of recruitment in the education and careers of academic business librarians.²⁰ The resulting survey instrument was expanded to make allowances for the leadership activities of both academic and public librarians, and for the Snowbird population.

The Winston instrument provided the basic structure of the Snowbird Leadership Institute instrument (See Appendix A). Basic demographic queries and items on educational background were taken directly from this instrument or adapted (See Appendix A, items 5–7a, 9–16, 17, 19–25 and 33–36).

The Snowbird survey adapted a number of relevant areas from the Brewer/OLPR instrument such as queries requesting the year of participation, and the individual who nominated the respondent for participation (See Appendix A, items 1 and 2). The Professional and Career Development section of the Brewer/OLPR instrument provided the basis for a similar section in the Snowbird instrument relating to the participants’ perception of Snowbird’s overall impact on their careers and professional development (See items 27–31). Snowbird items 29–30e were constructed to gather information on specific aspects of the Snowbird experience which continued after the Institute itself. Items in the summary section of the Brewer/OLPR instrument were adapted to construct queries about the participants sta-

tus before and after the Institute (See items 11–16).

Both researchers are from academic librarianship and therefore, defined and interpreted leadership activities as publications and participation in committees and professional/scholarly associations. Item 26 asked for other leadership activities; however, many respondents from public librarianship were critical of the academic slant of the survey and implied that the inclusion of item 26 and other items as the sole mechanism for collecting additional qualitative data were not adequate.

Prior to survey distribution, the instrument was reviewed by Institute administrators and consultants for their approval and comments. In October 1998, surveys were mailed to the entire population of individuals ($n=213$) on the most current list of Snowbird Leadership Institute participants (1990–1998) as obtained from the Salt Lake City headquarters.²¹ In mid-November, a follow up mailing was done. In total, 150 useable surveys were returned, reflecting a response rate of nearly 71 percent. Thirteen surveys were returned by the postal service as a result of non current addresses; and, one survey was returned with a note from the respondent, but was not completed. The latter survey and those returned but incomplete were included in the response rate; and the data on incomplete surveys (those where the participant inadvertently skipped items or pages of items) were included in the data analysis. Surveys were accompanied by a letter and a self-addressed envelope. Postage was not included, although at least one participant indicated that this would have been a welcome addition and may contribute to a higher response rate. Prior to the mailing of the surveys, an email message was sent to the Snowbird listserv²² announcing the intended research, that the surveys would be arriving shortly and to encourage the return of completed surveys.

Although a large amount of data was collected, this paper will present only relevant selected findings related to the demographic profile of the population and leadership activities, career progression and development. A more complete discussion is forthcoming.

Selected Findings and Discussion

The researchers intent to collect relevant data from all participants from the beginning of the Institute (1990) until 1998 took into consideration that the 1997 class was a reunion and did not include new participants; however, the instrument did not make allowances for 1998 participants who had recently completed the Institute

and therefore could not adequately answer many of the queries. Therefore, the 1998 participants will be discussed where relevant. All statistical analysis was done on a $n=150$ scale and throughout much of the analysis, null and N/A responses will be reported where appropriate.

Demographics

Of the 150 useable surveys, 1994 and 1998 classes showed the highest return rate, as shown in Table 1.

The population is somewhat homogenous in that it is predominantly White (85.33 percent) and female (76 percent), and in the 40+ age range (55 percent). However, nearly 24 percent reported their age in the 31–35 range. One hundred and forty-eight of the total respondents reported their gender and ethnicity, and 145 reported their age range, as shown in table 2. The Ethnic Background section of table 2 shows the *Other* category with three respondents. Of those three, one respondent reported her ethnic background as White Australian, and a second identified as a U.S. citizen, Jamaican heritage; the third *Other* was not identified.

Nominations

An important aspect of the Snowbird Leadership Institute which determines the pool for selection is the person who is doing the nominating. Participants are selected from a pool of nominees; therefore, one can not be selected if he or she is not nominated. It should be noted that responses include respondents who reported more than one person nominating them. Thirty-five percent (or 53 respondents) of the participants were nominated by their library school dean or department head. State librarians were instrumental in nominating 25 percent (or 38 respondents); nineteen percent (or 29 respondents) of the participants selected the *Other* category; library directors nominated 18.6 percent (or 28 respondents); and 2 percent (or 3 respondents) of the respondents did not know or could not recall who nominated them.

Academics

Undergraduate Careers

The academic backgrounds were of interest to the researchers because it helps in providing a complete profile of the Snowbird participant. All but 4 of the respondents reported having attained an undergraduate degree and the major subject area. Nearly 23 percent (34) reported English as their undergraduate major. Other subject areas worth noting include history (8 per-

Table 1. Breakdown of useable returned surveys by year of attendance.

Year	# of useable surveys received	%
1990	11	7.3
1991	14	9.3
1992	22	14.6
1993	11	7.3
1994	25	16.66
1995	21	14
1996	17	11.3
1998	25	16.66
	4	2.66
Total	150	

cent), social sciences²³ and other (7.3 percent each). Fine arts and business tied with 6.6 percent (10). More than fifty percent (92) of respondents reported not having an undergraduate minor. Three persons reported library science as an undergraduate minor.

MLS/MLIS and Other Graduate Degrees

The terminal degree for the library and information science profession is considered by the American Library Association and the majority of the profession to be the master's degree. Findings in this area, 96.66 percent, overwhelmingly confirm this assumption; however, of the respondents, 2 percent (3) reported not having acquired the degree; and, an additional 1.3 percent (2) did not answer the question. Although more than a third of the participants were nominated by their library school deans, there was no concentration of participants from specific graduate schools. The University of Arizona ranked first with 11 participants; the University of Pitts-

burgh and Emporia State University each had 9 participants; and Brigham Young University and the University of Wisconsin-Madison each had 8 participants.²⁴

One hundred and fifteen respondents, nearly 77 percent, reported not having earned an additional graduate degree at the time of the survey. Thirty of the Snowbirders have earned master's degrees; 3 have earned doctorates; and 1 reported earning the equivalent of a master's degree in education. Almost 27 percent (40) of the respondents reported that they had completed additional graduate credits, which had not been applied toward a degree, in a variety of disciplines.

Career Background and Progression

An important component of the profile of the Snowbird Leadership Institute participants is a discussion of career backgrounds and career progression since participation in the Institute, and the level and type of involvement in leadership and professional activities. It is important to indicate that the concept of leadership is, and probably should be, defined broadly, with respect to the types of organizations in which individuals are employed and personal and professional goals.

Career Progression

Certainly, a significant part of this discussion is the respondents' perceptions regarding the impact of the Snowbird experience on their career paths and progression. The discussion of the career backgrounds and career progression of those who have participated in the Institute includes information regarding years of professional library experience, years of prior experience in other professions and as paraprofessionals in libraries. It also includes the types of libraries in which they worked at the time of their attendance and at present, the types of positions they have held and are in currently, and career progression since participation in the Institute.

In terms of professional experience, the participants have been librarians for an average of 8 years (See table 3). More than half of the respondents have been professional librarians for between 6 and 10 years, and slightly more than one-quarter have

Table 2. Gender, ethnic background and age range of Snowbird population.

Gender		Ethnic Background		Age Range	
Female	114	White	128	21-25	0
Male	34	Black/African American	11	26-30	9
Null	2	Hispanic/Latino	3	31-35	35
		Other	3	36-39	17
		Asian/Asian American	2	40-45	38
		American Indian-Native American	1	46 +	46

5 years or fewer of professional experience. In contrast, with regard to when they participated in Snowbird, the respondents indicated that they had an average of just under 4 years of professional library experience, reflecting the program focus on individuals who are relatively new to the profession. In fact, 85 percent had five or fewer years of professional experience at the time of participation.

With regard to the types of libraries in which they have been employed, nearly all of the Snowbird participants worked in public libraries (44 percent) or academic libraries (34.66 percent) at the time they attended the Institute (See table 4). Of those who did indicate the type of library in which they are working now, the majority are still working in public (29.33 percent) or academic (16.66 percent) libraries. However, providing a comparison between the types of libraries in which the respondents were working at the time of their participation and the types of institutions in which they are working now is difficult based upon the fact that exactly one-third did not indicate the type of library in which they are working now. The fact that such a large percentage of the respondents did not provide an answer for this survey item may be based on the fact that an earlier question addresses their current job situation in reference to their Snowbird participation. (See Appendix A, item 15). In fact, 38.66 percent indicated that they are in the same position (and same institution) now, as was the case at the time they attended the Institute. Another 25.33 percent are in the same institution but in a different position. It should be noted that some respondents selected more than one category in response to this item.

In fact, of the 58 respondents who indicated that they are in the same position that they were in at the time of the Institute, half (51.72 percent) are working

Table 4. Employing Institution currently and during Snowbird.

	Currently	During Snowbird
Academic	25	52
Public	44	66
Special	5	8
Government	7	12
School	0	1
Other	7	10
Not working in a library	12	3
No response	50	

in public libraries now. Nearly one-third are in academic libraries, with 10.34 percent in government libraries, and approximately 5 percent in special libraries. In contrast, a slightly larger percentage (55.26 percent) of those who are working in the same institution but in a different position are in public libraries, with fewer (23.68 percent) in academic libraries. It should be noted that almost half of those who are working in different institutions than was the case at the time of their participation in the Institute are in academic libraries, with approximately one-quarter in public libraries.

It is interesting to note the changes in the types of positions held by the respondents now as compared to the time of participation. More than a third (38.66 percent) of the respondents were working in public services at the time of their participation in the Institute (See table 5). With regard to administrative positions, 22.66 percent were department heads or heads of branches, 12 percent were directors or deans, and 3.33 percent were assistant or associate deans or directors at the time of their participation. Only 10 percent were working in technical services; and, 14 percent worked in other areas of library and information services. In contrast, only 20 percent are working in public services now. And, slightly fewer (8.6 percent) reported working in technical services now, as compared to their positions at the time of participation in the Institute. As would be expected on the basis of the fact that they have been in the profession for a greater period of time, more are in administrative positions now. At present, 30.6 percent are heads of branches of departments; 6.66 percent are assistant or associate deans or directors; and, 14.6 percent are deans or directors. Certainly, it is not possible to indicate a direct correlation between the respondents'

Table 3. Professional Experience currently and during Snowbird.

	Currently		During Snowbird	
0 to 5 years	39	26%	128	85.33%
6 to 10 years	83	53.33%	10	6.66%
11 to 15 years	14	9.33%	4	2.66%
16 to 20 years	8	5.33%	4	2.66%
More than 20 years	3	2%	0	
No response	3	2%	4	2.66%

participation in the leadership institute and their career and upward mobility. However, discussion of the respondents' perceptions of the impact of their participation with regard to their obtaining subsequent positions and their perceptions regarding whether their careers (discussed below) would have been different had they not had the Snowbird experience provides additional information regarding the role of the Institute.

While it is important to consider the promotions and what appears to be the upward mobility of those who have participated in the Institute, it should be noted that not all progression is vertical. Thus, being promoted or obtaining a higher level position elsewhere is not the only measure of career progression. Also, the size and availability of promotion opportunities in the employing institution and the relative mobility of the respondents are factors, as well. However, factors such as these are outside of the scope of this study. In addition, some of the respondents were already in administrative or managerial positions at the time of participation. Certainly, the comparison of the level of leadership activity prior to and since participation in the Institute is an important consideration in considering the role of the Institute in the careers of the respondents.

With regard to their career backgrounds prior to entering librarianship, more than 60 percent have held paraprofessional positions in library and information science prior to becoming librarians. Of those who have held such positions, the average number of years of such experience that the respondents reported was 6.4 years, reflecting the fact that 34 percent of those with such experience had five or fewer years of paraprofessional experience in library and information science; and, 19.33 percent had 6 to 10 years paraprofessional experience in

library and information science (See table 6). In contrast, slightly fewer than one-quarter (22 percent) reported having held positions in some other field prior to becoming librarians. And, of those who worked in other fields prior to entering librarianship, did so for relatively short periods of time. In fact 85 percent of those who did work in other fields had five or fewer years of such experience, with the average being 3.84 years.

Leadership Activities

One limitation of the study relates to the discussion of leadership activities. As the two researchers are working or have worked in academic library settings, the leadership activities about which the respondents were queried reflect an emphasis on activities that are often required of academic librarians, and which may, thus, reflect a greater degree of participation by participants in these types of settings than may be the case for others in public, school, or special libraries. The respondents were asked to indicate other leadership activities in which they have been involved. It is important to indicate that a full discussion of the leadership role taken by individuals in such a broad array of settings is not possible if the focus is on only scholarship, professional association activities, and other committee activities.

The leadership activities considered include scholarly activities, such as research, publication, and presentations. For the purposes of this discussion, the discussion of participation will be limited to research and scholarly activities. In order to consider the impact of the Institute on their level of professional activity, the participants were asked to indicate their level of scholarly activity and professional participation prior and subsequent to attending the Institute. Certainly, any discussion of these factors must include the indication that the fact the individuals have simply been in the profession for longer period of time is likely to have some impact on the level of scholarly and professional activity. In addition, the fact that the Institute focuses on leadership development for those who are at relatively early stages in their career suggests that at the time of participation, the level of activity reported is not likely to be directly comparable to that reported later. It should be noted that only 15 percent of the respondents indicated that they are required to write, publish, and/or engage in research in order to obtain promotion and/or tenure or a tenure equivalent. Fewer (12 percent) have

Table 5. Type of Position held currently and during Snowbird.

	Currently	During Snowbird
Public Services	30	58
Technical Services	13	15
Department or Branch Head	46	34
Asst. or Assoc. Dean/Director	10	5
Dean/Director	22	18
Other	26	21
No response	3	2

Table 6. Paraprofessional experience.

	LIS	Other Fields
0 to 5 years	52	128
6 to 10 years	29	10
11 to 15 years	12	4
16 to 20 years	3	4
More than 20 years	3	0
No response	51	4

held other positions with these requirements since participating in Snowbird.

The data gathered reflects the respondents' publication activity in terms of journal articles, books, book chapters, book reviews, and publications in conference proceedings.

Of the 150 respondents, only 36 had authored or co-authored articles that had been published prior to participating in Snowbird (See table 7). Since their participation in the Institute, there has been a 15.29 percent increase in the number of respondents who have published articles. Greater increases are also reflected for all other types of publications as well. Not surprisingly, the largest increase (43.75 percent) appeared with regard to the number of respondents who have written book reviews. However, it should be noted that a larger number of individuals wrote journal articles than did book reviews.

A more consistent level of increases was noted with regard to presentations reported. The participants were asked about presentations that they have made at professional library conferences at the national and international levels, the state level, and other library conferences, as well as conferences in other disciplines. The increases ranged from 14 percent to 25 percent, with the greater increase being reflected in relation to presentations at national and international library conferences, although the largest number of presentations reported were as a part of state library association conferences as shown in table 8.

Attitudes about the Institute and Perceived Impact

In order to gather data on the participants' attitudes about the Institute, the researchers included survey queries which asked about the participants' perceptions of the impact of the Institute on their career progression, as well as learnings and interaction with other Snowbird participants, and benefit and learnings from the Insti-

tute itself. Forty percent of the respondents reported that the Institute contributed somewhat to their obtaining subsequent positions, 19 percent reported that it contributed to a great extent. However, 31.33 percent (47) reported that it did not contribute at all to their obtaining subsequent positions. The latter statistic is in line with the 38.66 percent (58) who reported that at the time of the survey, they were in the same position as when they attended the Institute.

In a question related to career progression, nearly half of the respondents (48.66 percent or 73) selected yes when asked if they believed their career paths would have been different without the Snowbird experience. Forty-two percent answered that it would not have been different and 14 respondents declined to answer the question.

Individuals who have participated in the Institute are selected from a larger pool, and are ostensibly, the cream that rose to the top during the selection process. With this in mind, the researchers included queries which were intended to gather data about learnings and interactions with other Snowbird participants. One hundred and fourteen (76 percent) of those surveyed noted that interaction with other participants contributed a great deal to the overall quality and experience of the Institute. Twenty-two percent noted that it contributed to some extent and one person reported that interactions with other participants did not contribute at all to the overall quality and experience.

Recognizing the proprietary nature of the content and curriculum of the Institute itself, the researchers generalized the overall Snowbird experience, including all learning techniques, literature, and structured group and individual occurrences, by asking respondents about the perceived benefits and learnings from activities which occurred after the Institute. The survey instrument in-

Table 7. Leadership Activities: Respondents reporting publication activity.

	# of respondents before Snowbird	# of respondents since Snowbird
Journal articles	36	49
Books	12	17
Book chapters	18	33
Book reviews	18	46
Conference papers	20	25

cluded a number of opportunities for gathering qualitative data about the Institute and this data will be analyzed and disseminated at a later date. Four categories of post-Institute activity were identified and participants were surveyed using multiple choice format queries, modeled on a Likert scale.

Listserv

The Snowbird listserv is an electronic discussion list, open only to Snowbird participants. Selection and participation in the Institute does not guarantee automatic signup and many respondents expressed a lack of knowledge about the existence of the listserv and some included requests in their comments to be subscribed. Several offered comments about the traffic on the listserv including its perceived primary existence as being a method for announcing job and address changes, as opposed to being a tool for discussion of leadership and related issues. As primarily a lurker on this listserv, one of the researchers observes that there have been attempts to introduce and sustain stimulating and intellectual discussions; however, it is difficult for one or two persons to provide the continuing dialogue for an entire list. Table 9 shows the responses regarding the listserv as well as the other categories: informal reunions at professional conferences, collegial relationships developed with other participants, and mentoring relationships.

Informal Reunions

The Snowbird Leadership office in Salt Lake City hosts an annual reception for participants and mentors at the American Library Association's annual conference each summer. Depending upon the location of ALA's Mid-

winter conference, and/or division conferences (e.g., Public Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries, etc.), local participants sometimes organize dinner, lunch, or other informal meetings for Snowbirders's attending those conferences. Table 9, column 3 shows that 41 percent of the respondents reported that these informal reunions contribute to a great extent or to some extent to the overall quality of their post-Institute interaction. Nearly 60 percent (89 respondents) did not answer or reported that these reunions did not contribute to the quality of the experience. An analysis of the years of participation of the 89 respondents did not reveal any statistically significant relationship between year of participation and attitude about informal reunions.

Collegial Relationships

Collegial relationships were identified as an area for further analysis because the researchers recognize the importance of collegiality in the profession of librarianship. Collegial relationships are developed and maintained via listservs, at annual and biannual conferences, and via other professional development opportunities. Networking professionally and socially has long been associated with advancement in the corporate, private, public and higher education sectors. Table 9 reveals that collegial relationships have contributed greatly or to some extent to the quality of the experience for 114 (76 percent) participants.

Mentoring Relationships

Mentoring is an important component of the Snowbird experience. In fact, in the majority of the leadership institutes previously discussed, mentoring is an aspect that is given much consideration. The mentoring aspect of the Institute was more informal in that for the duration of the Institute, small groups of individuals were assigned to 2 mentors. These relationships have the potential to continue after the Institute, but this post-Institute activity is not directly structured. Mentors have ranged from lawyers to directors of large public library systems, to library administrators from universities, both public and private. Table 9 shows that more than 50 percent (87 respondents) of those responding to the survey rated mentoring relationships as contributing to a great extent or to some extent to the quality of their Snowbird experience. Thirty-eight percent of those surveyed reported that the mentoring relationships did not

Table 8. Leadership Activities: Respondents reporting presentation activity.

	# of respondents before Snowbird	# of respondents since Snowbird
National or International Library Conferences	30	50
State/Regional Library Conferences	63	84
Other Library Conferences	40	63
Other Conferences	54	81

contribute to the quality of their experience and 4 percent declined to answer the question. The fact that a significant portion of the population did not rate the value of the mentoring relationships highly may be based on the lack of individual mentoring relationships and/or as factor of the population demographics and the difficulty of building such relationships.

Other Library Leadership Programs

Based on the authors' interest in the effects of library leadership programs, item 31 inquired about participation in other library leadership programs. Twenty-two individuals responded about participation in *Other* Institutes, citing state or regional leadership programs. Seventy-eight percent reported that they had not participated in any other programs; eight percent reported they attended the ALA Emerging Leaders Institute, and 6 percent reported they had recently participated in the Association of Research Libraries Leadership and Career Development Program.²⁵ Although the former Institute appears to have been a one-time opportunity, plans are underway for the second ARL program; and, as participants in the latter, the researchers look forward to examining that population for trends and evidence of acquired outcomes.

Summary and Recommendations for Future Research

It is difficult to identify a direct relationship between participation in the Snowbird Leadership Institute and career progression and greater participation in leadership activities. However, it is clear that the respondents report an increased level of activity in a number of different categories of leadership activity. In addition, their perceptions regarding the value of the Institute with regard to their career progression are largely positive and reflect that many of their career paths would have been different had they not had the Snowbird experience.

In terms of the respondents attitudes about the

Institute and perceived impact, it is difficult to determine the relationship between the impact of the Institute on the obtaining of subsequent positions. The fact that nearly 40 percent reported that they are currently in the same position as when they attended the Institute does not allow a clear analysis of this particular occurrence. Other activities engaged in, however, while remaining in the same position may begin to shed some light on this aspect of the study; and, as mentioned previously, the number of individuals increased in every category in the presentation and publication categories.

Interactions with other Snowbird participants, categorized as Collegial relationships, and mentoring are rated highly among most participants. However, the nearly 40 percent answered that mentoring did not contribute to the quality of their overall experience. As previously mentioned, mentoring is critical and the informal, unstructured approach may not have been the best method for introducing the mentoring component.

The listserv and informal reunions were not highly rated, as well. This could be contributed to the informal nature of both.

The researchers recommend further analysis of the data collected, with a special emphasis on the qualitative responses to the queries on leadership, career progression and impact of the Institute on individual careers. It would also be beneficial to track the participants of the Spectrum Initiative, for more in depth qualitative data on the mentoring component and the proposed Spectrum institute²⁶; as well as the participants of the Senior Fellows program, the Emerging Leaders Institute, and the ARL Leadership and Career Development Program.

Notes

1. "Leadership Development Programs: An Environmental Scan." Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries Office of Leadership and Management

Table 9. Responses for categories identified as post-Institute relevant activities.

Contributions to individual benefits and learning	Listserv	Informal	Collegial reunions	Mentoring relationships
To a great extent	15 (10%)	14 (9.33%)	35 (23.33%)	26 (17.33%)
To some extent	57 (38%)	47 (31.33%)	79 (52.66%)	61 (40.60%)
Not at all	69 (46%)	62 (41.33%)	31 (20.66%)	57 (38%)
No response	9 (6%)	27 (18%)	5 (3.33%)	6 (4%)

- Services. Unpublished document, 1.
2. Ibid.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Ibid. 1–2.
 5. “ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute.” *College and Research Libraries News* 60 (February 1999): 71.
 6. Donna Brockmeyer-Klebaum, “Leadership Institutes: The Living Legacy They Can and Can’t Leave,” *Feliciter* (October 1995): 18
 7. Ibid.
 8. F. William Summers and Lorraine Summers, “Library Leadership 2000 and Beyond: Snowbird Leadership Institute,” *Wilson Library Bulletin* (1991): 38.
 9. Ibid.
 10. Ibid.
 11. Nancy Tessman, “Learning to Be Library Leaders,” *Wilson Library Bulletin* (October 1990): 16.
 12. Ibid.
 13. F. William Summers and Lorraine Summers, 39.
 14. F. William Summers and Lorraine Summers, 40.
 15. Marilyn L. Miller, “Snowbird: An Experiment in Leadership,” *American Libraries* (October 1992): 812.
 16. F. William Summers and Lorraine Summers, 41.
 17. Ibid.
 18. Julie A. Brewer, “Post-Master’s Residency Programs: Enhancing the Development of New Professionals and Minority Recruitment in Academic and Research Libraries,” *College and Research Libraries* 58 (Nov. 1997): 528–37.
 19. Ibid., 531.
 20. Mark D. Winston. “The Recruitment, Education and Careers of Academic Business Librarians.” Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh. (1997).
 21. For information on the Snowbird Leadership Institute, contact Bobbi Bohman, Salt Lake City Public Library, Salt Lake City, Utah. In 1997, a “reunion” Institute was held for participants from earlier years, instead of the usual Institute. Thus, respondents were asked to complete the instrument on the basis of their first participation in the Institute.
 22. The Snowbird Leadership Institute listserv is openly only to Snowbird participants, mentors, and administrators. To be added to the list, contact Mike Silvia at msilvia@etal.uri.edu.
 23. Includes double majors, international affairs and American studies.
 24. Other schools attended include: State University of New York-Albany, University of Alberta, University of British Columbia, Clarion University of Pennsylvania, Emory University, University of Michigan, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, San Jose State University, St. John’s University, University of Texas at Austin, Wayne State University, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Columbia University, and the University of Southern California—1 participant each; University of California-Los Angeles, Catholic University of America, Kent State University, University of Kentucky, North Carolina Central University, University of South Carolina, University of Tennessee, and University of Washington—2 participants; Drexel University, University of Hawaii, University of Iowa, University of Oklahoma, Rutgers University, Simmons College, and University of California, Berkeley—3 participants; University of Illinois, Indiana University, University of North Texas, and Texas Women’s University—4 participants; Louisiana State University and University of Missouri-Columbia—5 participants; University of South Florida and Florida State University—6 participants; and University of Maryland—7 participants.
 25. For additional information on the ARL LCDP, contact DeEtta Jones, ARL Program Officer for Diversity at [<deetta@arl.org>](mailto:deetta@arl.org) or at 202-296-2296; and for information on the Emerging Leaders institute, contact Emily Melton [<emelton@ala.org>](mailto:emelton@ala.org); or see Teresa Y. Neely, “Diversity Initiatives and Programs: The National Approach,” *Journal of Library Administration* (forthcoming 1999).
 26. See the Spectrum Initiative Mission at [<http://www.ala.org/spectrum/mission.html>](http://www.ala.org/spectrum/mission.html) and also, Spectrum Initiative: Scholarship Requirements and Expectations at <http://www.ala.org/spectrum/mission.html>.

Snowbird Leadership Institute: A Survey of the Implications for Leadership in the Profession

Teresa Y. Neely and Mark D. Winston

Appendix A

SNOWBIRD LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE SURVEY

This survey was designed to determine your perceptions of the Snowbird Leadership Institute. We are also interested in finding out if there is a relationship between your professional activities before and after the Institute and currently. Your responses are confidential and will not be connected to any individual in the reporting phase. The results of this survey will be reported at the ACRL conference in Detroit in April of 1999, and will also be submitted for publication in a refereed journal. Thank you for your participation. Mark and Teresa

1. During what year did you participate in the Snowbird Leadership Institute? _____

2. Please indicate, from the following choices, who nominated you for Snowbird.

_____ Dean or department head, School of Library/Information Science

_____ State Librarian

_____ Library Director

_____ Other (please specify) _____

_____ I don't know

3. In what type of library did you work at the time you attended Snowbird?

_____ Academic

_____ Public

_____ Special

_____ Government

_____ School

_____ Other

_____ Not working in a library at the time

3a. What was your job title at the time you attended Snowbird?

4. In what state did you work at the time you attended Snowbird? _____

5. What was your undergraduate major? _____

6. What was your undergraduate minor, if applicable? _____

7. Have you earned a Master's degree in Library/Information Science (MLIS)?

Yes _____ No _____ In process _____

7a. If yes, at what institution did you complete the degree? _____

8. Other than the MLIS degree, what additional graduate degrees have you earned?

_____ None

Degree	Discipline
_____	Master's _____
_____	Doctorate _____
_____	Other _____
	(please specify)

9. Have you completed additional graduate courses which have not been applied to a degree?

Yes _____ No _____ go to # 10.

9a. If so, in what disciplines have you taken these graduate courses?

Discipline	Number of credits completed
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

10. For how long have you been a professional librarian? _____

11. Prior to entering librarianship, have you held (a) paraprofessional position(s) in the library science field? Yes _____ No _____

11a. If so, how many years of such experience did you have before participating in Snowbird? _____ Years

11b. What type(s) of position(s) did you hold?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

12. Prior to entering librarianship, have you held (a) paraprofessional position(s) in another field? Yes _____ No _____

12a. If so, what type(s) of position(s) did you hold?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

13. How many years of professional library experience did you have **before participating in Snowbird**? _____
Years

14. What professional library positions had you held **prior to participating in Snowbird**? Please indicate these positions in chronological order, with the most recent past position listed first (e.g., 1-General reference librarian, 2-Social sciences librarian, etc.).

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

15. Please select the item which applies to your current job situation in reference to your Snowbird participation. Are you:

- _____ a. In the same position at the same institution? (Go to # 19)
 _____ b. In the same institution in a different position?
 _____ c. Neither

16. What professional library positions have you held **since participating in Snowbird**? Please indicate these positions in chronological order, with the most recent past position listed first (e.g., 1-General reference librarian, 2-Social sciences librarian, etc.).

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____

17. In what type of library do you work now?

- _____ Academic
 _____ Public
 _____ Special
 _____ Government
 _____ School
 _____ Other
 _____ Not working in a library at this time

18. In what state do you currently work? _____

19. What is your current job title? _____

20. For how long have you been in your current position? _____ Years

21. In your current position, are you required to write, publish, and/or engage in research in order to obtain promotion and/or tenure or a tenure equivalent? Yes _____ No _____

22. In other positions that you have held since participating in Snowbird, have you been required to write, publish, and/or engage in research in order to obtain promotion and/or tenure or a tenure equivalent?

Yes _____ No _____

23. How many of each of the following have you published (authored or co-authored) before and since participating in Snowbird?

Before	Since	
_____	_____	Journal Articles
_____	_____	Books
_____	_____	Book chapters
_____	_____	Book reviews
_____	_____	Papers in Conference Proceedings

24. How many presentations have you made at professional conferences before and since participating in Snowbird?

Before	Since	
_____	_____	presentations at national/international library conferences
_____	_____	presentations at statewide or regional library conferences
_____	_____	presentations at other conferences
_____	_____	presentations to other (board of directors, board of visitors, city council, school boards, etc.)

25. Please indicate if you have been involved in professional associations before and since participating in Snowbird. For each item 25a–25c, select all that apply.

25a. National or international professional library associations?

Before	Since	
_____	_____	Attended conference
_____	_____	Committee member
_____	_____	Office holder

25b. Other professional associations?

Before	Since	
_____	_____	Attended conference
_____	_____	Committee member
_____	_____	Office holder

25c. What has been your level of involvement on committees at institutions where you have been employed (i.e., college/university committees, school or departmental committees, city or local committees)?

Before	Since	
_____	_____	Attended conference
_____	_____	Committee member
_____	_____	Office holder

26. What other leadership activities have you participated in before and since Snowbird? Please explain.

Before _____

Since _____

27. To what extent did your participation in the Snowbird Leadership Institute contribute to your obtaining subsequent positions?

- _____ To A Great Extent
- _____ To Some Extent
- _____ Not At All

27a. Please explain. _____

28. Do you think that your career path would have been different without the Snowbird experience?

Yes _____ No _____

28a. Please explain. _____

29. To what extent did your learnings and interaction with other Snowbird participants contribute to the quality of your experience in the program?

- _____ To A Great Extent
- _____ To Some Extent
- _____ Not At All

29a. Please Explain _____

30. To what extent do you believe you received benefits and learnings from activities after the Institute for the following:

30a. Snowbird Listserv

- _____ To A Great Extent
- _____ To Some Extent
- _____ Not At All

30b. Informal reunions at professional conferences (e.g., ALA, Midwinter, PLA, etc.)

- _____ To A Great Extent
- _____ To Some Extent
- _____ Not At All

30c. Collegial relationships developed with other participants?

- _____ To A Great Extent
- _____ To Some Extent
- _____ Not At All

30d. Mentoring relationships?

- _____ To A Great Extent
- _____ To Some Extent
- _____ Not At All

30e. Please Comment here on any part of question 30. _____

31. Have you participated in other library leadership programs in addition to Snowbird?

- _____ None
- _____ American Library Association Emerging Leaders Institute
- _____ Association of Research Libraries Leadership and Career Development Program
- _____ Other _____
(please specify)

32. Please indicate any additional comments which are important with regard to the impact of your participation in the Snowbird Leadership Institute on your career.

33. What is your gender? Female _____ Male _____

34. What is your ethnic background?

- _____ White
- _____ Asian/Asian American
- _____ Black/African American
- _____ American Indian/Native American
- _____ Hispanic/Latino
- _____ Other

35. What is your age?

- _____ 21 – 25
- _____ 26 – 30
- _____ 31 – 35
- _____ 36 – 39
- _____ 40 – 45
- _____ 46 +

36. Are there any additional comments that you would like to make regarding the questionnaire overall?
