

**Bridging Boundaries to
Create a New Workforce:**
A Survey of Spectrum Scholarship Recipients, 1998-2003
Commissioned by the American Library Association



Prepared by
Dr. Loriene Roy, Principal Investigator
Glendora Johnson-Cooper
Cynthia Tysick
Daisy Waters

With assistance from:
Jorge Chavez
Kara Huggard
Antony Cherian
The ALA Office for Diversity

© 2006 American Library Association

Survey Methodology

Survey questions are organized into three sections: (1) Questions for all Spectrum Scholarship recipients; (2) Questions for those who have completed their graduate degree or library media certification; and (3) Questions for those who did not complete their degree plan and are not currently enrolled as students. The instrument was developed in cooperation with the ALA Office for Diversity and pretested by selected LIS faculty and students who shared demographic characteristics with Spectrum Scholars.

The survey instrument was housed on the ALA Office for Diversity Web site with a non-fillable version of the instrument posted on a Web site hosted by the School of Information at the University of Texas at Austin. Scholars were invited to complete the form in early May 2004 Scholarship recipients by ALA's Office for Diversity. A separate contact list was also compiled and invitations sent to each scholar for whom there was available contact information. Copies of the instrument were forwarded via e-mail as plain text, as MS Word attachments, or in paper format as needed. Four follow-up reminders were issued to increase the response rate. Research Assistants coded the responses into data files using the SPSS statistical analysis package. A total of 164 completed surveys were received from the potential pool of 257 scholars for a response rate of 64 percent. As not every respondent answered all questions, the total number of responses to any given question may be less than 164.

Bridging Boundaries to Create a New Workforce Survey Responses

Respondents

This survey sought responses from the first six cohorts of Spectrum Scholarship recipients. 164 of 257 scholars responded, for a response rate of 64 percent. Responses were received from students within each of the six cohorts. Table 1 shows the number and percentage of responses from each cohort as well as the percentage of total surveys contributed per cohort from 1998-1999 to 2003-2004. Since a balanced number of surveys were received from each Spectrum class, responses should reflect experiences shared across Spectrum cohorts.

Spectrum Year	Number Received	Total Number of Scholars	Percent of Cohort Responding	Percent of Total Surveys Received
1998-1999	31	50	62	19
1999-2000	30	50	60	18
2000-2001	26	50	52	16
2001-2002	33	52	63	20
2002-2003	22	27	81	13
2003-2004	22	28	79	13
Total	164	257		100

In presenting the findings to key questions results are indicated as numbers and percentages of respondents to relevant survey questions—not as percentages of total number of survey respondents.

Scholar Demographics: Ethnicity, Gender, Disability, and Age

Answers to basic demographic questions help provide a profile of the respondents' national origin, gender, race and ethnicity. Ninety-six percent (n=157) of respondents indicated that they were U.S. citizens with three percent (n=5) Permanent Residents and one percent (n=1) Canadian citizen.

Approximately three fourths (77 percent, n=114) of the respondents indicated that they were born in the United States with 23 percent (n=34) indicating other countries of origin. Sixteen respondents did not answer this question. Of those respondents born outside of the United States, half (53 percent, n=18) were from Asia followed by the Caribbean (26 percent, n=9). In terms of gender, 86 percent (n=141) of the respondents were female; 14 percent (n=23), male.ⁱ The difference in gender indicates that alternative approaches may need to be instituted in order to recruit male students of color into LIS programs.

Spectrum Scholarships applicants were originally asked to self-identify from four ethnic groups. In 2001, the Asian /Pacific Islander category was split into two categories Asian, and Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander to conform to the revisions of the standards for the classification of federal data on race and ethnicity promulgated by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in October 1997. The largest number of respondents indicated that they were Black/African American/African Canadian (42 percent, n=67), followed by Hispanic/Latino (30 percent, n=49), Asian (22 percent, n=36), and Native peoples (6 percent, n=9). These results are shown below in Table 2. Three respondents did not answer this question.

Race or Ethnicity	Number	Percent
American Indian/Native	9	6
Asian	36	22
African American	67	42
Hispanic/Latino	49	30
Total	161	100

When asked, “Would you also describe yourself as a person of mixed or blended ancestry,” nearly half (49 percent, n=80), of the respondents responded that they would. A chi-square test, shown in Table 3, reveals significant differences (p<.005) when respondents’ race or ethnicity is compared to their self-identification as a person with mixed or blended ancestry; these data elements were available for 151 of the 164 respondents. Hispanic/Latino respondents were more apt to identify themselves as persons of mixed heritage with smaller numbers of African American or Asian students doing so.ⁱⁱ Sixty-nine percent (34 of the 49 respondents who indicated that their race/family origin was “other”) noted that their heritage was best categorized as Mexican, Chicano, Mextizo, or two or more cultures, including Mexican-American (Caucasian Hispanic or White Hispanic), Spanish-Mexican-Indian (or Native American), and Chicana/Asian/American Indian. Note that the Native respondents are not included in this cross-tabulation analysis due to their small inclusion in the sample. Nevertheless, LIS programs might especially keep in mind that a large number of prospective students of color might be more responsive to an application process and financial aid structure that acknowledges people of mixed heritage.

Table 3. Race/Ethnicity and Mixed/Blended Ancestry Cross Tabulation (n=151)				
Race or Ethnicity		Mixed Ancestry		Total
		No	Yes	
Asian	Number	25	11	36
	Percent	69.4	30.6	100.0
Black	Number	40	26	66
	Percent	60.6	39.4	100.0
Hispanic	Number	15	34	49
	Percent	30.6	69.4	100.0
Total	Number	80	71	151
	Percent	53.0	47.0	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square value of 15.299; significance level <.005

Six percent (n=9) of the respondents reported that they one or more disability. The 2002 Census indicates that nearly 19 percent of the U.S. population from 16 to 64 years has a disability.ⁱⁱⁱ Individuals with disabilities appear to be underrepresented among Spectrum Scholars when compared to the population as a whole.

Table 4 groups the ages of the survey respondents at the time they received their scholarships into six categories from 21 to 25 years of age to 46 years old and older; 158 respondents provided this information. Results show that over half (54 percent, n=86) of the respondents were thirty or younger at the time they received their award. Age at time of scholarship ranged from 21 to 61 with a mean age of 32. Cross-analyzing age with other variables resulted in one finding of possible interest: students in each of the three largest ethnic groups (Asian, African/American, and Hispanic/Latino) had representatives in all age categories except one. No scholarships were awarded to Asian students over 45.

Table 4. Age at Time of Receiving Spectrum Scholarship (n=158)		
Age	Number	Percent
21-25	33	21
26-30	53	34
31-35	26	16
36-40	16	10
41-45	17	11
46 and over	13	8
Total	158	100

Developing Interest in Librarianship as a Career

These data provide rich information that helps us understand more fully the recruitment of people of color into LIS professions. Whether students had prior experience working in libraries, at what point in their lives they decided to enroll in a LIS program, what criteria influenced this decision, how they learned about the Spectrum Scholarship Program, and whether they felt it influenced their decision to pursue further education were also key areas of interest raised in this survey.

A majority (62 percent, n=101) of respondents had degrees in social sciences disciplines such as education, psychology, or history. Thirty-two percent (n=53) of respondents had a humanities related degree with only five percent (n=8) with prior degrees in the sciences. In addition to completing an undergraduate degree, 15 percent (n=25) of the respondents had completed another master's degree prior to starting their LIS programs.

Over half (57 percent, n=93) of the respondents first made their decision to enroll in a LIS program after completing their undergraduate degree, 18 percent (n=29) made this decision while still undergraduates and another 15 percent (n=25) did so after completing another graduate program. The most productive recruitment programs might be those that are tailored for individuals at these points in their lives. Table five illustrates these results. One respondent did not answer this question.

Table 5. Time When Decision to Enter LIS Program Was Made (n= 163)		
Time Span	Number	Percent
Before completing high school	2	1
After completing high school	2	1
While completing an undergraduate degree	29	18
After completing an undergraduate degree	93	57
While enrolled in another graduate program	12	7
After completing another graduate program	25	15
Total	163	100*

*Rounded.

The single most predictive indicator of whether a scholar would enter a LIS program was prior experience working in a library. Respondents provided details on their experience working in libraries throughout their lives. Seventy-six percent (n=125) of respondents had prior experience working in paid positions in libraries with twenty percent (n=25) working both during and after receiving their undergraduate degrees. Twenty-one percent (n=35) of the respondents had never worked in a library prior to receiving their Spectrum Scholarship. Sixty-five percent (n=106) had worked only in

prior paid positions, with twelve percent (n=19) working both in paid and in volunteer positions and only two percent (n=4) having worked solely as library volunteers.

Over half (59 percent, n=96) of the respondents were working in a library at the time they made the decision to attend an LIS program. There were no significant differences between Spectrum Cohorts 1998-99 through 2003-2004, indicating that this is a consistent finding. As a result, recruiters might find the most promising prospective LIS students of color to be individuals with prior experience in paid library positions who have just completed their undergraduate degrees.

Table 6. Library Work Prior to Receiving Spectrum Scholarship**		
Work Experience	Number	Percent
No	35	21
Yes, only in a paid position	106	65
Yes, only as volunteer	4	2
Yes, both in a paid position and as a volunteer	19	12
Total	164	100
Yes, in a paid position	125*	76
Paid, during high school	17	10
Paid, while an undergraduate	73	45
Paid, after completing undergraduate degree	67	41
Paid, while enrolled in another graduate program	26	16
Paid, after completing another graduate program	18	11
Yes, as a volunteer	23*	14
Volunteer, during high school	9	6
Volunteer, while an undergraduate	5	3
Volunteer, after completing undergraduate degree	5	3
Volunteer, while enrolled in another graduate program	4	2
Volunteer, after completing another graduate program	5	3

*Respondents could provide more than one response. **N varies

As shown in Table 7, below, a significantly greater ($p < .05$) percentage of male respondents were working in libraries when they decided to attend their LIS programs. Two of the 164 respondents did not answer this question.

Table 7. Gender of Respondent and Working at Time of LIS Decision Cross tabulation				
Gender of Respondent	Working in Library at Time of Decision to Attend LIS Program			
		No	Yes	Total
Male	Number	5	18	23
	Percent	21.7	78.3	100.0
Female	Number	61	78	139
	Percent	43.9	56.1	100.0
Total	Number	66	96	162
	Percent	40.7	59.3	100.0

Pearson Chi-Square value of 4.009; significance level <.05

Respondents identified multiple reasons why they decided to pursue librarianship as a career. They were attracted to the flexibility of the career options, agreeing that librarianship would be able to let them use their talents (97 percent, n=157).

Respondents were strongly attracted to the service aspects of the field: 95 percent (n=155) agreed that they thought the career would give them the opportunity to help others. The next highest-rated reason for enrolling in library school was enjoyment using libraries in the past; 93 percent (n=151) indicated that this was one reason why they sought a career in librarianship. Over 80 percent of the respondents also felt that the degree would give them opportunities to advance professionally (90 percent, n=145), would complement their education (89 percent, n=145), and would give them skills that were marketable (84 percent, n=134). Students agreed least with the statement, "I always wanted to work in libraries:" Fewer than half (43 percent, n=70) of students always wanted to work to libraries. Answers to these questions are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Factors Influencing Scholar's Decision to Pursue Career in Librarianship		
	Agree (%)	Disagree (%)
I thought this career would let me use my talents	97	3
I thought the field would enable me to help others	95	5
I had enjoyed using libraries in the past	93	7
I felt I would have opportunities to advance	90	10
The degree would complement my education	89	11
I though librarianship would give me marketable skills	84	16
I knew a librarian who enjoyed his or her work	79	21
I thought the field would enable me to help my ethnic/racial community	79	21
I had enjoyed working in libraries	76	24

I desired a career change	73	27
Someone suggested that I would be successful in the field	73	27
I thought I would earn a good income	64	36
I always wanted to work in libraries	43	57

Geographically, respondents were residing in 38 states at the time they decided to apply to a LIS school. Of those states, ten or more respondents were residing in five states: California, Illinois, Maryland, New York, and Texas. Nearly 50 percent (47 percent, n=75) of respondents were living in these five states at the time they made their decision to return to school. Almost one out of three (29 percent, n=47) respondents moved from 65 to 5000 miles to attend a LIS program. The average relocation distance was nearly 1000 (957) miles.

Applying to the Spectrum Scholarship Program

Results indicate that the most effective means for marketing Spectrum was the ALA Web site; a third of respondents (35 percent, n=57) learned about the Spectrum Scholarship Program by visiting www.ala.org. Among respondents who used the Web site to learn about Spectrum, those who were already ALA members used the ala.org Web site at roughly the same rate as those who were not ALA members. Respondents also learned about Spectrum from co-workers in a library (21 percent, n=34), from a university librarian (10 percent, n=17), from the LIS program to which they applied (10 percent, n=17), or from a university professor (9 percent, n=15). One out of four respondents (29 percent, n=47) said that they would not have pursued their education without a Spectrum Scholarship.

Two thirds (68 percent, n=111) of respondents were working in a library or information center at the time they applied for their Spectrum Scholarship with two thirds (68 percent, n=75) of these working full-time. Half of the respondents were employed in two types of library settings: 26 percent (n=43) of respondents were working in college or university libraries and 24 percent (n=39) respondents were in mid-sized to large public libraries.

Choosing a LIS Program

Spectrum Scholarships are awarded to individuals who have completed up to one third of their LIS program coursework. Four out of ten respondents (41 percent, n=67) were enrolled in a LIS program at the time they applied for their scholarships. A greater number of scholarships were awarded to students newly recruited into LIS programs. Respondents attended forty-one different LIS programs including forty programs with ALA accredited master's programs and one nationally recognized NCATE-AASL reviewed/approved program in school library media education.

There were no significant differences between how respondents enrolled in LIS programs and those not enrolled learned about the Spectrum Scholarship Program.

Table 9 shows that approximately equal numbers of respondents found initial information about the Spectrum Scholarship Program through the ALA Web site, through contacts at LIS programs, publications, and practicing librarians.

Table 9. Enrollment in LIS Program at Spectrum Application and Source of Information about Spectrum Scholarship Program		
Learned about Spectrum From	Enrolled in LIS Program (#) / (%)	Not Enrolled in LIS Program (#) / (%)
ALA Web site	23 (34)	34 (35)
Co-Worker	11 (16)	23 (24)
College Librarian	10 (15)	7 (7)
Publication	7 (10)	5 (5)
Library School	6 (9)	11 (12)
University Professor	6 (9)	8 (8)
Public Librarian	5 (8)	7 (7)

Half of respondents (51 percent, n=83) said their school demonstrated special recognition of Spectrum recipients. Of these students, the most frequently mentioned recognition was additional financial support through matching funds, other scholarship awards, and salaried appointments—especially graduate assistantships. Other respondents were introduced at social events such as receptions, awards dinners, in class, or at convocation. Some LIS programs also identified their respondents in their newsletters, on their Web sites and electronic lists and in alumni or university-wide publications. Some recognition was less formal: several respondents indicated having easy access to LIS program faculty and administrators was a form of recognition. Twelve percent (n=19) of respondents were unaware of any recognition organized by their LIS program; none of these students were involved in their program’s graduate student organization, indicating that that this may have led to greater awareness of information about local support of Spectrum Scholarship recipients. LIS programs might also ensure that consistent communication reaches all students in their programs.

Once admitted and enrolled in a LIS program, Spectrum respondents did not leave that program to transfer to another program. Over 90 percent (93 percent, n=153) of scholars completed coursework at only one LIS program. Few students (3 percent, n=5) were enrolled in dual-degree programs. In-residence programs were the preferred program format for Spectrum Scholars, with 70 percent enrolled in such programs, three out of ten (30 percent, n=49) were enrolled in a distance delivery program. About half of students (55 percent, n=90) were enrolled full-time. As might be expected, those who moved to attend a LIS program were more apt ($p < .005$) to be full-time students when they enrolled. A significantly greater ($p < .005$) number of students enrolled in distance programs were fully employed, part-time students.

The top criterion in selecting an LIS program was cost: 85 percent (n=139) of the respondents agreed that their decision was influenced by the cost associated with attending a given program. Other criteria ranked as important were reputation of the school (83 percent, n=135), financial assistance provided (82 percent, n=132) and nearness to home (81 percent, n=131). Ranked as less important were standard of

living of the community (45 percent, n=73) where the program was located, a visit to the campus (42 percent, n=67), or the availability of a distance education program (36 percent, n=58).

Factor	Important (%)	Unimportant (%)
Cost of attending school	85	15
Reputation of the school	83	17
Nearness to home	81	19
Financial assistance provided	82	18
Specific program of study	79	21
Responsiveness of staff and/or faculty	77	23
Reputation of the faculty	72	28
Diversity	55	45
Recommendation from someone	53	47
Standard of living where school is Located	45	55
Campus visit	42	58
Distance education program available	36	64

Nearly three-fourths (74 percent, n=121) of respondents received additional financial support including financial awards, scholarships, fellowships, grants, stipends, tuition waivers, or salaried appointments as work study students, graduate student assistantships or teaching assistants. Ninety percent of respondents (42 of 47) who relocated to attend their LIS program received additional funding, differing significantly ($p < .005$) from those who did not relocate. A significant number of respondents ($p < .05$) receiving additional funding also were recognized in some way by their LIS schools. Significantly fewer students ($p < .025$) in distance programs received additional funding. Significantly fewer students ($p < .005$) employed full-time received these graduate awards, possibly due to funding requirements limiting many awards to those who can take more than one class.

Experiences in LIS Programs

Respondents reported a high degree of satisfaction with many aspects of their graduate programs, as shown in Table 11. While more than half (55 percent, n=89) of the respondents reported that standard of living was not a factor influencing their choice of LIS program, a high percentage of respondents (91 percent, n=142) were satisfied with this aspect of their graduate experience. A majority (87 percent, n=142) of students identified proximity to home as a key factor in choosing their school; respondents expressed satisfaction with this characteristic of their life as students. Students incorporated the financial assistance offered into their choice of LIS programs and their expectations appear to have been met: 83 percent (n=134) of respondents were somewhat satisfied or very satisfied with the financial assistance they received. Responsiveness of staff and faculty probably were slightly above their expectations: 82 percent (n=135) of respondents reported satisfaction with these interactions while 77

percent (n=127) indicated this contributed to their decision to attend a particular school. A high percentage (83 percent, n=134) were also satisfied with the quality of their interactions with classmates. Cost of attending a program was a key factor in choosing a program: 81 percent (n=132) of respondents were satisfied with these expenses.

A majority (71 percent, n=92) of those respondents enrolled in distance education were satisfied with their distance education program.

Respondents were least satisfied with two environmental features of student life: extra-curricular experiences and opportunities and diversity. Some degree of the dissatisfaction with events outside of class may be explained by the low degree of involvement of respondents in their LIS program student organization. One of three (31 percent, n=51) respondents reported that they were not involved in their student organization. Involvement in the student organization may lead to knowledge of and participation in events held outside of formal class meetings.

While diversity was not a major factor in the student's decision in choosing a program, respondents expressed the greatest dissatisfaction with this aspect of their choice once they were enrolled. Diversity as an environmental factor might speak to student body characteristics, campus environment, diversity among the faculty, and diversity in the curriculum. Spectrum Scholars able to study with classmates of similar backgrounds in undergraduate programs may find less diversity in their graduate programs. Campus diversity efforts also might focus more on the undergraduate experience. The resources and support Spectrum Scholars found as undergraduates might not have been available to them as graduate students. Scholars might also find lack of diversity among LIS faculty; when faculty with diverse backgrounds are present they may be overstretched in other responsibilities. Scholars might also not find diversity within the curriculum and the lack of specific courses on diverse topics or lack of content in other courses.

Factor	Satisfied (%)	Unsatisfied (%)
Standard of living where school is located	91	9
Nearness to home	87	13
Financial assistance provided	83	17
Responsiveness of staff and/or faculty	82	18
Quality of interaction with classmates	83	17
Quality of teaching	83	17
Cost of attending school	81	19
Specific program of study	79	21
Distance education program available	71	29
Extra-curricular experiences and opportunities	66	34
Diversity	58	42

Nearly all respondents (95 percent, n=155) were employed while pursuing their degrees, with around half of these respondents (57 percent, n=87) employed full-time. As expected, a significantly greater number ($p<.005$) of respondents enrolled in distance programs were also employed full-time while attending their LIS program. Similarly, significantly fewer of those employed full-time during their graduate studies ($p<.005$) relocated to enroll in their selected LIS program. Eighty percent of those employed (122) worked in a library setting, most often in a college or university library (34 percent, n=56) or a mid-sized to large public library (19 percent, n= 31).

Scholars were asked to indicate their initial areas of study by identifying one or more information settings and types of work assignments that appealed to them when they first enrolled in their LIS programs. Respondents mentioned traditional information settings more frequently than other work settings: 43 percent (n=70) were interested in working in a college or university library, 34 percent (n=56) in a mid-sized to large public library, and 13 percent (n=22) in a school library. Within those settings, half of scholars (50 percent, n=82) initially considered a career in reference services. Table 12 shows the work setting and assignment preferences selected by ten or more respondents.

Table 12. Scholars' Initial Career Plans: Settings and Work Areas	
Information Setting	Identified by (%)
University or College Library	43
Mid-Sized or Large Public Library	34
School Library	13
Archives	9
Community College Library	7
Non-Profit Organization	7
Corporate Library	6
Work Area	
Reference	50
Collection Development	16
Youth Services	15
Cataloging and Classification	13
Library Instruction	12
Media Specialty	11
Archives	10
Administration	9
Acquisitions	7
Automation/Systems	7
Circulation	6
Solo Librarian	6
Web Master	6

Only about a third (31 percent, n=51) of respondents reported being involved in their LIS program's student organization. Their involvement was influenced by their status as full-

time or part-time students: predictably, a significantly greater number ($p < .01$) of full-time students were involved with their student organization.

Along with the scholarship, students received one year's membership in ALA. Over half of all respondents (56 percent, $n=91$) indicated that they also joined a Division of ALA. The Divisions with the largest number of Spectrum Scholar student members were ACRL (16 percent, $n=26$), PLA (10 percent, $n=17$), RUSA (9 percent, $n=15$), and YALSA (10 percent, $n=16$). One out of four (27 percent, $n=44$) respondents joined an ALA Round Table during their years as a student. This membership was most often with the New Members Round Table (15 percent, $n=24$).

Half of the respondents (52 percent, $n=86$) also joined an ethnic library association affiliated with ALA. Higher percentages of respondents indicated they had joined the Black Caucus of ALA (18 percent, $n=29$), REFORMA: The National Association to Promote Library and Information Services to Latinos and the Spanish Speaking (16 percent, $n=27$), and APALA, the Asian/Pacific American Librarians Association (12 percent, $n=20$). A third (37 percent, $n=61$) also joined a statewide library association.

Over half (64 percent, $n=105$) of the respondents attended an ALA Midwinter Meeting or Annual Conference while they were a student. They funded their attendance through various sources—from a grant or scholarship (42 percent, $n=44$), their own funding (22 percent, $n=23$), or their employer (17 percent, $n=18$). Nearly a quarter (24 percent, $n=39$) of respondents participated in some way at ALA through serving on a committee, giving a presentation, or assisting at a conference event such as the Diversity Fair or the Scholarship Bash.

A third (34 percent, $n=56$) of the respondents attended a statewide or regional library conference, with 41 percent ($n=22$) of the respondents funding their own attendance and 24 percent ($n=13$) receiving funding from their employer. A significantly greater percentage of respondents ($p < .005$) enrolled in distance programs attended a statewide conference when compared with respondents enrolled in residence programs.

Over half of respondents (69 percent, $n=113$) reported that they received formal or informal mentoring while they were a student. The top four mentoring sources were library practitioners (34 percent, $n=56$), faculty advisors (24 percent, $n=40$), professors or course instructors (18 percent, $n=29$) or co-workers (15 percent, $n=24$). Only 15 percent ($n=24$) of respondents were involved in a mentoring experience through an organization. Half of those who did not receive mentoring through associations (49 percent, $n=60$) simply did not know about any mentoring opportunities. Another quarter of the respondents (27 percent, $n=33$) were unable to participate in organization-based mentoring due to time constraints. There was one statistical difference ($p < .005$) between respondents who received mentoring and those who did not: respondents who were involved in mentoring were more satisfied with extra-curricular activities. Nearly all (95 percent, $n=43$) of respondents involved in mentoring rated their experience as beneficial.

In addition to mentoring, a number of respondents (28 percent, $n=46$) completed an internship during their LIS studies. A significantly greater number of respondents who relocated to attend their graduate programs ($p < .005$) also completed an internship.

Those who did not relocate were possibly unable to add an internship experience due to work and/or family responsibilities. Similarly, a significantly greater number ($p < .005$) of respondents employed part-time also participated in internships. A significantly greater number of respondents involved in their student organization ($p < .005$) also completed an internship. Students involved in their organization might hear of internship opportunities and/or may have more time to devote to experiences outside of formal coursework.

One out of four scholars (23 percent, $n=37$) received an additional honor while they were a student. Most frequently, and for over half of those who received another honor (68 percent, $n=25$), this was induction into Beta Phi Mu. Of those who have completed their programs, 4 percent ($n=5$) planned to pursue a PhD while 42 percent ($n=49$) indicated that they might consider doing so. The remaining respondents indicated that they definitely were not interested in continuing into a doctoral program.

At the time the survey was administered, about three-fourths of the respondents (74 percent, $n=118$) had completed their graduate library degrees or certificates with another 18 percent still enrolled and planning to complete their programs. Spectrum graduates were enrolled in their program of studies from ten to seventy-two months and took an average of twenty-four months to complete their degrees.

Eight percent of the respondents, thirteen individuals, had not completed their programs and were not currently enrolled. Significantly fewer of the respondents who did not complete their degrees ($p < .005$) attended the Spectrum Leadership Institute. This may reflect the importance of the support of the leadership institute in the lives of these respondents. It might also indicate that respondents unable to attend the leadership institute also had difficulties completing their programs due to other responsibilities or to the stresses of health or family issues. All of those who did not complete their degrees expressed satisfaction with the faculty and quality of teaching at their LIS programs, indicating that these factors likely did not contribute to them not receiving their degrees. None of the respondents who did not complete their programs participated in their school's student organization or received honors while they were a scholar, indicating, to some degree, their possible isolation within their programs, inability to spend time on campus, or lack of social connection within their schools. None of those who did not complete their degrees had plans to complete a PhD in the future.

Spectrum graduated and non-graduated respondents differed significantly from each other in another way. When comparing why they selected their particular LIS program, a significantly greater number of those who finished their degrees ($p < .05$) considered the reputation of their school an important criterion for selection. This may indicate that a school's reputation imparts a sense of responsibility on its students or help them frame a greater sense of commitment to their degrees. The 13 non-graduates attended ten different LIS programs..

Half of the non-graduates (54 percent, $n=6$) completed at least one course towards their LIS degree or certificate with two students completing as many as twelve courses. All but one respondent provided one or more reasons why they did not complete their degree. No one reason was predominant as respondents cited financial constraints,

personal health reasons, family needs, uninteresting coursework in their programs, or change in accreditation status of their preferred LIS program. At least three of these students enrolled in and/or completed studies toward a degree in an education field. Five non-graduates were currently working in library or information setting and a majority (73 percent, n=8) indicated that they would re-enter their LIS program if given the opportunity.

About a third (31 percent, n=4) noted that more financial assistance might encourage them to reenter a LIS program. One or two respondents each mentioned other factors that might lead to their readmissions, including the option of enrolling in a distance education program, an opportunity to participate in a mentoring experience, greater flexibility in program requirements, and the ability to work on an interesting project. Only two suggested that the Spectrum Scholarship Program could have helped them more in their pursuit of their degree.

Current Employment

Respondents who graduated from their LIS programs provided details about their current employment and the degree to which they are currently involved in professional organizations.

Most of the 118 graduated respondents are working full time (100 individuals, n=85 percent) or part-time (4 percent, n=5) in a library or information setting. Table 13 presents these data. Those not working in a LIS setting provided several reasons including the lack of available jobs and family commitments.

Current Employment Status	Number	Percent
Employed Full-Time in LIS Setting	100	85
Employed Part-Time in LIS Setting	5	4
Employed Full-Time in Another Setting	3	3
Employed Part-Time in Another Setting	2	2
Self-Employed	1	1
Temporarily Unemployed/Seeking Work	6	5
Other: Full-Time PhD student	1	1

Table 14 shows data on the income of the 100 graduated respondents employed full-time. About half of the graduated respondents (46 percent, n=45) earn salaries in the range of \$40,000 to \$49,000, well above the mean beginning salary of \$38,918 for librarians nationally and comparable to the national average salary of \$45,554 for librarians in non-supervisory positions and the national average of \$46,648 for those supervising support staff.^{iv}

Salary Range	Number	Percent
\$20,000 - \$29,000	4	4
\$30,000 - \$39,000	27	28
\$40,000 - \$49,000	45	46
\$50,000 - \$59,000	14	14
\$60,000 and higher	7	7

*Three respondents did not provide this information.

The survey asked respondents to describe the work area and the type of library or information setting of their current library position. Since respondents could indicate more than one work area, these results are presented in terms of the percentage working in each area.

Table 15 presents these results and compares the 115 graduated respondents' current work responsibilities with the work area that initially interested them when they enrolled in their LIS programs. There was a certain degree of stability across many of the work areas. Among graduated, employed respondents reference services was the top career choice—with half (54 percent, n=57) of the scholars originally choosing this area and a drop to 42 percent (n=44) working in reference at the time they completed the survey.

Fewer graduated respondents who initially considered collection development as a career were working in this area. While only 7 percent of graduated respondents considered a career in administration during their programs, 16 percent reported currently working in administrative positions. Library instruction saw a more moderate increase (5 percent) between planned work area and current position while only half of the respondents initially planning careers in cataloging/classification were working in this area.

The top employment venues also remained relatively stable between the time students started their programs and continued into their present work settings with slight drops over time between planned work environment and actual work setting. Initially, scholarship recipients were interested in careers in nineteen areas; respondents ultimately were employed in thirteen of these settings. At present, respondents appear to be working in traditional areas with nearly two-thirds of graduates employed in mid-sized or large public libraries or university or college libraries. No respondents are currently working in historical societies, theological libraries, tribal libraries, museums, library cooperatives/networks, library schools, or in publishing. It may be that these are career paths that evolve over time. Initially, students might express broad interests and ultimately develop a focus through their coursework or the job market.

Settings	Initial Career Plan (%)	Current Library Position (%)
Mid-Sized or Large Public Library	39	34
University or College Library	37	37

School Library	12	11
Archives	10	4
Community College Library	8	2
Medical Library	5	4
Law Library	4	1
Small Public Library	3	1
Non-Profit Organization	4	3
Museum	6	0
Corporate Library	5	1
Government Library	5	4
Historical Society	3	0
Library Cooperative/Network	2	0
Vendor	2	1
Library School	1	0
Publishing	1	0
Theological Library	1	0
Tribal Library	1	0
Rural Public Library	0	2
Work Area	Initial Career Plan (%)	Current Library Position (%)
Reference	54	42
Collection Development	21	14
Youth Services	17	13
Cataloging and Classification	14	7
Library Instruction	14	19
Media Specialty	10	11
Archives	9	7
Administration	7	16
Automation/Systems	7	6
Acquisitions	6	7
Government Documents	6	6
Solo Librarian	5	3
Web Master	5	4
Circulation	4	6
Information Systems/Architecture	4	3
Records Management	4	3
Conservation	2	2
Indexing	1	0
Interlibrary Loan	1	1
Competitive Intelligence	1	1
Usability Specialist	1	2
Competitive Intelligence	1	1
Information Broker	2	1

Preservation	1	1
--------------	---	---

*Graduates could indicate more than one work area

Respondents were asked to indicate the relative importance of twelve factors in making the decision to accept their current position. The top three choices, each rated important by 90% or more of the respondents, were salary and benefits, the match of the new position to the graduate's skills and interests, and the opportunity the position provided to develop new skills. By far the two least important variables were the opportunity to pursue another graduate degree and the ability to return to work in a library where one had worked in the past, both rated as unimportant by over half of the respondents. Nearness to home featured prominently in the decision to choose a LIS program and remained a factor in selecting a position, though not the key factor. The importance of diversity was rated higher as a workplace selection criterion than it was as a criterion for selecting a specific LIS program: 70 percent of graduated respondents indicated that diversity was an important factor impacting their decision to accept their current position while 55 percent of respondents rated diversity as a important criterion influencing their selection of a LIS program.

Table 16. Importance of Various Criteria Affecting Decision to Choose Current Position (n=115)		
Criteria	Important (#)	Unimportant (#)
Salary/benefits	95	5
Match of position to my skills/interests	94	6
Opportunity to develop new skills	93	7
Career advancement opportunities	86	14
Support for professional development	86	14
Standard of living	83	17
Nearness of home	78	22
Reputation of institution	74	26
Opportunity to help racial/ethnic community	73	27
Responsiveness of institution to diversity	72	28
Reputation of staff	66	34
Opportunity to continue in present library	57	43
Opportunity for research or writing	48	52
Opportunity to pursue another graduate degree	38	62
Ability to return to work in a past library	33	67

A majority of graduated, employed respondents (82 percent, n=or 83) indicated that they did not experience any special recruitment efforts as a result of their status as a Spectrum Scholar. A significantly greater number of those working in reference or in university libraries ($p<.05$) noted such special recruitment efforts compared with those not working in reference or information services or in university libraries.

Three-fourths (74 percent, n=76) of graduated respondents employed full-time indicated that they felt their distinction as a Spectrum Scholar was beneficial. Twenty-six percent (n=27) responded that they felt their Spectrum Scholar status was somewhat or very unbeneficial. There were several significant differences between full-time employed graduates who rated their Spectrum Scholar status as beneficial and those who rated it as unbeneficial. Significantly more of those who rated Spectrum beneficial also indicated that they considered diversity an important factor in accepting their current position ($p < .05$). They also considered more important the reputation of the institution that hired them ($p < .005$) and recommendations from friends or colleagues when they made this decision ($p < .005$). In other words, those respondents that rated Spectrum unbeneficial in their job search were not concerned about recommendations from friends or colleagues, the reputation of their institution, or the degree to which their employer was responsive to diversity.

A strong majority of respondents who had graduated and were employed full-time (89 percent, n=92) would accept their current position and nearly as many (82 percent, n=84) felt somewhat or very satisfied with this position. Most (89 percent, n=90) were confident that they would find a satisfying position in librarianship should they chose to leave their current position.

The scholars hinted at several areas where their work setting could be improved. Nearly one out of four graduates employed full-time (23 percent, n=23) did not feel that they had as many opportunities for advancement as did others in the same work environment. Similarly, 24 percent (n=23) did not think their current institution was supportive of diversity initiatives. Respondents who indicated that their current employer is supportive of diversity initiatives credited residency programs, travel support to conferences, the hiring of diverse staff, diverse collections and programming for library patrons, international diversity, and staff training on diversity topics. Those who did not feel their employment setting supported diversity had lack of diversity among professional and administrative staff, inadequate continuing education about diversity issues, and avoidance of diversity action. Respondents described these environments as “it’s all talk and no action” and “Most institutions talk about diversity, but how many actually know what it is?” Management style could contribute to an environment not conducive to support of diversity. Several respondents explained the lack of attention to diversity by adding statements such as, “Key figures in the library who were instrumental in advancing diversity initiatives have moved on to new responsibilities. Library administration has not hired anyone to serve this function.”

Almost all of the graduated respondents (92 percent, n=94) felt that their employer provided opportunities to attend continuing education programs.

Professional Affiliations

Table 17 provides data on professional involvement both when the graduated respondents were students and after they were employed in their current full-time positions, charting their membership, conference attendance, and conference

involvement during their time as students and once graduated and fully-employed in a library/information setting.

Table 17. Fully-Employed Graduated Respondents' Professional Involvement as Students and in Current Employment (n=100)		
	Number	Percent
Membership		
In ALA, as a LIS student	100	100
In ALA, as a fully-employed graduate	68	68
In ALA Division, as a LIS student	55	55
In ALA Division, as a fully-employed graduate	37	37
In ALA Round Table, as a LIS student	30	30
In ALA Round Table, as a fully-employed graduate	22	22
In Ethnic Affiliated Organization, as a LIS student	56	56
In Ethnic Affiliated Organization, as a fully-employed graduate	30	30
In State Library Association, as a LIS student	46	46
In State Library Association, as a fully-employed graduate	6	6
Attendance		
At ALA Conference, as a LIS student	67	67
At ALA Conference, as a fully-employed graduate	45	45
At State/Regional Conference, as a LIS student	38	38
At State/Regional Conference, as a fully-employed graduate	35	35
Participation		
At ALA Conference, as a LIS student	17	17
At ALA Conference, as a fully-employed graduate	4	4
At State/Regional Conference, as a LIS student	17	17
At State/Regional Conference, as a fully-employed graduate	17	17

Membership level in ALA dropped by about thirty percent from the time the respondents were students to when they accepted their latest position. Note that all Spectrum Scholars are ALA members at least during their scholarship year. Over half of graduated respondents reported they were members of Divisions while they were students and nearly a third were members of Round Tables. Membership in Divisions and Round Tables also dropped once they were fully employed. Over half (68 percent, n=68) of graduated respondents now working in libraries are ALA members, a third (37 percent, n=37) are members of ALA Divisions, and one out of five (22 percent, n=22) is a member of an ALA Round Table.

Fewer than half of the respondents who had graduated and were employed full-time (45 percent, n=44) attended an ALA conference after graduation. A significantly greater number of graduated respondents employed in university libraries ($p < .005$) attended at least one ALA Midwinter Meeting or Annual conference, indicating that these institutions may be more supportive of conference attendance and advocate and/or provide financial support for such activities. In fact, 64 percent (n=30) of those employed in a university library who attended an ALA conference reported that their attendance was funded by their employer. While nearly one out of five (17 percent, n=17) were actively involved while at an ALA conference such involvement dropped (4 percent, n=4) once they graduated and were employed.

Graduated respondents also reported on their membership in an ethnic library association affiliated with ALA. About a third (30 percent, n=30) retained their membership once they were employed full-time, indicating that ethnic library association membership was nearly equivalent to ALA Round Table membership (22 percent, n=22).

The largest drop in membership was in state library association membership: nearly half (46 percent, n=46) of graduated respondents joined a state library association while a student but only 6 percent (n=6) were members once they were fully-employed in a library/information setting. Attendance and participation in state library conferences, though, was relatively stable: those who attended and participated in these events while students continued their engagement when they were employed. A high percentage (88 percent, n=87) found their participation in professional associations beneficial. When asked why they decided to join a professional association, the most common answer (42 percent, n=42) was to gain access to professional tools provided by the organization. Other responses included the opportunity for mentoring and peer support (22 percent, n=22), the availability of complimentary membership (19 percent, n=19), access to new job opportunities (16 percent or 16), and career advancement opportunities (12 percent, n=12).

Along with involvement in professional associations, fully employed graduates were asked to indicate whether they participated in mentoring opportunities. While over half of all graduated respondents reported receiving mentoring while a student, only twelve full-time employed graduates reported receiving mentoring; three-fourths of these worked in a university library. A greater number of these respondents (19 percent, n=19) participated in leadership training with half of those receiving leadership training (50 percent, n=9) employed in university libraries.

Respondents' Recommendations and Reflections on the Spectrum Scholarship Program

The final section of this report presents the respondents' narrative responses to several questions:

- (1) What suggestions do you have for recruiting others into the field of library and information science?
- (2) What do you feel are the strengths of the ALA Scholarship Program?
- (3) What do you feel are the weaknesses of the ALA Scholarship Program?
- (4) Do you believe that the Spectrum Scholarship Program is necessary? Why or why not?
- (5) What impact, if any, has the Spectrum Scholarship Program had on your life?

Recommendations for Recruitment

Neely summarizes what is known about minority student recruitment:

To date, no one solution or method has been proven to be the most effective or successful for recruiting diverse peoples to the profession of librarianship.^v

Respondents were asked to provide suggestions on how to recruit others into the LIS field.

They identified a number of partners who might collaborate to increase recruitment of students of color. These partners included LIS schools, those in specific information settings such as archives and musicology, historically Black Colleges and Universities, two-year colleges and trade schools. They also mentioned working on recruitment with museums, heritage foundations, and school districts and associations such as NABE (National Association for Bilingual Education).

They suggested groups of individuals who might be especially effective in recruiting including representatives of ALA, Spectrum Scholars, university professors, and all librarians, especially librarians of color. Many respondents recommended recruiting at career fairs and targeting young students and library staff without MLS degrees. They mentioned other targeted recruitment audiences including socioeconomically challenged individuals, grocery store baggers, and "disaffected publishing/literary/junior academic types." In addition to presenting at career fairs, other recruitment approaches included a job shadow program with librarians, marketing in various media outlets such as local newspapers and television, scholarships and internships for undergraduate students who promise to pursue MLS degrees.

Respondents warned, "We can't afford to wait until someone expresses interest." And they reminded us that recruitment is continuous and can occur in all locations: "We should show off our passion, values, and overall concern for the greatest good through our quest to contribute to the building of a more information literate and educated society."

Spectrum Strengths

Respondents identified what they felt were Spectrum's strengths. These are grouped into six categories: funding, prestige, socialization, career support, fellow respondents, and the leadership institute.

Funding

They acknowledged the importance of the scholarship money. While \$5,000 does not cover all of the expenses of a graduate degree or, in most cases, even the expenses incurred in one semester of graduate education, the respondents acknowledged that the funding "helped ease the financial burden of graduate school." Along with this, respondents were grateful for the opportunity to leverage the scholarship for additional funding from other sources. The financial assistance improved the quality of life of students; "I didn't have to work extra hours at my job and I was able to concentrate on my studies and get involved in library associations." And in other cases, the scholarship was the critical element that affected whether or not a student of color would begin or continue his or her education. As one scholar observed: "Simply stated, without the funding from Spectrum, it would have been nearly impossible for me to go back to school."

At the same time, respondents reflected that Spectrum is "not just the \$\$, though that is VERY important." They appreciated the other elements of the Spectrum package including the support to travel to an ALA Annual conference site and ALA membership.

Prestige and Socialization

Spectrum brought the benefits of socialization and networking in a collegial atmosphere that opened doors for them. They learned from each other, from ALA staff involved in diversity, and from role models in the field, including individuals they recognized as "some of the top library thinkers" and "library luminaries of color." They benefited from their connection to a highly visible, prestigious program. One scholar noted "a feeling of celebrity status" by being a Spectrum Scholar.

Career Support

Respondents noted the inspirational features of the Spectrum experience that helped them set the stage for future professional careers. The scholars predicted that the Spectrum Scholarship Program would continue to impact them and the field.

- "It has parlayed me to easily carve out a solid service agenda by presenting an almost guaranteed acceptance..."

- “Spectrum has made me much more conscious of my community, the resources available to me, and my responsibility to give something back.”
- [Spectrum] nurtures an ethos of responsibility to continue “the work” in the scholars and, thus, it builds a strong web of diversity advocates.
- “This initiative has direct impact on the students it supports but it has a larger immeasurable, long-lasting effect on the larger “majority” communities like ethnic groups, low income people, women, etc. because the scholars are like ambassadors of empowerment regardless of their assigned job. I often find myself helping people unintentionally, just [because] this nature and value has been developed in me.”
- “The ALA Spectrum [Scholarship] Program has become my guardian angel. I know that the people who are associated with the program will always be there if I need them. I know they are always trying to help someone who is discriminated against and hopefully with perseverance the day will come when there will be no discrimination.”

Leadership Institute

One of the unique features of the Spectrum Scholarship Program is the three-day leadership institute. This venue includes presentations by leading librarians involved in diversity initiatives and socialization through cultural expression and engaged discussion. Over three-fourths (83 percent, n=134) of respondents attended a Spectrum Scholarship Program Leadership Institute. As noted earlier in this report, the one characteristic shared by respondents who did not complete their degrees was attendance at a leadership institute.

They reflected on attending the Spectrum Leadership Institute:

- “I found the Leadership Institute to be one of the most powerful experiences of my life.”
- “The Spectrum [Scholarship Program] was very intense for me. It opened my eyes to thoughtful consideration and understanding of different cultures and brought a more balanced view or perspective of diversity in learning and multicultural styles of learning.”
- “I came away from the Institute, in particular, feeling like I was a part of something very important.”
- “I wish that I could attend the Spectrum Leadership Institute every year. I would pay to attend this event!”

Fellow Respondents

They credited their fellow scholars: “I met [at the Institute] 50 of the best, most emotionally balanced, people to be found in my generation of librarians.” “When I attended the Institute [I] met other scholars--some of the smartest, most interesting people I've ever met.”

Spectrum Weaknesses

While some twenty respondents felt there were no weaknesses in the Spectrum Scholarship Program, others contributed over 120 comments about perceived weaknesses. A few suggested that additional funding be granted or that scholarships be renewed. Several suggested revisions to the application process to also include a requirement that scholars stay involved or otherwise “give back” to ALA in exchange for the support.

Respondents focused their criticisms on four categories: marketing Spectrum more widely; improving the leadership institute; strengthening the promised mentoring program; and improving communication among scholars, especially after the scholarship year.

Marketing Spectrum

About 10 percent observed that Spectrum should be marketed more widely.

- “I never would have known if I didn't talk to someone in the human resources department at the library [where] I worked.”
- “This is not really a weakness of the program but of the school I attended—it was basically ignored by the school...”
- “Many people still have no idea the program exists. My library school did not advertise the scholarship and the only way I learned of it when I applied is through a scholarship database.”

The Spectrum Leadership Institute

While respondents were supportive of the leadership institute they recommended some changes in the format to incorporate more social and ‘down time.’ Sample comments include:

- “It would have been better to have a few free hours to relax, see the sights and absorb. By the end of the Institute I felt so burned out and overloaded.”
- “The schedule was relentless—with speakers and programs even at meals. It was hard to find downtime to know people casually when we weren't exhausted.”

Mentoring

While there may be a divergence of opinions on the definition and scope of mentoring, it is widely accepted that the process of mentoring can be an important factor in recruitment and retention. In its 1989 handbook on recruitment, ALA's Office for Library Personnel Resources (now, Office for Human Resource Development and Recruitment), states: “Mentoring and individual recruitment stand out as two of the most effective techniques that exist [in recruiting new students to the profession of librarianship].”^{vi}

Not all respondents were involved in the mentoring program and those who were indicated that this was the area of the Spectrum Scholarship Program that needed the most improvement. Some mentors did not contact students. In other cases the match between mentor and mentee was not logical.

Why did the mentoring aspect of Spectrum not flourish? At what point in a scholar's career preparation did the mentoring feature of Spectrum fail to catch fire? Mentoring arrangements are often framed within a specific organizational setting, often a college or university environment. Perhaps the lack of the institutional support led to the difficulty of Spectrum mentor/mentee pairs from successfully forming. Spectrum has had to prioritize its activities which encompass recruitment, selection, marketing, and seeking sources of sustaining the program. Those involved in Spectrum may have thought that mentoring would naturally occur within LIS programs through contacts developed at the leadership institute or in the work place. Since librarians of color may not have traditionally been included in mentoring arrangements prospective mentors may have needed not only encouragement but also training on how to be responsive.

It may simply be that mentoring is a difficult task. In a survey conducted in fall 1998 of 122 Association of Research Libraries members, only one of out four institutions (26 percent) had formal mentoring programs.^{vii} Within those mentoring programs, nearly three-fourths (71 percent) had policies or procedures on mentoring while organization did not extend to incorporating an evaluation component: over half of the mentoring programs (62 percent) did not have assessment or evaluation. In half of the programs (53 percent), the mentee selected his or her mentor. Those involved in mentoring recommended that libraries be flexible in their approach, avoid requiring mentoring, and add a training element for mentors and mentees.

Concern with mentoring extends beyond the impact on a given scholar: certainly, a Spectrum Scholar's experience as a mentee may impact his or her decision to serve as a mentor in the future. Both partners in the mentoring relationship need to be involved. In some models, even the initial pairing is directed by the mentee: with mentees selecting a prospective mentor from a list or database of willing mentors. Mentors can also assist the process by clearly setting goals and suggesting how they would like to assess their mentoring experience. Clearly, such a program would need to be more structured though in a way that need not be burdensome.

While it is important for mentors and mentee pairs to be able to communicate via email, it is difficult to establish long-distance mentoring programs without at least the expectation of some future face-to-face contact. This becomes increasingly difficult after scholars graduate and are employed in library settings. As this survey reveals, this is a time when their professional involvement drops off.

The mentoring program should also provide some benefit for mentors, perhaps through some recognition at ALA meetings, a note on the ALA Web site, or a roster published in the ALA conference program. Another incentive might be published profiles of mentor/mentee pairs and perhaps even the opportunity to apply for conference attendance support. Perhaps innovative mentoring models needs to be developed. Are

there alternatives to one-on-one mentoring which will always be subject to the dedication of two individuals at a very personal level? Can mentoring be available to any scholar especially at critical moments?

Communication

Finally, 21 percent (n=34) of respondents recommended that communication be improved. One described this as “a sense of disconnection once you graduate.” They recommended starting local or regional chapters of Spectrum scholars, an online and/or print newsletter, and a discussion board.

Impact of Spectrum on Respondents

When asked what impact Spectrum had on their professional lives, respondents noted psychological impacts such as improved self esteem, pride, and greater confidence: “It changed my life in that I am a librarian and it is a great job.” A focus on diversity prompted some respondents to reflect deeply on their identity:

“I tend to identify myself first as an individual and only second as part of an ethnic or racial group. I also tend to put emphasis on personal responsibility. But the Spectrum [Scholarship Program] has shown me that I need structural support—something bigger than my will and my brain to truly participate, both as a servant and as a leader, in democratic institutions like public libraries.”

Status as a Spectrum Scholar brought career opportunities:

Respondents acknowledged the Spectrum Scholarship Program’s impact on their professional development and professional mobility:

- “Once potential employers hear I am a Spectrum Scholar, they are very impressed. When I finish my two-year residency program my options are wide open should I choose to take them.”
- “I’ve gone from being a disabled, unemployed, pregnant woman/single mother on welfare to being a corporate information worker for a Fortune 500 company. Spectrum certainly helped with that journey.”
- “Spectrum was my transition from para-professional administrative task to the world of professional interactions in library and information science.”
- “I feel like it put me ahead 5 years into the profession!”
- “I am a librarian! I’m happy being a librarian.”
- “Once I got Spectrum it seemed everything was opening. Doors were opening... Spectrum has opened the door and a lot of things are coming my way and I want to take advantage of every opportunity that I can.”

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study has provided information on recruitment of students of color into LIS professions and helped address how such students select their LIS programs, and how satisfied they are with their educational experience. It reflects their perceptions about the Spectrum Scholarship Program, including perceived strengths and weaknesses and how the program has impacted their early professional careers.

As a recruitment effort, Spectrum has worked. It has, year after year, awarded scholarships to students of color. Spectrum has reversed the sentiment within the field that diversity issues are being deferred.^{viii} These students are, for the most part, graduating from their LIS programs and taking positions in traditional settings in traditional roles. Prior to the Spectrum Scholarship Program ALA hosted a minority intern program where one information professional of color was supported. The Spectrum Scholarship Program has elevated ALA's goal from recruiting and supporting one student of color per year to producing, in five years a minimum of 100 librarians of color. The Spectrum Scholarship Program has enabled ALA to advance its goals of diversity in the workplace at a rate that would have taken one hundred years to accomplish, based on ALA's previous program of sponsoring one minority internship a year. It is and remains a highly visible, rewarding, and productive program that indeed has the potential to change the face of librarianship today and into the future.

This report closes by offering the following recommendations for LIS faculty and administrators; professional organizations, especially ALA; Spectrum Scholars; employers who desire a diverse staff; and librarians.

Recommendations for LIS faculty and administrators:

- Develop recruitment programs for undergraduate students currently employed in large public, college or university libraries geographically close to where your schools are located.
- Arrange to meet with undergraduates or recent graduates from social science disciplines such as education, history, psychology, and sociology.
- Consider tailoring recruitment material for prospective male students of color currently employed in library/information settings.
- Review recruitment material, including awards committee documents, to insure that the terminology recognizes that many students of color identify with more than one cultural or ethnic community.
- Recognize Spectrum Scholarship recipients who are admitted to your programs.
- Consider how to create environments more conducive to diversity. How is diversity reflected among students and faculty? How does the curriculum provide opportunities to learn about and work with diverse communities? How is the LIS program aligned with diversity efforts locally, especially campus-wide initiatives, and nationally in professional efforts?
- Consider how LIS student organizations can increase student involvement.
- Ensure that Spectrum Scholarship recipients receive communication about LIS program activities.

- Arrange to meet Scholars Scholarship recipients enrolled in distance programs at state/regional library conferences.
- Encourage and facilitate Spectrum Scholarship recipients' attendance at the Spectrum Leadership Institute.
- Stay in touch with Spectrum Scholarship recipients who might consider entering doctoral programs.
- Consider how to contribute to continued mentoring of Spectrum Scholarship recipients.
- Invite area Spectrum Scholarship recipients to LIS events.
- Explore ways to support gatherings of Spectrum Scholarship recipients.
- Offer recruitment packages to Spectrum Scholarship recipients.
- Ensure that all prospective LIS students are aware of the Spectrum Scholarship Program.

Recommendations for ALA and other professional organizations:

- Identify mentoring opportunities that exist across the ALA and its units.
- Promote mentoring opportunities in conjunction with LIS programs.
- Recognize successful mentor/mentee pairs through such means as published accounts, recognition on the ALA Web site or in ALA conference programs, and/or financial support for conference attendance.
- Provide ample opportunities for prospective employers to post job vacancy announcements directly to Spectrum Scholarship recipients or otherwise assist prospective employers in reaching scholars.
- Support more communication among Spectrum Scholarship recipients, including ongoing events.
- Provide more information about Spectrum Scholarship recipients, including biographies.
- Seek data on the workplace inclusion of people with disabilities.
- Red-flag Spectrum Scholarship recipients who are unable to attend their Spectrum Leadership Institute, as they are more likely to not complete their LIS programs.
- Track Spectrum Scholarship recipients, including those who did not complete their programs, and maintain contact with them.
- Conduct biennial surveys of Spectrum Scholars.

Recommendations for Spectrum Scholars:

- Attend the Spectrum Leadership Institute.
- Participate in LIS program student organizations.
- Stay connected with ALA's Office for Diversity by sharing current contact information and participating in Spectrum's electronic list.
- Consider how to provide support and mentoring services for each other.
- Volunteer for professional service to ALA and other professional organizations.
- Participate in recruiting additional scholars.
- Take a proactive role in personal career development.

Recommendations for employers who desire diverse staff:

- Examine salary and benefits packages.
- Market job vacancies to prospective employees who possess needed skills and interests.
- Provide employees with opportunities to develop new skills.
- Develop recruitment programs targeted for Spectrum Scholarship recipients.
- Provide all staff with opportunities for advancement.
- Support diversity initiatives and make this support known.
- Develop and include new staff members in mentoring opportunities.

Recommendations for practitioners within the field:

- Consider mentoring a Spectrum Scholarship recipient.
- As a mentor, communicate with other mentors.
- Arrange to meet Spectrum Scholarship recipients at professional gatherings, especially state library conferences.

ⁱIn 1998, ALA found that 68 percent of academic librarians surveyed and 79 percent of public librarians were female. Results of the Spectrum Scholarship Program indicate a slightly higher percentage of female scholarship recipients (86 percent).

ⁱⁱ“The Hispanic question of multiculturalism is even more complicated than the African-American. “Hispanic” refers to Spanish language, cultural heritage and national origin (Mexico, Spain, Cuba, etc.). Hispanic does not designate a race; there are black Hispanics and white Hispanics. Interestingly a sizeable proportion of Hispanics do not designate race on census forms.” Peterson, Lorna, “Teaching the Practitioners: One Professor’s Attempt at Library Education and Sensitivity to Multicultural Diversity,” The Reference Librarian 45/46 (1994), 26.

ⁱⁱⁱU.S. Census Bureau. QT-P21. Disability Status by Sex: 2000. Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 4 (SF 4)- Sample Data. Available through FactFinder at <http://www.factfinder.census.gov>. Accessed on 8 August 2005.

^{iv}Lynch, Mary Jo, “Librarian Salaries Increase Less Than Other Civilian Workers,” American Libraries 35 (10) (November 2004): 49.

^vNeely, Teresa Y., “Minority Student Recruitment in LIS Education: New Profiles for Success,” In Wheeler, Maurice, B., Ed., Unfinished Business: Race, Equity, and Diversity in Library and Information Science Education (Lanham, MD; Toronto; Oxford: Scarecrow, 2005), 93.

^{vi}American Library Association. Office for Library Personnel Resources. Each One Reach One: Recruiting for the Profession. Action Handbook. (Chicago: ALA, 1989), 2.

^{vii} Wittkopf, Barbara, Mentoring Programs in ARL Libraries (A SPEC Kit). Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 1999, 4.

^{viii} De la Pena McCook and Geist, "Diversity Deferred: Where Are the Minority Librarians?" Library Journal (November 1, 1993), 35.