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Executive Summary

Libraries Transforming Communities (LTC) — an initiative of the American Library Association (ALA) — seeks to strengthen librarians’ roles as core community leaders and change-agents. The initiative addresses a critical need within the library field by developing and distributing new tools, resources, and support for librarians to engage with their communities in new ways. LTC is made possible through a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

The LTC initiative seeks to help libraries become more reflective of and connected to their communities. This process has the potential to trigger a domino effect of positive results, including stronger relationships between libraries and local civic agencies, non-profits, funders, and corporations, and a greater community investment in democratic participation, collaboration, education, health, and well-being.

ALA’s partner for the LTC initiative is the nonprofit Harwood Institute for Public Innovation, whose Turning Outward approach emphasizes changing the orientation of institutions and individuals from internal (institutional) to external (community-facing). This process entails taking steps to better understand communities; changing processes and thinking to
make conversations more community-focused; being proactive about community issues; and putting community aspirations first.

Early groundwork for LTC was supported by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). In 2013, ALA worked with a core group of library leaders to develop a framework for the field and use by the Association itself, orienting a pilot group of “Advanced Leaders” in the Harwood approach and developing initial materials for distribution through ALA conference programming and online learning. The initial pilot work has now been extended in the current LTC initiative.

In partnership with ALA, external evaluator New Knowledge Organization Ltd. (NewKnowledge) engaged in a multi-pronged, intensive evaluation to track the progress of the initiative, ensure alignment with the goals of LTC, and uncover challenges that may impede efforts to Turn Outward. NewKnowledge used a mixed methods approach that included in-depth interviews, paper and online surveys, media discourse analysis, and a website review. The evaluation plan for LTC (covering the period between March 2014 through December 2015) incorporates specific recommendations made in The Promise of Libraries Transforming Communities (Keister Armstrong, 2013), a study of ALA’s work to orient library leaders in the Harwood Institute approach to Turning Outward.

This interim report is the first of four evaluation reports to be submitted by NewKnowledge (an interim report every six months followed by a summative evaluation in December 2015). It is the first step in evaluating how well the objectives are being achieved and will describe in detail what has been learned from evaluation activities that have occurred since March 2014.

Overall, key findings from the six-month interim evaluation indicate:

- According to the preliminary findings of a national media discourse analysis, libraries were mentioned in newspaper articles in the context of informing the public about programming, changes to library hours, library rankings and awards, and funding concerns for library services;
- Qualitative interviews with four Advanced Leaders demonstrated a sense of continuity with the pilot study (The Promise of Libraries Transforming Communities). Advanced Leaders were able to increase community
connections and felt that the training has helped create a shared vocabulary and framework necessary for changing the local perception of the role of the library in their communities. After more than a year of working toward implementation, Advanced Leaders’ input suggested that the training has been responsible for a notable shift in thinking.

- Prior to the Harwood training, the Public Innovators Cohort expressed a strong desire to learn more effective ways of engaging communities and forming partnerships. Data from the post-training survey indicated that participants were confident that they had learned new and valuable skills, although by the end of the training some noted that implementation would be challenging or that they were unsure about how to effectively use what they had learned. They indicated a range of next steps based on community engagement plans, as well as suggestions for improving the training. The Public Innovators Cohort is currently receiving mentoring from Harwood, facilitated by ALA, through webinars and coaching calls.

- Data from the Post-Intentionality Forum conducted with ALA staff illustrated concerns and mixed sentiment about the training. Attendees suggested breaking the session into two days, providing attendees with background materials before the training, and a stronger focus on concrete application of the Harwood tools.

- Feedback from Public Library Association (PLA) and ALA Conference training sessions was very positive, indicating that the sessions were effective in facilitating learning and that attendees found the training relevant and meaningful for their current work. As with the Public Innovators Cohort, survey results show enthusiasm about implementing the Harwood method of Turning Outward. Evaluation at the Annual Conference in June 2014 showed promise that a community of practice is starting to develop among those who have been trained, as enough people are familiar with the basic concepts and vocabulary of Turning Outward.

Most of the evaluation activities that have occurred at this early stage in the project have been immediate post-training surveys, which help ALA and Harwood modify tools and resources, but do not address most of the evaluation criteria listed in the Gates
Foundation Results Framework. At this point it is too early to measure longer-term implementation and impact goals. However, if the interviews with Advanced Leaders are any indication, these early trainings and subsequent mentoring activities will come to fruition over the course of the upcoming year.

There is evidence that a shift is occurring in conceptions of community engagement and framing potential pathways to achieve true engagement, but not yet in actual implementation or concrete community impact. The Harwood Institute approach appears to be ideally situated, as it meaningfully resonates with libraries’ existing goals of community outreach. The Turning Outward training seems to sharpen the focus of these objectives, adding new dimensions to understanding what true community engagement can be. The critical next step for libraries as part of the Public Innovators Cohort will be in implementing the new tools and action plans developed in the training. The evaluation showed that there is still some uncertainty and a lack of confidence among library professionals and ALA staff concerning how to put their newfound knowledge to use.

At this point, the field relies on the leadership of ALA and the Harwood facilitators, who will act as mentors and guides through upcoming phases of the initiative. As the number of training alumni continues to grow, more and more libraries will be undertaking similar efforts. The support they need may exceed the capacity of ALA staff and Harwood facilitators to provide tailored guidance to each library. As this happens, it will become increasingly important for Turned Outward alumni to become a self-sustaining network that brings new members into the fold and consistently supports all members as they set out on new endeavors, meet challenges, and even fail from time to time.
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Introduction

The American Library Association (ALA) is the oldest and largest library association in the world, with approximately 58,000 members in academic, public, school, government, and special libraries. The mission of ALA is to provide leadership for the development, promotion, and improvement of library and information services and the profession of librarianship in order to enhance learning and ensure access to information for all. For Libraries Transforming Communities (LTC), an initiative made possible through the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, ALA chose to partner with the Harwood Institute for Public Innovation, a nonprofit organization that teaches and coaches people and organizations to solve pressing problems and change how communities work together. Richard C. Harwood guides the institute; his transformational work during the past 25 years has spread to thousands of communities across the country and worldwide, from small towns to large cities.

LTC is an ALA initiative that seeks to strengthen libraries’ roles as core community leaders and change-agents. LTC addresses a critical need within the library field by developing and distributing new tools, resources, and support for library professionals to engage with their communities in new and effective ways. As a result, we believe libraries will become more reflective of and connected to their communities and build stronger partnerships with local civic agencies, nonprofits, funders, and corporations.

Early groundwork for LTC was supported by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). In 2013, ALA worked with a core group of library leaders to develop a framework for the field and use by the Association itself, orienting a pilot group of “Advanced Leaders” in the Harwood approach and developing initial materials for distribution through ALA conference programming and online learning.

The evaluation plan for LTC incorporates specific recommendations made in *The Promise of Libraries Transforming Communities* (Keister Armstrong, 2013), a study of ALA’s work to orient library leaders in the Harwood Institute approach to *Turning Outward*. This study found that initial “training sessions were successful in meeting the desired project outcomes” and participants’ recommendations included follow-up meetings with participants throughout the year that would allow for opportunities to share experiences in a supportive network of colleagues. The evaluation explicitly focused on assessing fidelity to the initial goal of the LTC project.

The initial pilot work has now been extended in the LTC initiative, which began in early 2014, enabling ALA to orient library professionals and volunteers to become more focused on and skilled at convening aspirational *Community Conversations* and more innovative in transforming internal practice to support fulfillment of community aspirations. ALA also seeks to mirror that change internally, in its own processes.
Through LTC, librarians are receiving training meant to help them become more reflective of and connected to their communities, while building stronger relationships with local partners. To this end, four objectives have been established, as LTC intends to:

- Provide intensive training for a cohort of 50 library professionals and volunteers representing ten libraries nationwide (Public Innovators Cohort);
- Train ALA staff and member leaders in this approach to community engagement and the *Turned Outward* orientation (ALA Staff Cohort);
- Develop an array of accessible tools and modular learning units for wide distribution to thousands of librarians through conference-based learning sessions, webinars, and the project web site; and
- Build support, visibility, and buy-in for the work of libraries as agents of community innovation and change.

ALA is working closely with an external evaluator, New Knowledge Organization Ltd. (NewKnowledge), to assess LTC’s work toward these objectives. This interim report is the first step in evaluating how well the objectives are being achieved. The report is organized into sections that describe what we have learned from evaluation activities that have occurred since March 2014.

Part I establishes the current context. This includes preliminary findings from a media discourse analysis, as well as the results of qualitative interviews with four Advanced Leaders, providing continuity with the 2013 IMLS-funded pilot training. Part II presents the findings from surveys taken by the Public Innovators Cohort before and after they completed a three-day Harwood-led training. Part III is a discussion of ALA staff training through the Intentionality Forum. Part IV evaluates tools and resources offered to the broader ALA community, primarily through conference sessions.

Key findings and recommendations based on these findings are provided for each section. These recommendations can be used to further improve the trainings and tools to be used more effectively over the remaining course of the initiative.
Part I – Current Context

Underpinning the LTC initiative is the recognition that libraries are facing acute challenges in society today. Many wish to address the needs of their communities in more relevant ways, but few have developed strategies rooted in an understanding of their community’s shared aspirations. Through the deep knowledge of community aspirations that comes with training in the Harwood method, libraries will be better positioned to navigate and work with changes in community demographics, leadership structures, and local fiscal and social issues. Positioning librarians as facilitators of community knowledge and dialogue will enhance libraries’ potential as community change-makers, and deepen the reservoir of trust enjoyed by public libraries across the nation.

NATIONAL MEDIA DISCOURSE

A library media discourse analysis has been conducted to evaluate whether and to what extent discourse about public libraries in the national and local media is moving away from the narrative that describes libraries as “in crisis.” This evaluation identifies trends in both local and national media content as a way to determine if a shift is occurring away from public views of libraries as isolated entities in the community and towards libraries as agents of positive community change. This library media discourse analysis seeks to identify the current media discourse about public libraries as a baseline assessment for comparison at later stages of the project.

The NewKnowledge team used two newspaper databases available through library subscriptions: LexisNexis and ProQuest Gannett NewsStand. Both databases were used to determine where library-related discourse occurred, the content of the discourse based on titles and newspaper abstracts, the locations of the discourse, and the method by which the discourse is shared.

Newspaper titles were run through a semantic analysis software program called Leximancer to determine which themes were prominent and how themes were connected across the newspaper titles. The Leximancer software is based in natural semantic language processing, used to identify semantic patterns from written language. It conducts automatic content analysis of text to uncover themes from the connections between words used in a data corpus. By ranking words based on their frequencies and then assessing their co-occurrence with other words, the software can generate specific “concepts” for sets of words that are semantically close. Leximancer enables researchers to tailor analysis depending upon the specific research questions, as long as these steps are part of a deliberate, justifiable analysis strategy. This software further allows the team to identify trends available through national media content to determine the nature of library discourse, while also exploring the relational properties of semantic content in the media sources.
Terms that were found in multiple forms, such as *Library* and *Libraries*, were merged into one concept prior to generating the analysis. The most prominent themes characterizing the newspaper titles were *library, book, hours, fines,* and *seeks* (Figure 1).

A full description of the methods and analysis can be found in the Library Media Discourse Report (NewKnowledge Report #PVT.74.175.03; publication pending). However, the key findings are worth mentioning here as they help define contextual conditions for the LTC initiative.
Key findings of the media discourse analysis include:

- Newspaper titles and abstracts described libraries as in-crisis due to a lack of funding;
- Reports of changing library hours and library services presented libraries as in-flux throughout the newspaper titles;
- Newspaper abstracts brought focus to the programs and services that libraries provide to their surrounding communities;
- Library journals emphasized libraries’ connections with their local communities through concepts such as outreach and the minor theme, community;
- Journals provided library professionals with professional development opportunities and methods to strengthen their connection with their community;
- Technology was cited as one of the bridges between the library and its surrounding community;
- ALA was also cited in the library journals as a resource for library professionals and as an overseeing body of governance for library professionals;
- As a minor theme, the centrality of community in the discussions of libraries suggests that library professionals are aware of and perhaps concerned about their presence in their local communities.

As a result of these findings, we recommend the following:

- Solicit the participation of the Public Innovators Cohort in collecting local media stories that may not otherwise appear in LexisNexis and ProQuest for another media discourse analysis to be performed at the end of the project.

FOLLOWING UP WITH ADVANCED LEADERS

Another way of assessing the current context for LTC—in addition to assessing the discourse surrounding libraries—is to view the initiative as building upon the 2013 pilot study. The evaluation plan for LTC incorporates specific recommendations made in The Promise of Libraries Transforming Communities (Keister Armstrong, 2013), a study of ALA’s work to orient library leaders in the Harwood Institute approach to Turning Outward. This study found that initial “training sessions were successful in meeting the desired project outcomes,” and suggested that the subsequent evaluation phases focus on assessing fidelity to the initial goal.

The Promise of Libraries Transforming Communities—the training serving as a pilot program for what would subsequently become LTC—was held for librarians in January 2013. During this pilot, ALA partnered with the Harwood Institute to train “Advanced Leaders” in collaborative methods of community engagement. Six
months after the training, a follow-up interview was conducted with four of the participating librarians to sample the impact of the Advanced Leaders Training and to evaluate whether the tools and practices provided in the training affected activities of the participants’ at their respective libraries. At that point, Keister Armstrong (2013) found that:

Three of the four participants interviewed already had introduced the tools and concepts they learned during the Advanced Leaders Training in January 2013 to their work at their libraries. The fourth planned to begin Community Conversations as part of an overarching strategic planning process but cited time constraints as a challenge to implementation (p. 23).

ADVANCED LEADERS INTERVIEWS: 15-MONTHS POST-TRAINING

Based on the recommendations made in the pilot study, NewKnowledge conducted qualitative interviews with the same four Advanced Leaders 15 months after their initial January 2013 training. These interviews again highlighted the participants’ aims to incorporate the Harwood approach into their institutional perspective. They attempted to use the new framework in their strategic planning, mission or vision statements, or through training their own staff in Turning Outward, sometimes during periods of considerable organizational change. Overall, positive engagement and stronger connections with their respective communities and community partners were major themes amongst the interviewees. Early participants were enthusiastic that the pilot study has become a nationwide initiative and that additional tools are being developed for the library field:

I think that Libraries Transforming Communities was just ideal because it brings in additional capacity for me to help the rest of my team learn this method.

One of the strategies that I used when I got here in developing our strategic plan that’s going forward now was that I actually utilized some of the Harwood ideas in organizing large scale staff meetings where we talked. We actually used the aspirational approach with staff.

We’ve been in a phase I would call massive structural change in this organization...the project that we proposed fits very nicely into some of the initiatives that we want to do.... One of our priorities that emerged is directly engaging with our diverse communities, our ethnic communities.

While each interviewee saw the Harwood approach as important to their work, there were different methods by which new ideas were incorporated into daily activities. Some found new ways to build on existing resources—both physical and interpersonal—as a way of expanding engagement. Interviewees related successfully expanding their community connections by offering their library space to a growing spectrum of community groups and also by offering longer open hours. One interviewee, recognizing through the process
that a re-envisioned physical space was necessary for more people to make better use of the library space, secured additional funding for flexible furniture to accommodate shifting needs for the space.

Partnering with other community organizations has led to a sense of accomplishment and pride. Some felt that the local perception of the library or the library’s role in the community is being increasingly transformed in a positive way, addressing the disconnect between how libraries are currently being used—as very active, dynamically up-to-date spaces serving contemporary needs—and the outdated, ill-informed perception that they are stuck in the past:

I think that the way we imagine it is using the assets the library already has, which are fairly tremendous. We have the physical space for convening, we have a trusted reputation, we have this awesome staff that’s multilingual and we also sort of have technology options that we can utilize to facilitate engagement.

Community impact starts with individual impact and I think that we have tremendous individual impact and that what this project might be doing is looking at how to build on that in certain specific communities.

This is an opportunity for us to see how the library can facilitate the city better engaging with those communities. And that’s what we’ve, and I’ve been talking on a policy level with the electives and my manager about that approach and they’re all really receptive. So it’s kind of at a strategic level we’ve been using it and this will be our first program to initiate.

Librarians provided evidence that they were personally finding new ways to interact with community organizations, such as joining the Rotary. Often the interviewees gave very specific examples of programs that had been created as a result of actively listening to their communities:

One of the things we’ve been working on the last couple of years is really beefing up our pre-[Kindergarten] and early literacy, and also at the same time working on our STEM offerings for children. So I was talking to...one of the community groups, and you know it hit home again that people still don’t have access. We decided we would take our Little Leapers program, which are STEM kids for pre-[Kindergarten] and early literacy, and combine it with technology for ages 3 to 5. So this year we launched something called Little Leapers 3.5, and it’s iPad Minis in three of our branches in high risk targeted areas, and each iPad Mini is loaded with an age appropriate app that has been pre-selected for ages 3 to 5.

Other specific examples included setting up a website where library users are able to tell their stories (with videos of people talking about what the library means to them); sponsoring a gathering of community leaders once a year (e.g., business leaders, educational leaders, young professionals, county healthcare system
representatives); offering STEM kits with activities that support science and technology learning; and sponsoring a classic car show with related activities for at-risk populations through an afterschool program. However, it was unclear whether these initiatives resulted directly from the training or simply offered as evidence that the library’s orientation was increasingly outward-focused. Interviewees were cautious with their responses, perhaps not wanting to identify a single source of inspiration for their public programs, yet there appeared to be evidence that the Harwood training has added new dimensions to libraries’ work in communities.

Interviewees indicated that they have been able to further leverage their communities’ enthusiasms, specifically mentioning that more members were willing to serve as advocates for the library in regards to funding, and others felt a stronger connection to the library through increased access to the library’s leadership. And serving on library committees and boards reportedly have become coveted and sought-after volunteer positions at some of the represented communities:

> So when it comes to ‘please advocate on our behalf for funding,’ we’ve got people who are willing to say that. Because we are important to them. Or to their families. So it’s moved it from ‘I love libraries ‘cause I like to read,’ which is great, to ‘you’ve become part of my life, and I’m willing to speak up for you.’

After more than a year of working toward implementation, it was clear—from both Advanced Leaders’ responses and the qualitative analysis—that the training has been responsible for a notable shift in thinking, even if not always in concrete action, given constraints and obstacles. Perhaps just as importantly, however, is how the Harwood approach has provided a clear framework and vocabulary for library professionals who had a desire to engage their communities without knowing how to do so. The Harwood approach provides a framework, language, and direction for professional development. One interviewee had extended what normally would have been an internal process and initiated the development of a new mission/vision statement for the library through conversations with administrators, students, parents, and teachers:

> One of the strategies that I used when I got here in developing our strategic plan that’s going forward now was that I actually utilized some of the Harwood ideas in organizing large scale staff meetings where we ... used the aspirational approach with staff.

> Part of my work in changing the strategic direction is also changing the story and telling the story about the library because we need to get it out there to make sure people understand how libraries are used, what’s the role.

Another indicated, however, that the process might not necessarily be an intuitive one for librarians who tend to be “problem-solvers” seeking more immediate answers and solutions. Building in a slow, reflective process
may present some unique challenges and pose different demands on librarians than what may have typically been expected.

Several constraints were cited as obstacles preventing fuller implementation of the training and tools. One interviewee had only been in her current position for six months when invited to become an Advanced Leader and has continued to face the challenges typical for someone adjusting to a new position and setting. Having colleagues who were likewise recent hires further necessitated a thoughtfully slowed pace of implementation. One interviewee, however, who was also new to her current role (after the position had been empty for an extended period of time), found that the newness was an advantage, encountering a ready and willing staff intent on making the extra effort to work with her during this “honeymoon period.”

Given that some aspects of implementing the Harwood approach may be similar to other work the library is already doing, there were consistent themes in conversations with Advanced Leaders: it is important for staff to genuinely understand the training process and to build a strong internal team. This will help reduce resistance among staff, feelings of “we already did this and we don't need to do it again.”

In addition to understanding the Harwood method, interviewees indicated that limiting training to one person per site contributed to a sense of isolation for some, somewhat tempering their enthusiasm. Interviewees indicated a desire to build a community of practice, both externally across the wider field and internally, with “a partner who understood the Harwood method.” They suggested that community partners would also benefit from training, in addition to librarians. The current Public Innovators Cohort model seeks to address some of these concerns.

Rather than perceive the inherent challenges that come with complex systems change as insurmountable, the interviewees all consistently used optimistic language to discuss long-term plans, indicating that it wasn’t a matter of “if” positive change would occur, but “when.” This seems to indicate an important attitudinal shift. It was universally acknowledged that a strong foundation was the key to building the type of collaborative vision leading to sustainable change and long-term success:

- *I really want to take the Harwood methodology and embed it into my strategic planning. I think it’s excellent the way it talks about what are your aspirations for your community, because I think we’re going to get better answers. I think we're going to be better able to plan our library programming and services.*

- *If we can listen to what [community members] say and find an appropriate way for the library to fill a need, I think that's going to cement the importance of a library in the community.*

- *The ultimate desired impact is that the library is seen as a player in the community.*
Interestingly, even when interviewees were quick to note shortcomings and offer reasons why they hadn’t been as “successful” as they had hoped, the language and essence of the interviews made it very apparent that the Harwood method had deeply influenced and shaped the way these librarians approached their work. They explicitly stated how this had given them the opportunity to think critically about priorities and aspirations, even if it still seemed too premature to talk about implementing new programs or initiatives.

Overwhelmingly, the four interviewees conveyed a sense of the advantages of cultivating the ability to understand issues from others’ points of view, to harvest stories and to use them to shape professional practice, rather than presuming to know what needs exist. The Harwood approach conveys a real and honest desire to listen and to hear, a fundamental component in changing the perception of libraries and in further enabling people to become their own agents of change, a process that extends far beyond the walls of the library itself:

*What I kind of tell my decision-makers [is] that’s where the library is of value to them, in that we’re the trusted source. We’re the place people come and they have these stories to tell us about how much it means to them. We can be an ally to the city to change, to turn that into a city dialog – about what the aspirations the neighborhoods have for themselves [are]!*
NewKnowledge interviewed Advanced Leaders 15 months after they had completed the Harwood training, finding that:

- Overall enthusiasm is very high for helping their libraries *Turn Outward* to their communities;
- Librarians are able to adapt to the approach to their communities needs;
- LTC addresses Advanced Leaders’ existing priorities;
- The Harwood approach equips these leaders with the tools and skills to progress their libraries’ community work;
- The training has influenced the way libraries think about community engagement, even though the process of implementing new programs is slow and faces obstacles;
- There are workplace dynamics inherent in being new to an organization – and particularly in a role of leadership or when they organization is in transition – that may present challenges for Advanced Leaders creating new programs;
- Advanced Leaders indicated that limiting training contributed to a sense of isolation for some; and
- Building the trust of colleagues and earning their buy-in for a new approach to the work is important and difficult at times.

As a result of these findings, we recommend the following:

- Invite Advanced Leaders and their colleagues to train together, in order gain greater support and buy-in among staff, reducing the burden on one individual;
- Offer community partners access to training (in addition to libraries), as this could reduce feelings of isolation and contribute to the establishment of a community of practice; and
- Incorporate a post-training program of check-ins and networking to support the trainees when they set out to implement change in their libraries. This may take the form of providing simple ways for them to interact with one another, such as meeting up at conferences, or scheduling quarterly calls with small groups of three to four trainees, particularly those with similar interests. Adding an accountability mechanism where they can keep track of new initiatives and log progress can help sustain the work of *Turning Outward*. 
Part II – Public Innovators Cohort

The Public Innovators Lab was created to provide intensive training in the Harwood Institute approach for up to 50 library professionals and volunteers from ten libraries nationwide.

Currently, there are 45 members of the Public Innovators Cohort, representing a range of library systems and geographic regions, as indicated in Table 1. The Public Innovators training occurred in Denver on May 20-22, 2014. Prior to the training, participants were asked to join a webinar, held on April 30, 2014, which oriented them to the LTC initiative as well as their role in evaluation efforts. That webinar introduced them to the evaluation plan and encouraged participation in all evaluation activities. Following the Public Innovators Cohort training, each participating library developed a community action plan to serve as a road map for the upcoming work they planned to do. These community action plans include upcoming events (such as conducting the Aspirations exercise and holding Community Conversations).

Table 1. Public Innovators Lab Cohort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red Hook, NY</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, WI</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox County, IN</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>33,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk, VA</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, CT</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, MA</td>
<td>City Library</td>
<td>153,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscaloosa, AL</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County, WA</td>
<td>Library District</td>
<td>255,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>980,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>3.8 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRE-TRAINING SURVEY RESULTS

Public Innovators Lab participants were given both a pre- and post-training survey to assess changes in perspectives and skills that developed during the training session.

Before the training occurred, participants were generally excited to learn new tools and approaches through the Public Innovators training ($M = 4.85, SD = .36$). When asked whether their library did an adequate job of addressing the needs of the community, participants disagreed that their library did not do an adequate job ($M = 2.52, SD = .94$). Participants differed in their beliefs that they generally agree with colleagues about how to define and address needs of their community ($M = 3.33, SD = .92$), and that their colleagues are willing to try new approaches to community engagement ($M = 3.89, SD = .95$). Participant responses were split among
disagree ($n = 12$), neither agree or disagree ($n = 13$), and agree ($n = 13$) when asked about whether they felt that a shared understanding of what community means is lacking ($M = 3.02$, $SD = 1.13$). Responses also varied about whether participants were aware of the aspirations and needs of their community ($M = 3.63$, $SD = .88$), with many disagreeing ($n = 5$), neither agreeing or disagreeing ($n = 14$), agreeing ($n = 20$), and strongly agreeing ($n = 7$).

Figure 2. Levels of agreement about aspects of community work and the Public Innovators Lab. ($N = 46$)

### Defining Community

During the pre-training survey, training attendees were asked to describe what “community” meant to them in the context of their work at their library. A total of 45 respondents provided an open-ended description to this prompt. Most participants defined community in terms of the geography and region in relation to their own library ($n = 19$). For example, one participant defined community as:

> The residents, businesses, organizations, churches, etc. that occupy the geographic area surrounding my library.

Other participants described their community as a place where people live, work, and play. However, some of the respondents understood community as the people whom they serve through their work in the library ($n = 15$), as illustrated in the following response:
Community means the working together of the Library Board, staff members, and citizens to meet the needs of citizens of all ages and backgrounds.

Some participants used terms such as “connection,” “interaction,” and “network” in describing the way their community functions \( n = 12 \). Other themes included a general conceptualizing community as a group of individuals with shared needs and goals \( n = 6 \) and as library constituents \( n = 3 \).

**Addressing the Community’s Needs & Aspirations**

Participants were then asked about their library’s strategy for addressing the needs and aspirations of the community. Most people reported that their library was using a form of public feedback, including surveys, interviews and/or community discussions, and general evaluations \( n = 17 \). In addition, many participants also stated that their library’s staff and leadership were having conversations with various library members and residents of the surrounding area, communicating with community leaders, and asking what members wanted and needed through library programming and services \( n = 15 \). This is illustrated in the following response:

> We listen to the expressed needs and watch for places to improve. The director, staff, and board are involved in various community efforts and clubs and, therefore, receive suggestions. We respond by trying to improve and/or correct any situation.

Sixteen participants were working on addressing community needs, while thirteen specifically said that they were doing this by pursuing partnerships with various organizations and groups in their community. Seven other participants were holding library-run programs to address community needs, and five were attending community groups and meetings not run by the library in order to gain understanding of community needs and aspirations. Although they recognized the importance for addressing community needs and aspirations, eight participants said that they, along with their library staff, were improving on this, and two participants stated that there were no current strategies in place.

**Listening to Diverse Voices**

When asked whether participants felt they listened to diverse voices in their community, most participants acknowledged that they needed to improve this process both as an individual and in relation to their work on behalf of the library. However, a number of participants cited that they do this, although they did not clearly state how they were drawing in diverse voices \( n = 13 \). A total of eight participants said that they were aware of the importance of listening to diverse voices, as indicated in the following:

> I believe that I understand and am aware of the diverse voices in my community. My goal is to expand that awareness to all of our staff.
Nine participants felt that they were listening to diverse voices as an individual and five specified that they were doing this in relation to their library work. Other participants mentioned a variety of ways they listen to diverse voices in their community, including partnering with different organizations ($n = 3$), outreach to different demographic groups ($n = 3$), creating programming for different populations ($n = 3$), and identifying diverse communities in need of service in their region ($n = 3$). Out of those who said they were struggling with listening to diverse voices, four said they had limited contact with different populations, four were missing populations in their work, two had limited resources to allow them to include diverse voices, three said they needed improvement on an individual level, and two did not do very well in general.

**Enthusiasm & Expectations for the Public Innovators Lab**

When asked what excited them most about being involved in the Public Innovators Lab and what they expected to gain from the experience, participants' most commonly looked forward to learning how to better engage and serve the community ($n = 23$). Many participants responded that they were expecting to learn more ideas, strategies, and skills through the training ($n = 15$). Thirteen participants were hoping to connect and develop relationships with others during the training. Similarly, ten participants wanted to share and learn from others. Seven participants responded that they were excited to return back to their libraries and communities to share what they learned from the training with the rest of their staff and community. Several participants expressed interest and excitement in bringing and refocusing librarianship back to community ($n = 7$) and others stated that they were looking forward to learning about and creating innovation in their libraries ($n = 7$). Other responses included gaining support for their library ($n = 4$), developing better programs and services for their community ($n = 2$), gaining tools for library and community evaluation ($n = 1$), and developing better ways of communicating ($n = 1$).

**POST-TRAINING SURVEY**

Following the Public Innovators Cohort training, each participating library developed a community action plan to serve as a road map for the upcoming work they planned to do. These community action plans include upcoming events (such as conducting the Aspirations exercise and holding *Community Conversations*).

The Public Innovators Lab participants were also given an online post-training survey to determine the impact of attending and participating in the lab, which they were asked to complete within a week of the May 20-22, 2014 training.

**Defining Community**

When asked to define a community, many more participants indicated people-focused conceptions of their community, with far fewer participants using more geographic terms to describe community ($n = 8$). In particular, some participants now realized that their library was not engaging certain parts of their community:
In a similar way to before the training, I now recognize some of the people or groups that we have not had as much interaction with, and know that we need to hear their voices.

Seven participants recognized that their community consisted of diverse populations of people, and seven defined their community in terms of shared aspirations. Six participants understood their community as those who they serve and six admitted that their understanding of community, along with their understanding of their library, was changing and developing. The remaining participants mentioned library staff as their community (n = 4), library supporters (n = 4), and between catalytic and growth (n = 2).

When asked whether participants’ definition of community was a shared definition with their colleagues, most of the participants responded that it was a shared definition (n = 26). About 17 participants indicated that there would be some level of difference between their library staff’s conception of the community they serve. Some of these indicated that the differences could be subtle, noting that the general definition might be shared, but the interest in working with specific parts of the community may differ:

I think many of my colleagues would understand community as the people in our area and surrounding areas, but I also think that they would have different opinions about how or why we do (or do not) need to serve some populations.

Other participants said that they and their colleagues would agree that community consists of their library’s users (n = 2), two were unsure, and two said that although they would have similar ideas and concepts as their colleagues, they would have different definitions and understandings.

**Addressing the Community’s Aspirations & Considering Impacts**

Many participants believed that their decision-making on behalf of the library was shaped by the Public Innovators Lab in ways such as encouraging them to Turn Outward (n = 12), focus on community feedback (n = 12), and on community aspirations (n = 12). Eleven participants said they planned to focus more on addressing specific needs in the community, and seven indicated that they would be thoughtful about the impacts their decisions would have on the community:

I will reinforce the need to make decisions based on the needs of the community and not to just do things to do them or to check a box on a list. It will make us think of the impact each decision will have on the community.

Seven other participants said they would focus on developing better and more effective programs and services on behalf of their library. The remaining participants mentioned a general shift in framework regarding all their decisions (n = 5), and gaining empowerment from the Post innovators Lab that will help them make decisions (n = 2).
When asked about the effectiveness of the training in its ability to create an internal library capacity for ongoing innovation and learning that uses the community as a reference point, many participants stated that the training was very effective \((n = 23)\). Ten participants said that the training gave them the tools they need to implement change within their library and community, and ten other participants were planning to share the tools and knowledge with the rest of their library staff and community. Nine participants mentioned that training helped them become more community-focused in their work and work towards placing the community’s needs and goals at its center. Six participants felt it was an important training, but that the implementation would be difficult. Five participants were unsure about the effectiveness of the training and four felt unprepared to carry out the training in their work. Three participants said the training would help them to Turn Outward in their work, two felt that the training allowed them to shift perspectives in a beneficial and positive way, and one said that they planned to focus on community aspirations.

**Applying the Turning Outward Approach**

When asked how they would apply what they learned from the session to their work, the most commonly cited training tool was becoming more community focused \((n = 14)\):

> [It] will help me in making sure we are focused on what our community wants and needs, according to the community, and will make sure we solicit feedback from the community and engage them with conversation as we continue to develop as a living part of the community.

Participants were planning to apply the concept of Turning Outward in their work \((n = 10)\), bring Community Conversations to their libraries \((n = 8)\), and using the Aspirations exercise \((n = 8)\). Nine people responded that they would utilize the tools as soon as they returned to work, and eight were planning to do this by sharing the information and training with others (staff, colleagues, and/or the rest of the community). Other tools mentioned included the Three A’s (authority, accountability, and authenticity), personal covenant, Innovation Spaces, assessment exercise, sweet spot, and the Turn Quiz session.

**Understanding Community Engagement & Planning**

Participants were then asked to describe the work they had done on their community engagement plan during the training and the next steps for their library. Many used the terminology and tools that they learned in the training. For example, most participants focused on developing plans for implementing Community Conversations with their library \((n = 19)\) and a number of participants said the next steps for their library were staff training, in which they had worked on developing staff training during the sessions \((n = 13)\). Other participants said they worked on and would be bringing the Aspirations exercise to their library and community \((n = 9)\). Some participants focused on sharing their training with others, including their library and community \((n = 7)\) and developing a structured and concrete community engagement plan \((n = 7)\). Other
responses included the phrase *Turning Outward* \((n = 5)\), implementing tools learned in general \((n = 5)\), using the innovation spaces exercise \((n = 1)\), and the “ask exercise” \((n = 1)\). Only three participants were unsure.

Most participants said their understanding of community engagement changed as a result of participating in the Public Innovators Lab \((n = 23)\). However, some participants said that their understanding of community engagement did not necessarily change, but rather was reinforced \((n = 15)\), underscoring that the LTC project resonated with librarians’ goals for work in their communities. Eight participants said their understanding did not change.

Of those who gave examples of this change, seven said they started focusing more on community needs as a result of the training; three were able to implement new tools into their work; three were planning to bring *Community Conversations* to their libraries; two were now more focused on *Turning Outward*; one mentioned understanding including different community; one cited *Innovation Spaces*; and one cited using the *Aspirations* exercise. Only three participants said their understanding of community engagement somewhat changed. In general, participants did not find anything unexpected or surprising about the training \((n = 13)\). Some participants found the similarities between different libraries surprising \((n = 6)\), and the challenges of going through the training and bringing the training back to their communities surprising \((n = 6)\). A number of participants \((n = 11)\) did not expect the sense of empowerment they gained in the training and all the new information they received. Some participants were surprised the overarching meaning and potential impact of the training:

> I didn’t realize how big this idea is. I thought we were gaining tools for our next strategic planning series. I hadn’t realized that in the meantime we would be changing our community.

Overall, participants felt that the length of the training could be adjusted to improve the training \((n = 17)\). Participants felt they needed more time to process the information they were receiving and felt they were not given enough time to plan with the rest of their staff. Some participants felt they needed more clarity throughout the training on the information they were receiving, including having better organization and clarity of materials they were using \((n = 9)\). Other participants mentioned the need for additional real-life examples throughout the training because they were unclear how to apply the information applied to their libraries and communities \((n = 6)\). A few participants wanted more interaction between the libraries \((n = 5)\) and more individual coaching from the staff in the training \((n = 3)\). Nine participants responded that they not did feel like anything could have been improved.

**Support for the Public Innovators Cohort**

Members of the Public Innovators Cohort receive support from ALA and Harwood through regularly scheduled, ongoing webinars and conference calls. These resources were made accessible for those who are unable to attend scheduled events. One recent webinar provided training for the Cohort on how to host
Community Conversations. This training is based on a 23-page guide, downloadable from the LTC project website, called Community Conversations Workbook. The webinar covered how to use the workbook, explained the role of facilitator and note-taker, and reinforced the need for setting ground rules. Community Conversations are held with groups of 8-15 people, run between 90-120 minutes, and result in concrete actions and next steps. The webinar was helpful and all information was clearly explained. ALA and Harwood have worked together to customize this resource for use by library professionals, (e.g. adjusting meeting protocols for sensitivity to library-specific privacy and information gathering issues). An ALA leadership training specialist and content developer has served as consultant to assist with review of the Public Innovator Lab materials, resulting in specific changes to the lab workbook, including:

- Addition of Learning objectives (page 1.2);
- Creation of the “Our Team Plan” worksheet (pages 1.4-1.5); and
- Creation of a public library-specific fictional case study.

A staff member from the Harwood Institute provided group-based support for the Public Innovators Cohort members through conference calls that took place on June 17 and July 10, 2014. During these calls the library staff and/or volunteers asked questions and make comments about their progress implementing what they learned in the Denver training, then the Harwood trainer provided feedback and assist in designing the next steps.

There was emphasis on connecting with partner organizations, from both Harwood and the cohort members. As coaches, Harwood gave practical advice regarding techniques to use to better facilitate Community Conversations. Reflecting on using the Community Conversations tool, one cohort member commented:

> Really impressed with how the questions really lead the participants to reflect on the community, reflect on what they want their community to be, and how they naturally...identified the places the library could be the center of the community, or filling a need that community had.

At various times during the coaching calls, Harwood facilitators promoted using ALA Connect so each librarian could share their documents regarding their planning. However, the amount of information posted on ALA Connect remains minimal, suggesting that the platform itself may pose challenges that have not yet been explored.
NewKnowledge surveyed the Public Innovators Cohort prior to and after their Harwood Institute training in May 2014. Key findings were:

- **Before the training**, participants were very excited about the initiative; believed that LTC aligned with libraries' current goals; acknowledged that they could do a better job of meeting the needs of their communities; and indicated a desire to learn how to more effectively engage community members.

- **After the training**, participants showed a large degree of satisfaction and believed that the training met their expectations; and indicated that most participants had a clear idea of how to help their libraries move forward with community engagement plans.

Time limits and clarity of training materials were among the only cited challenges. Therefore, we recommend adjusting the length of training to allow for additional individual coaching as well as more peer-based interaction, and modifying training materials to include real life examples and add additional detail to improve clarity.
Part III – ALA Staff Training

The purpose of training ALA staff in addition to librarians is to create the deep internal knowledge required to support the field and align ALA’s internal processes with the LTC work. Through this, ALA staff hopes to mirror the shift in orientation and competencies that this project proposes for the field of public librarianship. Informal “Kitchen Table” conversations took place at the 2013 Annual Conference in Chicago, resulting in a narrative highlighting ALA members’ desires for a welcoming, inclusive, engaged, supportive organization.

Attendees were concerned about navigating ALA’s complexity and suggested that ALA be more welcoming to new members and ideas. There was an overarching theme where members wanted to build more relationships with each other and ALA, in addition to continuing this conversation and needing flexible ways that they could participate through ALA. Members identified the strength that they have as a community, and the apparent commonalities that span across the members. This became the foundation for an internal ALA staff training that occurred as part of LTC in April 2014 – the Intentionality Forum. To further encourage ALA staff engagement with the LTC initiative and promote the Turning Outward orientation, ALA has implemented Innovation Spaces, held a Staff Listening Party, and hosted multiple Make ALA More Welcoming meetings, to discuss how to make ALA a more welcoming organization for all of the communities it serves (both staff and members). At this point, evaluation efforts focus almost exclusively on the Intentionality Forum and do not take into account coaching and mentoring activities designed to scaffold the initial training. It is acknowledged that evaluating an isolated event does not give clear indication or accurate representation of ongoing process work with ALA staff members, and that opinions may shift to form a different picture once subsequent evaluation activities are implemented and taken into consideration. These assessments efforts, to be implemented Fall 2014, include a journaling practice whereby ALA staff members record their thoughts over time, and that feedback is used to seed conversation among the larger group in an iterative process.

POST-INTENTIONALITY FORUM SURVEY

To reflect and support the shift to Turning Outward occurring nationwide through the Public Innovators Cohort and conference based trainings, select ALA staff participated in a training forum with Harwood facilitators in April 2014. A total of 51 ALA staff, including two who form part of the project leadership team, attended one of the two one-day sessions: 25 attended on April 7 and 26 attended on April 8. Those who participated signed up as individuals or small teams representing their units within ALA. The invitation explained that the training would explore three tools fundamental to the Turning Outward approach, with an emphasis on a deeper understanding of the ALA community’s aspirations, ALA staff’s shared aspirations for improving member services, concrete tools to use in their work, and confidence in these tools to improve existing member programs. Following this training, staff members were asked to submit responses to an online survey administered by a NewKnowledge researcher, as part of evaluation efforts. This survey
attempted to identify which training activities had relevance for the attendees’ work and document the Intentionality Forum’s advantages and limitations.

Results from the Post-Intentionality Forum highlight the concerns and mixed sentiment expressed from the 39 attendees of the forum who responded to the survey. When asked whether they were satisfied with the training session, most attendees either disagreed ($n = 14$) or were neutral ($n = 12$) (Figure 3).

Figure 3. Satisfaction ratings for the Staff Training. ($N = 39$)

Furthermore, the forum attendees were had mixed responses when they were asked whether the training session enriched their professional development in which $14$ agreed, $11$ disagreed, and $14$ felt neutral about the training (Figure 4).

Figure 4. Agreement ratings for whether the staff training enriched professional development. ($N = 39$)
When asked whether they felt the training was relevant to their work, 21 respondents reported that it was relevant with 14 reporting that it wasn’t. Additionally, many of the respondents were either neutral ($n = 16$) or reported that they felt the training wouldn’t have an impact on how ALA staff work together ($n = 16$).

Most of the attendees didn’t feel ($n = 15$) or felt neutral ($n = 12$) about whether the training gave them a deeper understanding of what they could do to improve member services. However, some attendees reported that they gained a deeper understanding ($n = 11$) of member services (Figure 5).

Figure 5. Agreement ratings on how staff training gave attendees a deeper understanding of how to improve member services. ($N = 38$)
The following response was representative of those who gained knowledge on ways to improve member services:

*I think I will continue to ask for feedback and have open lines of communication with partners so that both our needs are met through the partnership.*

Attendees were asked whether they felt they had a personal responsibility to ensure that their ALA colleagues heard ALA members’ voices, whereas the responses primarily expressed agreement (n = 16) or strong agreement (n = 16). This suggests that forum attendees felt a sense of responsibility for the dissemination of knowledge to their colleagues.

There were varying levels of agreement as to whether the training session was relevant to attendees’ work. A total of 21 respondents felt that it was relevant, whereas only 14 felt that it was irrelevant, and three were neutral (Figure 6).

To expand upon the previous survey prompt, attendees were asked specifically whether the tools in the training were directly relevant to their work. Again, there were mixed responses with 12 disagreeing or strongly disagreeing, 11 that were neutral, and 16 that agreed or strongly agreed (Figure 7).

Figure 6. Agreement ratings about whether the staff training was relevant to attendees’ work. (N = 38)

Figure 7. Agreement ratings about whether the tools were directly relevant to participants’ work. (N = 39)
In spite of the levels of disagreement, some attendees felt that they could use the tools in their work and this is illustrated in the following response:

*I will focus more on asking ALA members more open-ended questions to determine how to better serve them. I will discreetly challenge the status quo in my unit and with colleagues that I'm friendly with.*

It appeared that attendees of the training felt a need for further support and a trial-and-error phase with the tools before knowing whether they would be effective for them. Many of the survey respondents reported that they needed to try out the tools from the training \( (n = 17) \) before they would know whether the training had relevance to their work and almost half of the respondents \( (n = 17) \) felt that they needed more support in thinking through how to apply the tools to their work. Only six of the respondents felt confident that they could successfully implement the tools without additional mentoring and only nine respondents felt confident that they could use the tools to make their work more effective. This lack of confidence is expressed in the following response:

*I am still sorting that out, but I have some initial ideas to look at the various entities we serve to see how I can apply the technique.*

When asked whether the training helped them to understand what ALA staff can do together to improve member experiences, responses were mixed with four strongly agreeing, ten agreeing, 12 neutral responses, ten disagreeing, and three who strongly disagreed (Figure 8).

**Figure 8.** Levels of agreement about whether the training staff can do together to improve member experience. \((N = 39)\)
Twelve of the respondents weren’t looking forward to another Intentionality Forum Training, while 11 respondents were looking forward to more training. Similarly, many respondents weren’t looking forward to meeting with people they work with every day to discuss what they learned from the Intentionality Forum (n = 15) and many respondents were neutral (n = 11).

When asked if they were looking forward to the change the learning would bring to their work, a majority of the respondents disagreed (n = 14) or strongly disagreed (n = 8).

Overall a great deal of uncertainty persisted throughout the responses to the survey items. Respondents had numerous ideas for ways to improve the training such as breaking the one-day session into two days, providing attendees with background materials before the training, and a stronger focus on application and practice of the tools from the Harwood Institute.

The Intentionality Forum agenda included training components similar to that of the Public Innovators Cohort and its sessions (described in Part IV), such as “Aspirations” and the “Turn Quiz.” One distinct difference, however, from other participants in the LTC initiative, is that the ALA Staff Cohort did not collectively determine their own aspirations but were instead given Aspirations as determined previously by the broader ALA community. This may have accounted for some of the confusion and disconnect and should be addressed in any future staff trainings.
NewKnowledge conducted a post-training survey of the April 2014 Intentionality Forum, exploring the attendees’ reactions to the training and how it might be improved. The results indicated that, while attendees felt a sense of responsibility to disseminate their newfound knowledge to their colleagues:

- Attendees did not fully understand how the training was relevant to their work;
- There was confusion and uncertainty about how to implement the Harwood tools; and
- Attendees found some terms and definitions confusing.

As a result of the analysis, we recommend the following:

- Separate the one-day session into two days, or potentially split up over an even longer period of time in order to sufficiently cover all the material and allow for reflection;
- Provide attendees with background materials before the training;
- Introduce a stronger focus on concrete case studies and implementation; and
- Ask ALA Staff to determine their own aspirations at the beginning of the training, so that expectations are clear, attendees feel a sense of ownership over their training, and relevance is more apparent.

**INNOVATION SPACES**

Following the Intentionality Forum Training, ALA has worked to provide follow up activities for training participants and the wider ALA staff community. These opportunities allow participants and ALA staff spaces for networking, learning, and brainstorming as a community.

Monthly Innovation Space meetings are a chance for trainees to get together and discuss how they are currently applying new skills, identifying potential barriers to success. Innovation Spaces are safe spaces, with ground rules that ensure that all voices are heard, and equal access to participation from across an organization. They are a way of drawing lessons from the work being done and applying what is being learned. Innovation spaces provide accountability and a way for the group to check in and self-assess its own performance.

The first of these monthly ALA Innovation Spaces gave attendees an opportunity to brainstorm journaling prompts to be used in upcoming evaluation. The journaling activity will assess changes made directly from ALA staff members. Each member of the ALA staff cohort, along with any other ALA staff who would like to participate, will be sent a link to these prompts, directing them to a third-party encrypted website where all
journal entries will be logged. These staff members will be given the opportunity to read and comment on their prior entries, and reflect on changes that have occurred over time.

**STAFF LISTENING PARTY**

As another follow-up activity, ALA also scheduled a Staff Listening Party: Welcome to Community Rhythms. Staff members are invited to the listening party through a group call with ALA members who have been using the Harwood tools for public innovation and community engagement. The call concludes with a staff activity using the Community Rhythms exercise to reflect on how the community is using the Turning Outward approach.

**MAKE ALA MORE WELCOMING MEETING**

In an effort to make ALA a more reflective and open workplace for library professionals the More Welcoming Meeting was held for staff on May 27, 2014. All staff members were invited to a last Monday of the month meeting where they work cross-functionally to find incremental ways to make ALA more welcoming to all the communities it serves, including the staff community. This process is also based on the Harwood process of *Turning Outward* and the innovation space tool, or looking at things from the perspectives/needs of the communities served. These meetings have become standing cross function monthly meetings.
Part IV – The Broader ALA Community

Training in the Harwood Method has been made available to ALA members through conference sessions at the ALA-associated meetings. Four 90-minute conference sessions were held in March 2014 at the Public Library Association (PLA) Conference in Indianapolis, and again at the ALA Annual Conference in Las Vegas in June 2014. The four sessions were “Aspirations” (identifying aspirations common to a community, challenges faced in reaching them, and necessary changes that must occur); “Turn Quiz” (a short quiz that lets individuals and groups assess how Turned Outward they are); “Intentionality” (a tool that helps people be more intentional about the choices they make); and “Sustaining Yourself” (a way of identifying how people can “recharge their batteries” while doing the work).

The “Turning Outward” Approach: Four Foundational Tools

- **Aspirations**: Talk to your community, framing the conversation to best understand their hopes, challenges and conditions for change.
- **Turn Quiz**: Approach your work with the community, not the institution, at the heart of all discussion and action.
- **Intentionality**: Act intentionally and authentically, evaluating your success as you go.
- **Sustaining Yourself**: Rejuvenate; make wellbeing for yourself and your team a priority.

Figure 9. Visualization of the Turning Outward approach, incorporated into training slides as a result of feedback.
PLA CONFERENCE TRAINING SESSIONS EVALUATION

A total of 340 people attended at least one or more of the four sessions. Three quarters of attendees identified themselves as public librarians \( (n = 258) \). Another 18 said they work or volunteer at a library but have a different role. Sixty-four identified as another role at a library, which tended to be either trustees or directors.

At the end of each session, participants completed a survey on paper or online, which asked the same questions across all sessions. In this configuration, it is possible that one attendee could have completed the survey four times, but would have been responding to four different sessions. The surveys did not collect personally identifying information, so individuals were not tracked across surveys.

The training sessions from the first day of the conference (“Aspirations” and “Turn Quiz” sessions) had higher attendance rates than the sessions on the following day. A total of 162 participants attended the “Aspirations” session, 128 attended the “Turn Quiz” session, and 106 and 76 participants attended the “Intentionality” and “Sustaining Yourself” sessions, respectively. Even with the comparatively lower attendance rates for the “Intentionality” and “Sustaining Yourself” sessions, participants indicated they had hoped to attend those sessions. The lower attendance may have been due to scheduling conflicts with other programs during the conference, participants’ loss of interest in the topics of these sessions, general fatigue that can occur at conferences, or other reasons that were not readily observable.

Figure 10. Attendance and intentions to attend PLA Conference sessions.
Participants were asked to rate their satisfaction with each conference session, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 representing a low rate of satisfaction and 5 indicating a high rate of satisfaction (Figure 11).

Figure 11. Satisfaction with the conference session. (N = 342)

Out of the 342 surveys collected, most conference attendees indicated satisfaction with the sessions (M = 4.07) and many of the participants indicated that they would like more leadership or facilitated for the group discussions. Similarly, many participants indicated that the training was effective in facilitating their learning (Figure 12; M = 4.00; N = 341).

Figure 12. Effectiveness of training in facilitating learning. (N = 341)
The participants who felt the training was not effective in facilitating learning offered mixed ideas for improvement. Four participants believed that the sessions could be improved by having more leadership during the discussions and five participants wanted more concrete and specific content and tools.

The majority of attendees agreed that the sessions were relevant and meaningful to their library work ($M = 4.20$, on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree), indicating that the PLA Conference was an ideal venue to invite the broader librarian community to learn more about the Harwood Institute approach.

Figure 13. Relevance and meaningfulness of the session to current library work. ($N = 340$).

![Bar chart showing the relevance and meaningfulness of the session to current library work.]

Many participants indicated that they intended to apply what they learned from the session (Figure 14). This indicated that, for most, they understood ways of implementing the tools and ideas they gained in the training.
Many participants offered their ideas for how they planned to incorporate what they learned from the session. Most notably, strategic planning and existing efforts in outreach and community engagement were the most common plans for implementation.

Attendees also shared their motivations for participating in the sessions, where the most common reason for attending was to build their library’s community involvement and outreach efforts.

Table 2. Reasons for attending PLA training sessions. \((N = 312)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Participating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand community involvement and outreach efforts</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Harwood / session topic / LTC</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General interest in attending all four sessions</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand library’s role and inform strategic planning</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing skills or how Harwood approach could help</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended out of convenience</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical tools or techniques</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet and learn from peers, or referred by a friend</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Codes for open-ended responses were not mutually exclusive, where one response could have more than one code.

Nearly nine out of ten attendees had not accessed the web materials in advance of the conference even though they were available to them.
When considering how the session could be improved, participants offered many ideas ($N = 190$). Among the most common requests was a desire for more time to engage with the information and other attendees. A smaller subset desired more time specifically for discussion. In that vein, many attendees believed that group discussions would benefit from more leadership or facilitation ($n = 25$). Attendees commented on other characteristics of the discussions and presentations—such as the size of the discussion groups, the proportion of discussions versus presentations, and the role of the audience in the presentation—but these represented small minorities of respondents.

About 24 participants believed the entire structure of the training sessions could be improved, with about 11 suggesting that the four sessions should be more of a clearly integrated whole and attendance required at all four. Meanwhile, 13 people thought that the trainings could be combined or moved to the pre-conference offerings.

Regarding the session content, 27 participants wanted more specific or concrete content and tools, while smaller numbers wanted more clarity, focus, or context for the materials. About 15 attendees also wanted more background information or preparation for the sessions, though as noted above, only about ten percent of overall attendees used the materials provided prior to the conference. With no comment on how to improve the sessions, 21 participants stated that they were satisfied with the training sessions.

Following the PLA Conference, ALA made a number of modifications to the slideshow presentations accompanying each of the four sessions. ALA realized that participants struggled to understand the relationship between the four sessions. To address this issue, an additional slide was created for the June Annual Conference to help explain the way the four fit together and the purpose of each (see Figure 9, above). They also learned that participants were confused in the small groups during the presentations, and included images of the handouts that were distributed around the room. Finally, ALA worked with the Harwood coaches, creating slide-paced agendas for them.
ALA convened four training sessions at the Public Library Association (PLA) Conference to share the *Turning Outward* approach with a broader audience of library professionals and volunteers. As a result of post-training surveys offered at the end of each session, NewKnowledge identified the following key findings:

- Overall, the great majority of PLA attendees who participated in one or more LTC training sessions were satisfied with the training and found the information highly relevant to their current work;
- Attendees said they understood the sessions and ways to implement what they learned, particularly in strategic planning and existing community engagement efforts; and
- Although attendees were satisfied with the trainings, their suggestions for improving the program centered around adding additional time, more facilitation and guidance in small group discussions, and more concrete ideas for tools and implementation from the sessions.

As a result of these findings, we recommend that:

- A Harwood training be offered as an intensive workshop at the PLA Conference, with all four sessions integrated and offered together, whether as a pre-conference activity or as part of the primary conference schedule.

**ALA ANNUAL CONFERENCE TRAINING SESSIONS**

In June 2014, the ALA Annual Conference occurred in Las Vegas. Four training sessions were held over the course of two days, similar in structure and content to those at the PLA Conference in March 2014. The same four sessions were offered: Aspirations, Turn Quiz, Intentionality, and Sustaining Yourself. Each of the four sessions had an attendance goal of 100 attendees. The method of evaluation was the same as at the PLA Conference – a paper survey was given to each participant to complete at the end of each session. A total of 106 participants attended the “Aspirations” session, 65 attended the “Turn Quiz” session, 70 participants attended the “Intentionality” and 54 attended the “Sustaining Yourself” sessions. The lower turnout can likely be attributed at least in part to the inconvenient location of the training sessions, which was difficult to find and far from the main conference hall.

While attendance rates were lower than at PLA, the feedback from attendees was enthusiastic. It seems that, based on attendees’ responses, a community of practice may be starting to form. Some people came because they had received previous training and wanted to “refresh” (*Went at PLA – came back to take better notes*!). Others had, encouragingly, been exposed to the Harwood method in their community, for instance, in the case of a local United Way that had also undergone training.
ALA Conference evaluation indicated that training sessions seemed to align with what librarians are thinking about in their practice. The *Turned Outward* orientation is perceived as central to the function of libraries:

*Our library is gearing up for another round of strategic planning and community engagement will be one of our main goals.*

*I think it is central to my library’s value for the community in the future.*

*Our library is moving in this direction to listen to our community and engage together.*

In multiple instances, attendees mentioned that the reason they chose to attend the session was that it came recommended by colleagues. The idea also surfaced that ALA has embraced the Harwood method and librarians who want to know what ALA is doing should get involved:

*As a new librarian, I wanted to learn about the initiatives ALA is leading.*

As was noted in the Advanced Leaders interviews, the Harwood training give more structure to what librarians are already engaged in and care about:

*To get additional info to help me do what I am already doing.*

Attendees had various comments for ways to improve the session. The location in the convention center was inconvenient, and likely accounted for lower attendance rates than anticipated. Technical issues, such as the sound system, were a distraction. Smaller tables were recommended because participants couldn’t hear one another very well. Many wanted more small group time to have discussions. Others wanted a longer training, perhaps in a pre-conference session, where all four modules could be completed together. Attendees wanted to hear more about examples where *Turning Outward* is currently occurring, to structure and guide conversation. There was a desire for more deliberate “matching” – pairing types/sizes of libraries so that the interests of people in small groups would be better aligned, and better able to discuss mutual experiences.

The “Turn Quiz” exercise in particular seemed ambiguous to many, requiring additional context, direction, and clearer expectations:

*Too vague, too obvious, nothing new, no specific tactics or tools were offered for us to use, just discussing something is what I already do everyday with staff. You did not give me any "meat" or "substance," just vague generalities.*

For those who attended more than one session, the closing remarks were repetitive.
**Turning Outward** training sessions were offered at the ALA Annual Conference in Las Vegas in June 2014. The following key findings emerged from the evaluation:

- Attendees were enthusiastic about the quality of the training sessions, with some attending the training a second time on account of positive experiences at a past conference;
- “Aspirations” was the most popular session, though it is not clear why;
- Word of mouth appears to be a powerful method of dissemination, as many participants’ colleagues recommended that they attend; and
- Suggestions for improvement included: a better location, longer sessions, smaller tables, and more clarity and usefulness in relation to the “Turn Quiz” exercise.

As a result of these findings, NewKnowledge recommends that ALA:

- Optimize attendees’ ability to share their enthusiasm about the training; and
- Provide more time for participants to “dig deeper,” potentially in additional discussion time or as part of a professional circle, such as a “**Turning Outward Network**.”

**ALA CONNECT**

One way of linking the broader ALA community to current initiatives is through ALA Connect, an online interactive forum for user-generated commentary and resource sharing. NewKnowledge researchers conducted a usability and content review of ALA Connect, finding that it suffers from various limitations that have resulted in low participation rates among Public Innovators Cohort members.

Currently, the Connect Committee entitled **Libraries Transforming Communities Public Innovators Cohort** has 60 members and hosts resources and discussions relevant to group members, such as webinar and conference call archives, related news items, and discussion threads. The majority of posts are made by ALA and Harwood staff members, rather than the Public Innovators Cohort, and many of these have been viewed by only a fraction of group members and received no comments. One notable exception was a post made by a library director on June 25 called “Dazed and Confused,” describing a lack of clarity about how to use the Harwood tools. The post was quickly addressed by the Harwood trainer, but the questions were answered in a separate email and phone call rather than in the thread itself. While this conversation carried over into coaching calls, it may have had the unanticipated consequence of stifling interaction and exchange on Connect. Likewise, it may have led to the perception that emailing or phoning a Harwood trainer directly is more effective, rather than engaging with the Cohort.
Not all community engagement discussion found on ALA Connect is limited to the Public Innovators Cohort. *Libraries Foster Community Engagement* is a 131-member community that has been active since 2009, bringing together ALA staff who are interested in the work of library-led community engagement. Participants share experiences facilitating public forums, fostering community and civic engagement, and leading change in communities. They also hear about professional development opportunities and library experiences related to convening, dialogue facilitation, forum moderation, deliberative dialogue and local partnerships to help communities understand issues of concern and solve problems together. Another Connect group, *Making ALA More Welcoming*, was set up in April 2014 in alignment with the Intentionality Forum staff training but also includes ALA staff members who have not been trained in the Harwood approach.

Much of the content currently in Connect is one-way information and resource distribution, rather than acting according to a Web 2.0 many-to-many model. Most Cohort members, when they log in at all, seem to view posts but without contributing or commenting. ALA can work to shift this dynamic by not only seeding relevant content, but stimulating and guiding conversation as well. Many digital platforms end up dormant because of a lack of effective facilitation, or end up reverting to a 1.0 model. In order to go the extra step of logging into a website that is separate from whatever they may already use in their professional and private lives, people must be motivated by a perception that the experience is valuable enough to merit the additional effort. The other way of addressing this “extra layer problem” that is often accused of limiting participation is to bring the conversation into a space where people are already engaging, often in Facebook or another social media platform.

Other reasons why more Cohort members fail to actively participate on Connect may be due to the site interface, which is challenging to use for a number of reasons. The Connect site is only usable via computer desktop; it does not utilize a responsive design. Thus, while it is accessible on a mobile phone, the interface remains the same as though a user were still looking at a desktop computer. Even on a desktop, the interface is cluttered with small fonts and has many options available on each page, issues that are exacerbated by mobile or tablet access. Currently, icons for the online documents, polls, events, and chats are available but not often used.

It is recommended that the next evaluation of the Public Innovators Lab, to occur six months following the initial training, focus at least in part on how to improve the Connect experience, or whether a different platform (such as a Facebook or a LinkedIn group) would be preferable insofar as this is a possibility for ALA to set up and facilitate effectively. This will present a key opportunity to ask potential users for their input on identifying barriers and, more importantly, optimizing the Connect experience so that they and their peers can benefit from the online platform, whatever shape it make take.
The ALA Connect website currently provides a platform for resource sharing, learning opportunities, and interaction related to the *Turning Outward* approach, primarily for the Public Innovators Cohort. NewKnowledge conducted a review of the website content and use analytics to uncover opportunities to improve this platform, which uncovered the following key findings:

- ALA Connect currently has low participation rates, indicated by few click-throughs and limited conversation threads;
- The user experience of the site tends toward a Web 1.0 configuration, where information exchange is mostly one-way, coming from the Harwood facilitators and ALA staff and received by group members; and
- There is minimal multi-device compatibility, as the interface on mobile phones and tablets is difficult to navigate.

As a result of this review, NewKnowledge recommends the following actions. Even though there appear to be a number of challenges within the platform, we believe that they can be addressed through a thoughtful process that includes the following:

- Streamline the appearance, making it more accessible across a range of devices, including mobile phones;
- Facilitate a web 2.0 model of engagement, where the focus moves from information distribution to communicative interaction;
- Get feedback from Cohort members concerning how they would prefer to share, exchange, and discuss and consider exploring other platforms, such as LinkedIn or Facebook; and
- Keep all conversation on-list; don’t post responses indicating questions will be addressed offline by phone if at all possible.

**TOOLS AND RESOURCES**

In order to meet project objectives, ALA will create resources and learning opportunities for distribution to thousands of librarians through conference-based and online learning opportunities, through releases of the webinar archives and other support resources that have been created as part of the Public Innovators Lab. These broader resources will include tools for library-led community innovation, created with the Harwood Institute, as well as aggregation of other models of civic engagement, dialogue facilitation and systems-change leadership efforts currently available to and used by the field. These resources are free and accessible...
through ALA’s Transforming Libraries website, on the Resources for Library Professionals page (http://www.ala.org/transforminglibraries/libraries-transforming-communities/resources-for-library-professionals).

Currently, it may be difficult for those with little or no knowledge of the LTC initiative to navigate the list of resources. ALA has addressed this issue by creating a tools/sequencing map in an attempt to provide easier entry for members of the field who have had minimal or no exposure to the Harwood approach. The tools map is currently under review will be published and made available to the field at large in the near future. Both ALA and the Harwood Institute have shown themselves to be responsive and adaptable, prioritizing the best interest of the trainees and wider professional field.

**The Cycle of Public Innovation**

The Cycle of Public Innovation was created by ALA with the support of Harwood based on feedback from participants in Harwood training sessions who had commented on not being able to follow the sequencing of tools and being confused by what the “library” role is in relationship to what their role as a professional might be. The Cycle of Public Innovation chart attempts to present the “personal practice” component of this work alongside the potential community engagement journey for a library team and an institutional process.
Figure 15. A diagram of the *Turning Outward* process, as part of a cycle of innovation, developed by ALA and Harwood Institute.
Part V – Conclusion

The goal of LTC is to assist libraries to become more reflective of and connected to their communities, while also building the capacity of ALA to support them. This is happening through the development and distribution of convening and conversation facilitation resources that build the practice of community engagement in library services, position libraries as innovative change makers, help the library profession to transform the ways it provides service to users, and ultimately benefit communities nationwide.

Results from the front-end evaluation have begun to illustrate the current national discourse surrounding libraries, in addition to the benefits of leaders in the library community participating in the Advanced Leaders Training. The overall preliminary results from each evaluation component indicate that the project is moving forward in a positive direction and LTC is seen as integral to ALA’s current work by the library field, although trainees need to be tracked over a longer period of time, throughout the implementation process, to genuinely assess their ability to effect community transformation.

A promising community of practice is beginning to form, one that gathers together professional roles beyond that of librarian, and ALA staff, who play a critical support role. Community of practice refers to a way of learning in which a group of individuals, in a common enterprise or profession, share information and experiences and collaborate to strengthen their skills and knowledge. NewKnowledge uses the conceptual framework developed by Wenger, Trayner, & de Laat (2011) to assess the value of communities in the learning process. In this model, community of practice is defined as a learning partnership among people who find it useful to learn from and with each other about a particular domain. This definition is based on the premise that networking and community involvement enable individual and collective learning, helping to improve both the participants’ performances and that of their organizations. This framework also suggests that the nature and content of the interactions that initiate the learning—such as sharing resources, learning from each other’s experience, or helping another resolve a challenge, gain knowledge, or stimulate new ways of thinking—determine performance outcomes.

The six-month tracking and evaluation of the LTC initiative point toward a nascent community of practice among those who have participated in training activities related to the Turning Outward approach. Early stages of this development may be signified by trainees participating in activities and interacting with others based on shared interests, as well as sharing tools relating to and knowledge about their approach to community engagement. This community is taking shape through conversations that occur at national conferences, and the potential exists for wider participation online. Evidence so far consists of increased recognition and adoption of the Harwood language of Turning Outward, enthusiasm about having a framework and tools to do more strategic community engagement.
At this point it is too early to gauge more advanced stages of the development of a community of practice among prior or current LTC participants, as the neither the trainees nor the evaluation team had the opportunity to fully explore further cycles of innovation, such as changing practices, improving performance, and redefining success. To pursue an understanding of this phenomenon, NewKnowledge recommends that evaluation efforts for the remainder of the LTC initiative slightly redirect some focus to integrate tracking and analysis of the emerging community of practice, which can be incorporated into planned evaluation activities.

As suggested in the Executive Summary of this report, the development of a community of practice may be encouraged by building opportunities for interactions among library colleagues, sharing experiences of success and failure, and increasingly looking to one another for support and professional development. Ultimately, it may be hoped that LTC will produce a self-sustaining organism that lives beyond the period of grant funding and have a long-term impact in the library field.
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## Appendix 1. PLA Conference Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. Which Turning Outward to Lead Change in Your Community session(s)...</th>
<th>Is the one you just completed?</th>
<th>Did you attend previously?</th>
<th>Do you hope to attend?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations: March 13, 10:45 AM-12 PM</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Quiz: March 13, 2 PM-3:15 PM</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality: March 14, 10:45 AM-12 PM</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining Yourself: March 14, 2 PM-3:15 PM</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2. Please rate how you feel:</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall I am satisfied with this conference session.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training was effective in facilitating learning.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information presented in the session was relevant and meaningful to my current library work.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to apply what I learned in this session.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. Why did you choose to attend this session?

Q4. Did you access/download the session materials in advance on the PLA Conference website?
   - ☐ Yes   ☐ No
If Yes, did the materials influence your decision to attend?

☑ Yes ☑ No

Q5. In your opinion, what changes would help improve the session for you?

Q6. Do you currently work:

☑ As a public librarian ☑ At a public library in a different role (including volunteer positions) ☑ Other

If Other, please specify. __________________________________________

Q7. How do you imagine you’ll apply what you learned in this session?
## Appendix 2. Intentionality Forum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. Please use the slider to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, I am satisfied with this training session.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I have a personal responsibility to ensure that ALA members’ voices are heard by my ALA colleagues.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel the training will have an impact on how staff at ALA is working together.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel this training gave me a deeper understanding of what I can do to improve member services.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel this training session enriched my professional development.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I felt this training session was not relevant to my work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel this training helped me understand what ALA staff can do together to improve member experience.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tools discussed in the training are directly relevant to my work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to try out these tools before I will know if the training is relevant my work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel I need more support to help me think through how to apply these tools to my work.

I feel confident that I will be able to successfully implement these tools without additional mentoring.

I look forward to meeting with people I work with every day to discuss what I learned in this Intentionality Forum.

I do not look forward to another Intentionality Forum training

I do not look forward how to how much change this learning will bring to my work in the next few months

I am confident that I will be able to use these tools to make my work more effective.

Q2. Based on what was discussed in the “intentionality forum” today, how would you define the ALA community?

Q3. Thinking about what you learned today concerning the Turning Outward approach, how do you feel you will act on this learning in the coming months?

Q4. Thinking about what you learned today, how do you feel the learning will help in partnering with other units at ALA?

Q5. Thinking about what you learned today, how do you feel the learning will assist in your relationships with partner organizations?

Q6. How do you feel what you learned in the session will influence your work group’s efforts for improving member services?

Q7. How will you apply what you learned from the session to your work?

Q8. In your opinion, what could be improved about how the training is delivered to help you as a learner?
Appendix 3. Public Innovators Pre Survey

Q1. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. Please note that some of the statements are phrased in the negative. The word "colleague" refers broadly to those you work with on behalf of the library and should be understood to include both staff and volunteer positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am currently aware of the aspirations and needs of my community.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My library does not do an adequate job of addressing the needs of our community.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues at my library are willing to try new approaches to community engagement.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am excited to learn new tools and approaches through the Public Innovators training.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I generally agree with colleagues at my library about how to define and address the needs of our community.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At my library I feel as though a shared understanding of what community means is lacking.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Please describe what “community” means to you, in the context of your work on behalf of your library.

Q3. How do you see your current role and responsibilities as related to community engagement?

Q4. Please describe your library’s current strategy for identifying and responding to the aspirations and needs of your community.

Q5. How well would you say you currently listen to diverse voices in your community, both as an individual and in relation to your work on behalf of the library?

Q6. What excites you most about being involved in the Public Innovators Cohort? What do you expect to gain from the experience?
## Appendix 4. Public Innovators Post Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. Please use the slider to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements. Please note that some of the following statements are phrased in the <em>negative</em>.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, I am satisfied with this training session.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I have a personal responsibility to ensure that voices in my community are heard by my library colleagues.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel the training will have an impact on how colleagues work together on behalf of my library.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through this training, my colleagues and I developed an understanding of and commitment to being outward-facing.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel this training session enriched my professional development.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I felt this training session was not relevant to my work.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The concepts explored in this training were sufficiently defined.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying the 3As of Public Life will be a useful tool for my work.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I need more support to help me think through how to apply these tools to my work.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can identify the shared aspirations of my community.</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following this training, I feel very inspired by the work I do. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

My team developed a clear plan for implementing what we learned in the training. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

I do not look forward to how much change this learning will bring to my work in the next few months. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

I am confident that I will be able to use these tools to make my work more effective. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Q2. Based on your experience in the Public Innovators Lab, how would you define your library’s community?

Q3. Would you say this is a shared definition, or would some of your colleagues have a different understanding of the term?

Q4. How will what you learned in the Public Innovators Lab shape your decision-making on behalf of your library?

Q5. How effective was this training for creating an internal library capacity for ongoing innovation and learning that uses the community as reference point?

Q6. How will you apply what you learned from the session to your work?

Q7. Please describe the community engagement plan you developed during the training. What are the next steps for your library?

Q8. Did your understanding of community engagement change as a result of the participating in the Public Innovators Lab?

Q9. Was there anything unexpected or surprising for you about the training session?

Q10. In your opinion, what could be improved about how the training is delivered to help you as a learner?

Q11. Is there anything you would like to share publicly with ALA and the Harwood Institute about your experience during the Public Innovators Lab? (Please note: Your name will be included with this response. Representatives of ALA or Harwood may wish to follow up with you as a way of harvesting stories of practice, to be used internally or for external communications, such as testimonials on websites associated with the LTC initiative.)
Appendix 5: Advanced Leaders Interview

Hi, this is Shelley Stern from New Knowledge Organization. As you know from your emails with Lainie Castle, we’re the evaluators for the Libraries Transforming Communities project. Thank you so much for taking the time to talk with us today. Is now still a good time for you to talk? <if no, reschedule>

Our goal for this discussion is to follow-up with people who were part of the pilot development of that project to learn how things have been going since the training. Before we get started, are there any questions you’d like to ask me? [Note the questions if needed.]

Before we jump in, I’d like to ask your permission to record our conversation. This will help me focus on what you’re saying rather than taking notes. [If YES, record.] The recordings will be transcribed, but all identifying information will be removed before the transcripts are shared with ALA.

Okay, great – let’s get started.

1. Programs
   1.1. For the first question, I’d like you to reflect back over the past year, about how you’ve implemented what you learned in the Harwood Institute’s Turning Outward training in January 2013. What programs or initiatives did you develop?
      1.1.1. <probe> How are they going today?

2. New communities engaged
   2.1. Which new communities or groups have you engaged with over the past year?
      2.1.1. <probe> How were you able to reach them?
   2.2. Can you tell me specifically, what you found most useful about the Harwood approach when you worked with these groups?
   2.3. How has the group’s relationship with the library changed
      2.3.1. Are they using the library in new ways? (probe resources or facilities)

3. Tools/methods
   3.1. How did the tools and practices learned in the Turning Outward training integrate with other strategies you use for community engagement at your library?
      3.1.1. <probe> What modifications to the Harwood approach did you use to suit your community’s needs?
4. **Outcomes**

When we talk about outcomes, we tend to focus on how people are changed as a direct result of what we do. We tend to use the term impact to focus on how those people have influence in larger communities and change the way things are done.

4.1. What were the anticipated outcomes of the work you’ve developed based on the *Turning Outward* approach?

   4.1.1. Did these expected outcomes occur? (Why or why not?)

4.2. Were there any unanticipated or unexpected outcomes that you can attribute to the *Turning Outward* approach?

5. **Impact**

5.1. For the next questions, I’d like to think about community impacts. What does community impact mean to you?

5.2. Can you describe some of the big impacts you’ve seen as a result of the work you’ve done based on the *Turning Outward* approach.

   5.2.1. How are you measuring or assessing your impact?

6. **Support**

6.1. How do you feel about the support you’re receiving at your institution to pursue new programs/initiatives aligned with the *Turning Outward* approach?

   6.1.1. What other support could help you achieve your goals?

6.2. Lastly, are there other areas where additional training, mentoring or follow-up would have been helpful for implementing the *Turning Outward* Approach? How/why?

*Thank you for your willingness to participate in this evaluation effort. The data collected in this interview will help us provide useful feedback to ALA, the Gates Foundation, and the Harwood Institute.*
## Appendix 6. ALA Conference Survey

Q1. Which Turning Outward to Lead Change in Your Community session(s)…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Is the one you just completed?</th>
<th>Did you attend previously?</th>
<th>Do you hope to attend?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations: June 28, 8:30 AM - 10 AM</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Quiz: June 28, 1 PM - 2:30 PM</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality: June 29, 8:30 AM - 10 AM</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining Yourself: June 29, 1 PM - 2:30 PM</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Please rate how you feel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall I am satisfied with this conference session.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training was effective in facilitating learning.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information presented in the session was relevant and meaningful to my current library work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to apply what I learned in this session.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. Why did you choose to attend this session?

Q4. Did you access/download the session materials in advance using the link provided in the ALA Conference Scheduler?

○ Yes  ○ No
If Yes, did the materials influence your decision to attend?

☑ Yes ☐ No

Q5. In your opinion, what changes would help improve the session for you?

Q6. Do you currently work:

☑ As a librarian ☐ At a library in a different role (including volunteer positions) ☐ Other

If Other, please specify: _______________________________

Q7. How do you imagine you’ll apply what you learned in this session?