



Recommendations for Action

The Nexus Project: Spanning Boundaries to Transform Library Leadership

Prepared for the Institute of Museum and Library Services

Authors: Katherine Skinner and Nick Krabbenhoft

Consultants: Karen Dyer, Shera Clark, David Horth

27 August 2014

Publication Notes

Title: Recommendations for Action

Authors: Katherine Skinner and Nick Krabbenhoeft

Publisher: Educopia Institute, 1230 Peachtree Street, Suite 1900, Atlanta, GA 30309

Copyright: 2014

This publication is covered by the following Creative Commons License:

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0

You are free to copy, distribute, and display this work under the following conditions:



Attribution – You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work). Specifically, you must state that the work was originally published as the Recommendations for Action, and you must attribute the copyright holder as the Educopia Institute.



Noncommercial – You may not use this work for commercial purposes.



No Derivative Works – You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder. Your fair use and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

The above is a human-readable summary of the full license, which is available at the following URL:

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
1 Background	3
2 Meeting Activities	4
2.1 Nexus Project Reports Evaluation	4
2.1.1 Discussion	5
2.2 Leadership Inventories.....	6
2.2.1 Change Style Indicator.....	6
2.2.2 Influence Style Indicator.....	7
2.3 Conversation Cafés.....	7
2.3.1 Process.....	7
2.3.2 Topic 1	8
2.3.3 Topic 2	9
2.3.4 Topic 3	10
2.3.5 Topic 4	12
3 Conclusion.....	13
Appendix A: Attendees	14

Executive Summary

The IMLS-funded planning project, “The Nexus Project: Spanning Boundaries to Transform Library Leadership” (2013-14), seeks to strengthen leadership development throughout the library sectors. Led by the Educopia Institute in partnership with a broad range of library thought leaders and meta-organizations, the project has accomplished three goals to date. It has documented existing library leadership development practices, encouraged catalytic thinking across leadership training stakeholder groups, and created a strong, extensible foundation to train and evaluate boundary-spanning leaders for the twenty-first-century library field.

This report provides a set of recommendations for action that were developed by the Nexus project team at a facilitated meeting hosted by the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) in Greensboro, NC, in June 2014.

These *Recommendations for Action* focus on promoting coordination across a set of distinct but related fields to provide unified vision across sectors and fields to accomplish high-reaching goals such as the advancement of our common missions. Our vision is to coordinate an approach to leadership development across the fields of libraries, archives, and museums and within their sectors and to affirm their critical importance for our twenty-first-century world.

In order to accomplish this goal, the Nexus I project team recommends the following concrete activities:

1. Establish a broad, multi-field network (“National Leadership Lab”) comprising thought leaders and leadership developers from libraries, archives, and museums.
2. Produce collaboratively a highly adaptable roadmap(s) that helps prospective and current programs and trainees to identify what competencies/training modules are needed at different stages of leadership, what offerings are available to meet these needs, and how these offerings fit together. Use this roadmap(s) to identify common needs across fields and sectors that may be met with a common core of curricular offerings.
3. Create a common core of curricular offerings that may be used by any member of the National Leadership Lab to enhance and bridge programs, existing and new. This will enhance, not replace, the field- and sector-specific offerings. Embed common language throughout the curriculum regarding the importance of libraries, archives, and museums to their twenty-first-century communities.
4. Create a common core of evaluation components to ensure that the curricular modules match and fulfill specific competencies. Distill the evaluation methodology such that it may be repurposed across many different leadership development programs, providing a common set of evaluation metrics regarding the success of these programs within and across the fields.
5. Establish a “train the facilitator” program that provides training to leadership development trainers. This will help to ensure consistency across the fields; it will also help to increase the number of available trainers in the face of pending retirements and other changes.

6. Support the National Leadership Lab through the design and implementation of a business model that includes multiple revenue streams, including from all beneficiaries/stakeholders (meta-organizations, hosts, trainers, funders). The core must be decentralized, and the constituent organizations should be able to play different roles over time.

Other issues that arose throughout the meeting are as follows:

- Risk-taking needs to be better taught, valued, supported, and/or rewarded to our leaders within our field in order to encourage and cultivate innovation.
- As the long-predicted baby-boomer retirement begins to escalate in academic and health sciences libraries, we must recognize the reluctance of many prospective leaders to take on top leadership positions. We also must seek to address the problems with these positions that exacerbate the leadership vacuum.
- Relationship building across the fields should be a priority—and should be expected to take time and effort.
- Emphasis should be placed on the advancement of our common missions as cultural and memory institutions. Circulating advocacy and value messaging throughout the library, archives, and museum fields via the leadership training modules could help leaders to reinforce the value of these institutions across the communities they serve, ultimately strengthening public and private support for libraries, archives, and museums.

The remainder of this report will provide details regarding the Nexus project meeting and a broader context for the recommendations above.

1 Background

The Nexus Planning Project was funded by IMLS in 2013 to address a national need for strengthening leadership in libraries. Libraries face unprecedented challenges as technical and social transformations dramatically impact and disrupt the communication channels through which information is acquired, accessed, and preserved. Shrinking budgets, changing user expectations, and competition from commercial information specialists place heavy demands on library leaders to transform their institutions to meet the needs of their increasingly digital, active, and globally curious twenty-first-century communities. Libraries in every sector are called upon to *reshape and restructure*, not just their staffing models, but also their missions, goals, services, and partnerships.

Leadership research provides evidence that such large-scale, accelerated transformations at both the organizational and field levels are often best achieved if strong networks of leaders work in alignment towards shared goals. As leadership experts Chris Ernst and Donna Chrobot-Mason wrote in 2011: “Where disparate groups collide, intersect, and link there is significant potential for a nexus to be created that unleashes limitless possibilities and inspiring results.”¹ These nexus points are crucial for providing unified vision across sectors to accomplish high-reaching goals.

Nexus points can be difficult to engineer, in part because boundaries are meaningful mechanisms. They provide us with a coherent sense of identity and purpose. For much of our day-to-day work, boundaries are useful definitional constructs. However, when we bring multiple sectors together with effective facilitation to identify and work on specific, shared challenges, each group has the advantage of seeing its own familiar issues through unfamiliar lenses. Cross-germination between the related communities of a field can quickly free us from bounded thinking, helping us create new solutions to our challenges. It can also equip us with a broadly shared vision and implementation strategy that can help to advance the field as a whole.

The Nexus planning project has sought to understand and document library leadership development over the last 15 years and across four distinct library sectors: public, academic, archival, and special. It has investigated what opportunities we may be missing as a result of developing our field’s leadership training programs in sector-based silos. It has documented ways in which we might improve the library’s future outlook by uniting leaders from across library sectors to study and document their common challenges and determine how best to overcome those challenges field-wide. It has also studied what will incentivize these leaders—who are busy with their own projects and communities—to work together to forge a lightweight but significant national approach to library leadership training and evaluation.

¹ Chris Ernst and Donna Chrobot-Mason (2011). *Boundary Spanning Leadership*.

Throughout the planning project, the Nexus team’s work has been framed and complemented by involving top researchers in leadership training topics—consultants from the Center for Creative Leadership—to facilitate and frame our own leadership training processes.

On June 10-11, 2014, the Nexus Project convened a project meeting at the Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, NC, to explore opportunities for cross-sector collaboration in library leadership training efforts. The meeting was facilitated by Shera Clark, David Horth, and Karen Dyer and attended by recognized thought leaders from the library field, including representatives of organizations that regularly conduct library leadership training. The complete list (16 attendees) is included in [Appendix A](#).

During the two-day meeting, the CCL facilitators organized a variety of sessions to help the group to explore library leadership training needs, opportunities, and potential nexus points. Each is summarized in a sub-section below.

- [Nexus Project Reports](#) - an open discussion of the results of the project’s *Training the 21st Century Library Leader* ([link](#)) white paper and CCL’s *Leadership Development Impact Assessment Report* ([link](#))
- [Leadership Inventories](#) - an analysis of the group’s leadership abilities as a nascent leadership training network
- [Conversation Cafés](#) - small group conversations on critical topics in library leadership training. The meeting culminated in the production of a set of recommendations regarding the future design and implementation of a national, cross-sector leadership training approach that spans the boundaries between libraries, archives, and museums.

2 Meeting Activities

Over the two days, the project team engaged in a number of activities intended to enact “boundary spanning” across the library sectors represented by attendees and to seek alignment opportunities within library leadership development. These activities included the evaluation of two deliverables from the planning project: the *Training the 21st Century Library Leader* ([link](#)) white paper published by the Educopia Institute in March 2014, and the CCL’s *Leadership Development Impact Assessment Report* ([link](#)) prepared in May 2014. The activities also included the use of two Leadership Inventories to establish more concrete knowledge and understanding of the leadership styles represented within the team. Finally, the core activities encouraged and facilitated conversations and brainstorming sessions regarding the needed “next steps” in leadership development for the library field. Each of these activities is described below.

2.1 Nexus Project Reports

The Nexus Project published *Training the 21st Century Library Leader* ([link](#)) in March 2014, a white paper describing the history and current state of library leadership training programs. The report was based on

data gathered and analyzed in a cross-sector review conducted from November 2013-February 2014. This review included literature (publications and white papers), web-based resources, a targeted survey with library leadership training programs, and interviews with key thought leaders in library leadership training. The [dataset](#) documents the spectrum of offerings that have served four major library communities—academic, public, special, and archival—between 1998 and 2013.²

During April and May of 2014, CCL conducted a series of four Leadership Development Impact Assessment (LDIA) focus groups with four to six representatives each from the archival, academic, public, and special library sectors. CCL facilitators asked participants to identify where they perceived success and failure in their organizations. From the resulting data, the facilitators identified a list of core competencies that leadership programs should address to fill leadership gaps in the field. The resulting *Leadership Development Impact Assessment Report* ([link](#)) contains both the anonymized comments of the focus groups participants and the facilitators’ analysis. Meeting participants were provided with copies of both the white paper and the discovery report for group discussion.

2.1.1 Discussion

In general, the meeting participants were not surprised by the contents of the two reports, which they described as mirroring their own perceptions of library leadership development. Attendees cited that successfully implementing the changes they suggest will be challenging. Those changes include:

- establishing a common core curriculum that addresses common competencies needed by leaders (as identified by needs assessments throughout this project) and that carries a consistent advocacy message across leadership in all sectors
- establishing common evaluation methodologies and frameworks that accompany this common core curriculum and that help to mature library leadership training’s approach to evaluation
- broadening the set of consultants/trainers engaged in leadership training to ensure continuity of expertise

As identified in the white paper, attendees agreed that leadership programs have been very inconsistent in performing evaluations. For the most part they have relied upon immediate self-evaluations. Given the diversity of stakeholders in leadership training, one potential model suggested by Katherine Skinner during the meeting is the *collective impact* approach.³ This approach would bring stakeholders together to define a common goal and methods to measure each stakeholder’s contribution to that goal.

Another challenge noted both in the report and by the meeting’s attendees is that there is a limited set of consultants conducting training. Many of the current consultants were trained in the ARL Office of

² Since the publication of the dataset, a number of additional programs have been suggested or discovered. An update to the dataset will be published at the conclusion of this project in September 2014.

³ See John Kania and Mark Kramer, “Collective Impact,” *Stanford Social Innovation Review* Vol. 69 (Winter 2011): http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/collective_impact

Management Studies under Duane Webster. One of these consultant trainers, Kathryn Deiss, worried that a limited perspective on leadership could come to dominate training programs. Of immediate concern, she also shared that many of the current library leadership trainers are beginning to think of retirement—and that to date, there are no new trainers ready to carry forward leadership development activities.

Leadership issues are reaching a critical moment across academic and health sciences libraries, where the long predicted retirement of baby boomers is occurring, as shared by Mark Puente (ARL) and Carol Jenkins (NLM/AAHSL Leadership Fellows Program). Of ARL's 125 members, 14 seek directors; and in AAHSL, 13 libraries currently seek directors.

Meeting attendees discussed the need for libraries to continue responding to large changes and disruptions in business practices. The information revolution did not merely transfer a library's main concern from print to electronic. Librarians need to address changes in their users' research and usage practices—in part by embedding themselves in user practices within their communities and consulting ever farther afield from their buildings. A concerted response to these changes will require new leadership skills, especially a willingness to experiment and fail. However, the group worried that with ever increasing budget constraints, tolerance for failure has dropped. This stymies risk taking by leaders, and risk taking is a crucial leadership skill, especially where innovation is needed, as it is today across the library field.

Finally, the group discussed how libraries and leadership training programs must address the desire of librarians to lead. The lack of tolerance for failure depresses the initiative of emerging leaders. Librarians arguably encounter greater pressures and responsibilities today than before (whether financial, familial, age-based, or otherwise) that discourage them from taking leadership positions even if they have the skills and desire to do so.

2.2 Leadership Inventories

As a nascent network intending to catalyze change in leadership development, the Nexus team sought to establish a sense of awareness of their own leadership styles and those of the group. Under the guidance of CCL facilitators, attendees completed two instruments produced by Discovery Learning, the *Change Style Indicator* and the *Influence Style Indicator*. These exercises identified the range of leadership styles and skills represented by the attendees, and their results were frequently referenced throughout the rest of the meeting.

2.2.1 Change Style Indicator

The indicator is a self-assessment describing ideas about change, arranged on a spectrum from -60 to 60. Conservers (-60 to -20) are change averse, preferring to maintain the status quo and consider issues carefully. Pragmatists (-20 to 20) are flexible, focused on results over paradigms. Originators (20 to 60) prefer to challenge the status quo and embrace risk.

The participants were heavily skewed towards the Pragmatist and Originator mindsets with scores ranging from -11 to 60. The group included no Conservers—an unusual finding in CCL experience. As the Nexus team begins to work towards its next steps and future projects to strengthen leadership

development programs, the group should be mindful of the reactions/perspectives it should expect from Conservers in the broader field, especially if they are not represented in the eventual Nexus network.

2.2.2 Influence Style Indicator

The indicator is a self-assessment describing five management styles:

- Rationalizing - pushes together using logic and reasoning
- Asserting - pushes together using personality
- Negotiating - always willing to compromise
- Bridging - pulls together by establishing trust
- Inspiring - pulls together by fostering shared purpose and excitement

Users repeatedly compare these styles two-at-a-time through a series of questions, and then determine a personal ranking of all five styles.

Nearly half of Nexus meeting attendees, particularly representatives of the meta-organizations, identified “bridging” as their top style. Almost as many attendees identified “inspiring” as their top style, although they were comprised of organizational leaders, such as deans and executive directors. Two attendees identified “rationalizing” as their dominant style, and two attendees that identified “negotiating” as their dominant style. No attendees identified “asserting” as their dominant style.

All of these styles are, of course, used by all people in different situations. Most of the group noted that the scores for their first and second preferences were often very close. For instance, many of the “Bridging” leaders scored “Inspiring” nearly as high and vice versa.

Both the Change Style Indicator and the Leading Style Indicator provided the Nexus attendees with a sense of their individual styles and their collective styles—important foundational knowledge that this group can build upon as it matures into a network.

2.3 Conversation Cafés

2.3.1 Process

At the end of the meeting, CCL coordinated a series of “conversation cafés”. First, a CCL Facilitator (David Horth) asked all participants to write important topics for the group to address on sticky notes. The participants then placed these sticky notes on a brainstorming wall and worked together to categorize the resulting notes into four general themes. Each of these themes was assigned to one of the four tables of attendees (as designated by seating arrangements) to be further refined into a question.

The questions were divided between four rooms, or “cafés”. Nexus attendees circulated through these four rooms at twenty-minute intervals, with four attendees in each café at a time. During each twenty-minute café conversation, participants were encouraged to collaboratively write their notes on large sheets of paper provided in the rooms. At the end of each interval, one participant stayed behind to continue the thread of conversation with the new participants.

The four questions are presented below. The core result of each conversation café is captured in the *Core Result* section, which is followed by a full reproduction of the sticky notes in *Generating Ideas* and a summary of the discussions that occurred around each topic in *Conversation Notes*.

2.3.2 Topic 1

Why is a coordinated approach to leadership development and training urgently needed? Articulate the vision.

2.3.2.1 Core Result

Our vision is to coordinate an approach to leadership across the memory field at all levels to defend the public good and to catalyze change. The groundbreaking notion here is coordination.

2.3.2.2 Generating Ideas

- Capacity building
- New leader identification and recruitment
- Discussing next steps for expanding trainer pool
- Coordination with library schools
- What entities would offer such leadership training (organizational issues)
- Overarching best practices for leadership training
- Shared vision
- Create a vision for why a leadership roadmap is critical to address now
- The role of authentic leadership in change management (leader self-awareness and behavior)
- Consider audience of greatest need for training
- How can we continue/start a collaboration? To what end? With all the fab people in this room
- Next steps post-meeting

2.3.2.3 Conversation Notes

Participants established the value of coordination. Many shared the opinion that not just the library field, but also the *library, archives, and museum fields* would benefit from greater coordination between programs. Specifically, representatives from the archives field (and representatives who were previously in the museum field) encouraged the group to think broadly and explore possibilities of spanning boundaries across all three fields. Doing so could enhance the opportunity to work at scale by leveraging existing resources and expertise. The fields could also define common sets knowledge, skills, and abilities while elucidating the unique aspects of leadership in different fields. As a result of this work, ideally, programs would be better able to define themselves in relation to one another, and the fields would be better able to support training geared toward each part of a career trajectory. Increasing the pipeline of good candidates for jobs will fundamentally strengthen the entire set of fields.

In this café, participants also articulated the need for a shared vision across libraries, archives, and museums. Attendees noted the lack of ability for any individual stakeholder to address the erosion of public goods such as access to information. Participants agreed that “memory organizations” or “cultural organizations” are integral to the health and well-being of the communities they are embedded in, whether academic, public, corporate, or otherwise. Leadership plays a critical role in

reminding both ourselves and our communities why we need to thrive. Having a common advocacy thread woven into leadership training may help to articulate this value in common ways across many sectors, ultimately strengthening the image and understanding of memory/cultural organizations in the broader public sphere. The discussion in this café also addressed the heightened need for strong vision in a challenging economy.

Other topics that arose briefly in this café include:

1. Currently, few, if any, graduate programs in museum, library, and information studies address the need for leadership. Starting training on personal development and personal style topics at this early moment in the career is an opportunity not yet explored.
2. User demographics are changing, as are expectations for services. Rapid organizational response to these needs requires agile leadership. However, creative, flexible, imaginative, and strategic thinking has not been traditionally valued in library leadership.

2.3.3 Topic 2

How do we construct a network of dynamic business model(s) that work(s) across or connect(s) all library/archives/museum communities?

2.3.3.1 Core result

We need to create a business model with multiple revenue streams, including from all beneficiaries/stakeholders (meta-organizations, hosts, trainers, funders). We need to produce a service model that clearly demonstrates value—primarily that by aligning community standards for leadership training and core competencies, we strengthen and give more credibility to each program. The core of the Lab needs to be decentralized, and the constituent organizations need to be able to play different roles over time.

2.3.3.2 Generating Ideas

- Possible components to address (from original stickies)
- Funding/Sponsorship
- Funding
- Funding (business) models
- Funding sponsors for deeper curriculum design
- Sustainability of leadership developments
- Sustainability
- Identify other resources needed (beyond stakeholders) to propel and sustain successful curriculum design and implementation
- Leveraging existing leadership training
- How the organizations represented here continue to engage—what are the key priorities
- Advocating up (above and beyond senior leadership)
- How to get staff from all levels/places/cultures to embrace urgency/need of leadership, that relevancy is critical for our sectors
- Library school involvement

- If we build it, will they come? How to incentivize

2.3.3.3 *Conversation Notes*

In this café, the participants agreed that the core value proposition of the proposed network would be in the resource sharing and greater coordination between programs, which should serve to improve learning outcomes and sustainability. However, the key tension in the creation of a network—its members’ degrees of independence—would require resolution. Should learning opportunities be shared *across* sectors or customized *by* each sector? Who stewards, updates, and/or facilitates the shared resources?

Some participants advocated that the network should be a simple federated structure sharing general goals such as targeted competencies. Stakeholders would design their own programs based on those goals/competencies and would continue to operate programs based on their organizational missions. A competing vision tasked the network with creating a base of leadership training programs and train-the-trainers program—similar to the Office of Management Studies in the research library community.

Depending of the functions of the network, its sustainability would require some level of monetary support. Participants suggested this could occur at a state/regional level by partners/consortia such as the state libraries and institutions like the CIC and Lyrisis, and/or at the field level by meta-organizations such as ALA, ARL, and AAM. Partners might also include organizations outside of memory organizations. The network will have to identify key stakeholders and provide a worthwhile value proposition and role for them in order to obtain this funding.

2.3.4 **Topic 3**

How do we develop a curriculum that applies across sectors but can be adapted to specific environments/audiences?

2.3.4.1 *Core result*

A National Leadership Training Lab for Libraries, Archives, Museums, and other Memory Stewards will coordinate leadership training for these fields.

2.3.4.2 *Generating Ideas*

- What should be included in a leadership curriculum
- Core curriculum
- Selecting competencies
- Balance between universal/cross-sector applicability and relevance to specific context
- Prioritize competencies and audiences
- Vocabulary-shared terminology
- Level of shared topics
- Organization cultural change processes
- Leadership v. management topics
- Evaluation
- Evaluation

- Evaluation models (methodologies)
- Longitudinal leadership studies
- Leadership success metrics
- Identifying key stakeholders to be involved in curriculum design process
- Relationship(s) between those designing/implementing leadership training
- Curriculum adoption
- Deciding how much we actually need one set of competencies
- Developing leadership competencies across sectors for middle managers, senior leaders (boss, others)
- Delivery methods for instruction (in-person, webinar, etc)
- Continued engagement
- Necessity to get library community to make community staff engagement a priority—how to make this need clear

2.3.4.3 Conversation Notes

In this café, participants agreed a shared curriculum must be modular to adapt to a variety of learning environments and needs, ranging from formal to informal, self-guided to traditionally led, deluxe to budget, basic to advanced. In order to encourage adoption and customization of content, the common modules would need to use a relatively open license such as Creative Commons. Modules would also need peer review during development and regular review, potentially by a Lab editorial committee, to ensure its continued relevance. The Library of Congress’s Digital Preservation Outreach and Education curriculum (DPOE) was mentioned as a possible model for how these modules might be created and curated over time.

Participants also agreed resources and expertise are too scarce for any current organization to develop all of the proposed curriculum modules from scratch. An efficient approach might include leveraging existing assets such as the curricula developed by ARL’s OMS and the expertise of existing trainers. Curriculum development should also be informed by convening small, agile groups of thought leaders, potential students, and evaluators for more perspective.

Long-term, the curriculum must be stewarded, maintaining authoritative copies of the modules and updating them as necessary. Stewarding will also involve the selection and approval of new modules, as well as the cultivation of a network of trainers with diverse expertise.

Participants agreed that the creation and development of leadership curriculum would be best accomplished by a central hub, which they called the “National Leadership Training Lab for Libraries, Archives, Museums, and other Memory Stewards.” Questions remain as to the sustainability of a National Lab and its relationship to existing programs. One possibility is to partner with another budding project such as the Coalition to Advance Learning in Archives, Libraries, and Museums to provide the administrative core of such a project.

2.3.5 Topic 4

What are the purposes of a roadmap? Who is the audience for it? How would it be developed? How would it be used? What will it accomplish?

2.3.5.1 Core result

We need to build a highly adaptable roadmap that helps prospective programs and trainees to identify what competencies/training modules are needed and how they all fit together. We need to track in the roadmap the multi-dimensionality of leadership, matching phases of training with common needs experienced at similar times by various levels of leadership. And we need to build evaluation components as we design the curriculum to ensure that the curriculum can be evaluated regarding the degree to which it fulfills specific competencies.

2.3.5.2 Generating Ideas

- Target audiences and scale
- Teaching vs. selection
- Combining, sorting, prioritizing the competencies and criteria each team generated with an eye toward fleshing out a roadmap
- Collaborating among stakeholder organizations (this group and others)
- How to apply boundary-spanning thinking in leader roadmap
- Identifying appropriate audience(s) for training
- Library leader roadmap
- Roadmap
- Re-convening group
- Hold a sponsors dialog on their goals for programs

2.3.5.3 Conversation Notes

Participants discussed the roadmap as having a number of purposes. They cited the need to represent the training opportunities available in a roadmap form in order to help consolidate, streamline, and eliminate duplication of effort. They also discussed its functionality as a framework that would be flexible, adaptable, and context sensitive. Other purposes for the roadmap included that it would help articulate and expose what needs funding; assist with evaluation of program successes; and serve as a tool for increased advocacy regarding leadership development aims.

The group also discussed a number of audiences that might use the roadmap, including organizations and individuals: program hosts/organizers, trainers, prospective trainees, and “matchmakers” (e.g., HR at a library that is either seeking a program to host internally or seeking programs to which staff members might be sent for training).

The group talked about the importance of representing the multi-dimensionality of the pathway, including level of leadership, but also current aptitudes, prior experiences, and career aims.

3 Conclusion

At the end of the meeting, the participants gathered to create a list of shared objectives. The primary objectives were to continue the work of the Nexus Project by building upon the foundation laid at this meeting and by applying for a grant(s) to create some of the assets discussed in the Conversation Cafés, including establishing a formal “Leadership Lab” framework (ideally inclusive of museums and archives), documenting a “roadmap” for library leadership training (and perhaps also leadership training in archives and museums), creating a shared curriculum built around common competencies, producing common evaluation metrics and instruments, and hosting train-the-trainer activities (maybe geared at developing a concentrated cadre of leadership trainers).

Although the planning project has focused exclusively on the library field, the meeting attendees agreed that all future activities in this work—and the very composition of the Nexus team—should ideally encompass and include leadership development in archives and museums as well. The Nexus team discussed the challenges this broadening effort will bring, and determined three activities that will need to be pursued by the team:

1. expanding the project team to represent all three fields
2. ensuring that the Nexus I project findings are complemented by additional research into the leadership development training opportunities/needs in the archives and museum fields
3. testing the feasibility of designing and implementing a National Leadership Lab that will meet the needs of all three fields

Appendix A: Attendees

Anne Akerson (CoSA)

Anne Craig (ILSOS)

Mary Ellen Davis (ACRL)

Kathryn Deiss (ACRL)

Martin Halbert (UNT)

Mary Hirsch (PLA)

Carol Jenkins (AAHSL)

Nick Krabbenhoeft (Educopia Institute)

Joan Lippincott (CNI)

Sarah Lippincott (Educopia Institute)

Mark Puente (ARL)

Deborah Robertson (ALA)

David Seaman (Dartmouth)

Cal Shepard (State Library of North Carolina)

Katherine Skinner (Educopia Institute)

Tyler Walters (Virginia Tech)