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The Mapping the Landscape needs assessment in continuing education and professional development offers a broad and statistically reliable overview of current perceptions, needs, assets and barriers, levels of competency and confidence across and within archives, library, and museum professions in the United States.

Based on a comprehensive conceptual model, the Mapping survey data offers three valuable forms of information:

- Descriptive and comparative information regarding professional development and competencies across the three sectors, framed within a carefully constructed taxonomy to promote clear communication across professional cultures.

- Actionable data to promote evidence-based policy and program decision making in continuing education and professional development, including cross-sector collaboration in CE/PD program and curriculum development.

- A robust database to serve as a baseline for future inquiry in this area, along with foundational research methodologies.

In addition to this Viewbook, an interactive data visualization storyboard may be accessed at http://truebearingconsulting.com/mapping/. The storyboard targets highlights of survey results and enables further exploration of the data. Links to additional supplementary materials, including instructions on how to get the most out of this data visualization and interpretive notes and an item-level glossary are also available on this page.
Background

The Coalition to Advance Learning in Archives, Libraries, and Museums (Coalition) was founded in 2013 in part to address the paradox of the increasing need and shrinking resources for continuing education and professional development (CE/PD) across these three fields by building a community to develop joint strategies and coordinate efforts. The Coalition strives to enable its constituents—stakeholders in CE/PD (primarily hosts, instructors)—to focus their limited funding towards CE/PD activities that have broad and deep impact.

In order to accomplish this mission, the Coalition first identified the need to document the current state of the fields—identifying and understanding both the range of CE/PD efforts underway and the range of professional needs across each of these fields. The Coalition also fosters and strengthens relationships between the organizations and associations that support these fields to enable them to undertake joint work in a trust based environment.

The Assessing the State of the Field workgroup of the Coalition was chartered in 2013, to begin strategizing how best to gather data to assist the Coalition and its constituents as they develop and fulfill a strategy leading toward effective, sustainable CE/PD environments that provide critical training for library, archives, and museum information stewards. This workgroup informally canvassed current CE/PD information sources, exploring those that can begin to gauge gaps and opportunities in offerings, both within and across field boundaries. In 2014, the group produced a draft data framework for the collection of CE/PD data on existing training offerings. This draft built upon and refined the data framework produced in the Nexus project, an IMLS funded planning project (2013-2014) that collected data about the library field’s CE/PD offerings for leadership training.

Representatives from the Assessing the State of the Field workgroup act as executive leadership on the current project, known as Mapping the Landscapes. They are supported by over 38 project partners, and nominated community representatives sitting on this project’s Survey Task Force, who advise and collaborate regularly with the professional consultants engaged for the Mapping project.

About the Mapping the Landscapes Project

This project was made possible in part through a federal grant from the Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS) and undertaken by Educopia Institute, a not-for-profit organization acting as fiscal host, in cooperation with the Coalition. The Mapping the Landscapes survey project aimed to establish a common core of data that explicitly benchmarks today’s CE/PD needs and opportunities in library, archives, and museum fields to identify the areas of surplus and paucity therein. The resulting data framework and visualization tools are expected to enable the Coalition to conduct ongoing market research, ultimately providing a vibrant knowledge source for the participating library, archives, and museum fields.

The Mapping the Landscapes project developed the data collection instruments and workflows to enable the Coalition to regularly gather, analyze, and publish data regarding
what CE/PD offerings are sought by librarians, archivists, curators, educators, technologists, and professional staff across the library, archives, and museum fields. Data from the current project as well as subsequent iterations will be used to inform both national and local decision-making, on policy and institutional management levels.

Armed with this multi sector dataset, decision makers and CE/PD providers will be able to identify: gaps, common needs, common offerings, opportunities for collaboration within or across fields, and other crucial components. The data will enable both funders and CE/PD hosts to magnify the impact of their investments, while also making it possible for hosts across libraries, archives, and museums to coordinate resources to reach greater efficiencies and better results both within and across their fields.

**Mapping the Landscapes Survey Project Team**

Within the context of the Coalition, the Mapping survey project team comprised these groups:

- **Mapping the Landscapes Survey Task Force:** Formed of nominated representatives from Libraries, Archives, and Museums with experience actively surveying staff on their professional development or continuing education needs, the Task Force provided project advisement, collaborating with the professional consultants engaged for this project on the development of the survey and its underlying conceptual model.

- **Educopia Institute:** Educopia provided project management services on behalf of the Coalition to Advance Learning in Archives, Libraries, and Museums.

- **TrueBearing Consulting:** Educopia and the Mapping Task Force selected this Seattle-based multidisciplinary research and evaluation firm to conduct all technical aspects of this project, including conceptual model development, survey construction, delivery, analysis, and reporting. The TrueBearing team comprised staff experienced in research and evaluation for these sectors, and capable of building a product that will yield ongoing data to support evidence-based decision making in the CE/PD fields for archives, libraries, and museums.

**Mapping the Landscapes Survey Project Team Members**

**Survey Task Force:**

Amanda Focke, MLIS, CA, DAS | Rice University
Eric Pourchet, Ph.D., MFA, MBA | American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC)
Laurie Sather, MA, MLIS, CA | Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference (MARAC), Hagley Museum and Library

**Educopia Institute:**

Katherine Skinner, Ph.D.
Christina Drummond, M.A.

**TrueBearing Consulting:**

Nathan Brown, Ph.D.
Jessica Aurelia Carr, J.D.
In order to construct a survey capable of producing the data necessary for effective evidence-based decision-making, the Project Team developed a survey conceptual model (Figure 1) to delineate the relationships among the professional competencies that are the object of CE/PD, the drivers and barriers that may be present in either promoting or discouraging said competencies, and the outcomes and impacts expected as a result of improvement in competency. In addition, the model also incorporated the gap that may exist between reported competency and desired competency.

In order to determine what specific competencies across the sectors should be the object of this investigation, the team acquired documentary statements of desired professional competencies from one or more professional associations in each sector. A systematic analysis of these competencies yielded a competency taxonomy (Appendix A) organized into six domains. Each of these domains comprised a related set of competencies, labeled and described in a manner expected to promote a shared meaning across the sectors.

In addition to the competency domains, the conceptual model also included the domain of individual confidence. Substantial research suggests that the successful execution of a behavior (including professional behaviors that define specific competencies) depends not only on an individual’s technical ability, but also on the degree to which they have confidence in that ability. This insight has important implications for professional education curricula. Therefore, the project team incorporated confidence in the model and in the survey, as the relationship between competencies and confidence may well have a bearing on CE/PD strategies and priorities.

Once the six competency domains and their constituent skills were identified by the project team, survey item construction was based directly on language found within each sector’s professional competencies documents. In addition to competency and confidence domains, the final survey included items designed to capture individual demographics, attitudes and perceptions of CE/PD, and setting characteristics.

For a more detailed description of the project strategy and a guide to replication, see the Mapping the Landscapes Survey Procedures Guide.
Figure 1.
Survey Development Process

The steps that the Survey Team completed to develop the survey instrument were:

1. **Identify threshold parameters and definitions.**
   a. What is a competency? “A competency is an observable, measurable set of skills, knowledge, abilities, behaviors, and other characteristics an individual needs to successfully perform a job.” (cf. National Archives and Records Administration, NARA Competency Connection)
   b. What sectors?

2. **Develop Survey Conceptual Model.** The Survey Team adopted an ecological approach that considered:
   a. Person factors (perceptions of individual skills and motivation that affect development, delivery and effectiveness of CE/PD, and perceptions of current availability and quality of CE/PD resources in the individual’s setting)
   b. Setting factors (key setting and sector factors that impact development, delivery and effectiveness of CE/PD, such as resources, technology, perceived institutional support)
   c. Interactions between person and setting (the effect of combined person and setting factors and its effect on CE/PD)
   d. External factors (factors outside of the individual’s setting that impact development, delivery and effectiveness of CE/PD)
   e. Desired outcomes and impacts

3. **Identify and gather existing sector competencies.** The Survey Team gathered existing competency sets from the relevant sectors and collaborated to compile these into a Competencies Crosswalk for side-by-side comparison. The primary competency sets used were:
   a. **Archives:** Society of American Archivists (SAA), “Guidelines for Archival Continuing Education (ACE)”; National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) “Competency Models – Core, General and Technical”
   b. **Libraries:** OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc., and WebJunction, “Competency Index for the Library Field”
   a. **Museums:** International Council of Museums (ICOM) “Curricula Guidelines for Museum Professional Development”; Committee on Museum Professional Training, American Association of Museums “Training for Entry-Level Museum Professionals”
   b. **Other:** American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works (AIC) “Defining the Conservator: Essential Competencies” and “Requisite Competencies for Conservation Technicians and Collections Care Specialists”; Special Libraries Association (SLA) “Competencies for Information Professionals of the 21st Century”

4. **Create Competencies Taxonomy.** The Survey Team distilled the common competencies appearing across two or more sectors into a Competencies Taxonomy comprised of six domains. This taxonomy was refined by condensing conceptually overlapping competencies where possible and prioritize for inclusion in survey. (See Appendix A).

5. **Item development.** The Survey Team drafted items that addressed domains in the Survey Conceptual Model, including the Competencies Taxonomy.
6. **Recruit pilot participants and complete pilot process.**
   a. The Task Force identified potential pilot participants from within their professional networks, aiming for diverse representation from all sectors, geographically, and by experience in the profession.
   b. Pilot participants were invited to take the survey in its entirety, providing specific feedback at the bottom of each survey page. The pilot yielded 34 completed responses.
7. **Finalize survey instrument.** Pilot feedback was reviewed and incorporated into the final survey instrument.

**Methods**

This section describes the survey’s structure, content, and approach as well as the recruitment strategy employed and procedure followed during the launch phase.

**Survey description**

The Mapping the Landscape survey (Appendix B) comprised a total pool of 66 items. Due to branching options, any given respondent answers only a subset of this total, based on their identification of priority competencies.

The survey incorporated items that spanned the following sections:

- Background and Setting
- Continuing Education/Professional Development (CE/PD) Engagement
- Continuing Education/Professional Development (CE/PD) Opportunities
- Competency Areas (in which respondents were asked to select specific competency areas critical to their work)
- Critical Competency Areas:
  o Basic
  o Collections
  o Institutional Management
  o Technology
  o Leadership
  o Public-facing
- Confidence (in which respondents were asked to indicate their confidence levels in the specific competency areas critical to their work)
- Closing thoughts

The project team employed a multi-method approach to item construction by using open-ended qualitative items to supplement quantitatively-oriented items as appropriate.

**Recruitment and sampling**

A key goal for participant recruitment in this project was to obtain a representative sample of professionals within each of the archives, library, and museum sectors. This objective implied two closely related objectives: to ensure coverage in the recruitment effort across and within sectors (e.g. ensure geographic coverage), and to work towards a pool of respondents that
reflect the makeup of each sector.

An initial constraint in the effort to achieve conventional objective representativeness was related to Federal guidelines on confidentiality that place heightened requirements on projects with direct researcher access to subject demographic and contact information, including email addresses. This level of access would restrict some desired forms of data sharing.

A second constraint in determining statistical representativeness by conventional calculations is the lack of reliable data about the aggregate numbers of professionals in each sector.

Given these constraints, the project team adopted the following recruitment strategy:

- Members of the the Assessing the State of the Field Advisory Board, the Mapping Task Force, and certain other key stakeholders identified key individuals across sectors (known as “distributors”), with whom they had personal relationships, and who were perceived to be well-placed institutional leaders to deliver survey invitations to professional in their local setting.

- The initial list of distributors was reviewed to ensure that sectors were fully represented in terms of areas of subspecialty as well as regional geographic location. Educopia worked with the Advisory Board and key individual leaders to address any gaps in coverage.

- Once a comprehensive list of distributors was recruited, the distributors received training and messaging language to implement when the survey went live.

- As described in the next section, during the survey’s live phase distributors sent out a standardized invitation message (as well as two follow-up reminders) to their network describing the purpose and benefits of the survey, and providing a link to take the survey itself.

- Survey participation was anonymous, preserving confidentiality.

This strategy had the advantage of ensuring representative coverage of the invitations to participate and leveraging positive network relationships to maximize response rates, while preserving anonymity.

For more information on the recruitment and sampling strategy used in this project, see Figure 2 as well as the Survey Procedures Guide.
Mapping the Landscapes Survey Timeline

**TrueBearing/Educopia**

- **Step 1**: Identify appropriate Distributors—Leaders in the field with access to potential survey participants— for personal contact by each MLB.
- **Step 2**: Distributors forward “heads up” email to leaders in their field demanding survey invitation to staff (cc'ing Educopia for tracking).
- **Step 3**: Push Email 1 - TB sends heads up email to MtLB list; True Bearing supplies text of a “heads-up” email to MtLB to send to Distributors. (Educopia follow up to verify receipt— not lost in spam).
- **Step 4**: Push Email 2 - TB sends survey invitation to MtLB list (and AAM Distributors).
- **Step 5**: Push Email 3 - TB sends publicity email to MtLB list.
- **Step 6**: Push Email 4 - TB sends reminder email to MtLB list.
- **Step 7**: Push Email 4 - TB sends reminder email to MtLB list.
- **Step 8**: Push Email 4 - TB sends reminder email to MtLB list.
- **Step 9**: Survey Closed by TrueBearing.

**MtL Advisory Board members (MLB)**

- 1a. Push Email 1 - TB sends heads up email to MtLB list.
- 1b. Email 1 - Forward heads up email to Distributors.
- 1c. Distributors' organization prepares appropriate distribution lists, mailchimp, etc.) as needed.

**Distributors**

- Leader/Administrator contacts in LAM settings—identified by MLB
- Interested Museum Distributors notify Educopia
- Distributors receive survey questions and following emails from TB/Educopia per schedule.

**Participants**

Professionals taking survey

**Sequence**

1. Distributors' organization may prepare/publish newsletter as appropriate
2. Distributors' organization may prepare/publish social media as appropriate
3. MtL Task Force, and MLB activate social media and other publicity channels identified in step 0b above
4. MtLBs forward survey invitation email to Distributors to forward to Participants
5. Survey Closed by TrueBearing

**Figure 2.**
Survey launch and messaging procedures

As Figure 2 illustrates, the survey’s live phase spanned 24 days, initiated by an introductory message relayed from the Advisory Board to the distributors, who in turn passed it on to their networks. Messaging for use in social media channels and newsletters was provided to the distributors for voluntary distribution. In addition, the Coalition, Educoop, and the Advisory Board members also posted social media messaging through their own channels.

Reminder messaging was similarly distributed at the mid-way mark, with a final reminder distributed four days prior to the close of the survey.

The content of the messaging (Appendix C) followed best practice principles developed by Don A. Dillman (Dillman, D.A., et al. (2008). Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method. Wiley,). These principles included: making the invitation through an individual with whom the recipient (presumably) already has a positive professional relationship; making the value proposition of survey participation explicit; and the use of positive norming strategies.

For more information on the recruitment and sampling strategy used in this project, see Figure 2 as well as the Survey Procedures Guide.

Results

This section reviews survey performance and describes basic demographic characteristics of the respondents well as patterns of sector representation observed. The bulk of this section displays selected cross-sector comparisons followed by item-by-item survey results for each sector.

Note that many of these results are also displayed in the data visualization dashboard that accompanies this viewbook. In that interactive format, additional inquiries may be performed.

Survey performance

A total of 2,788 professionals across sectors participated in the survey. Of these, 2,778 identified themselves as working in the United States and its protectorates, and ten outside the United States. Geographic distribution of respondents, age, education level, professional experience and setting may be reviewed in the next section.

The systematic nation-wide coverage of institutions accomplished through the invitation strategy appears to have yielded a generally representative sample of participants across sectors. As noted above, the absence of reliable national-level data on the numbers and characteristics of professionals in these sectors, as well as the inaccessibility of information on the overall number of invitees to whom distributors sent the invitation, preclude traditional statistical benchmarking for sample validity at the individual level. However, strong responses from invited institutions lends *prima facie* support to consideration of this sample as representative at the institutional and geographic level. An examination of geographic response patterns (Figure 8) and other demographic characteristics also suggest that the sample obtained through this administration of the survey is sufficiently representative for this exploratory study of professionals currently employed in a range of settings across the archives, library, and museum sectors.
Interpretive Notes

Throughout the results section, the sectors identified in the respondent pool are identified in two ways:

1) **Original identified sectors.** Respondents are categorized according to their self-identified sector (archives, historical societies, libraries, or museums) or as "hybrid/other." When this methodology is used, the sector is labeled as "[Sector] Professionals."

2) **Sectors including hybrid professionals.** In addition to self-identified sector professionals, respondents that identified as "hybrid" and specified one or more sectors (archives, historical societies, libraries, or museums) are included within the sector(s) they specified. When this methodology is used, the sector is labeled as "[Sector]/Hybrid Professionals."

To view the original item language for the competencies items, use the Survey Glossary in Appendix D. The full survey instrument may be accessed in Appendix B.

Participant and setting characteristics

This section offers a graphic summary of key characteristics of survey respondents, including sector representation, geographic location, age, level of educational attainment, and years of experience. Following this individually-oriented demographic information, characteristics of the setting in which participants work are reported, including type of setting, organizational structure, sources of institutional funding, and employer contribution to CE/PD.

**Sector representation**

![Figure 3. Number of Respondents by Sector](image-url)

- **Archives Professionals:** 516
- **Historical Societies Professionals:** 54
- **Libraries Professionals:** 1,095
- **Museums Professionals:** 676
- **Other Professionals:** 197

**n = 2,790**
Figure 3 displays the distribution of respondents by the sector in which their work primarily takes place. The darker bars for each sector indicate the number of respondents who selected that sector as their primary choice; the lighter "hybrid" segments show the number of respondents who selected "Other/Hybrid" and specified that sector in their open-ended response. "Hybrid" respondents (of which there were 255) may appear in more than one column (e.g., a respondent working as an archives professional and a library professional will be counted in the hybrid segment of both the archives and libraries columns).

![Bar chart showing the number of respondents identifying 1+ other professional roles.]

**Figure 4.**

Figure 4 displays the range of descriptions provided by those respondents who selected "Other/Hybrid" and specified a professional role outside of the archives, historical societies, libraries, or museums sectors.

Respondents who selected "Other/Hybrid" were asked to specify their primary professional role type in open-ended responses. Responses that mentioned role types outside the four primary sectors (archives, historical societies, libraries, and museums) fell into the "Other" category. These "Other" open-ended responses were coded into the top five most frequently occurring categories, shown above. In the figure above, responses could fall within two or more categories (e.g., a response of "Conservator in private practice" would be coded as "Independent, private practice, consultant" and "Conservation."
Respondent age, education, and years of experience in the profession

**Figure 5.**
- Under 20 years old, 1%
- 20-29 years old, 11%
- 30-39 years old, 27%
- 40-49 years old, 20%
- 50-59 years old, 23%
- 60-69 years old, 17%
- 70+ years old, 2%

**Figure 6.**
- Master’s, 75%
- Bachelor’s, 15%
- Associate’s, 1%
- Professional/Doctoral, 9%

**Figure 7.**
- Less than 6 years, 20%
- 6 - 15 years, 34%
- 16 - 25 years, 24%
- Over 25 years, 23%
Geographic Distribution of Respondents by Sector

2016 Population

Library prof.

Archives prof.

Museum-Hist Soc. prof.

Hybrid/Other prof.

Figure 8.
Respondents were asked to identify their immediate professional setting type - that is, in what kind of an organization or entity they were employed. Those who selected "hybrid/other" were asked to specify their immediate professional setting type. These open-ended responses were coded into the top six most frequently occurring categories, shown below. In the figure below, responses could fall within two or more categories (e.g., a response of "Academic Archives/Library" would be coded as "Hybrid - 2+ sectors" and "University, educational.")
Setting size: number of employees

Respondents were asked whether their immediate professional settings were standalone organizations, or settings nested within a larger organization (for example, a museum located within a university or archives in a government agency). Slightly more than half of the respondents work in a nested setting within a larger organization (52%); the remaining 48% work in standalone organizations.

### Employees in standalone organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total employees in freestanding setting</th>
<th>Archives setting</th>
<th>History setting</th>
<th>Library setting</th>
<th>Museum setting</th>
<th>Other setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-50</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-100</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-300</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-1,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 and more</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 1,326

Figure 11.
Employees in nested setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total employees in immediate setting</th>
<th>Archives setting</th>
<th>Hist. Society setting</th>
<th>Library setting</th>
<th>Museum setting</th>
<th>Other setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 and fewer</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-50</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-300</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-1,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 and more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 1,406

Figure 12.

Employees in larger setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total employees in larger organization</th>
<th>Archives setting</th>
<th>Hist. Society setting</th>
<th>Library setting</th>
<th>Museum setting</th>
<th>Other setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 or fewer</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-500</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001-5,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001-10,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-25,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 1,398

Figure 13.
Funding types by setting; employer contribution to CE/PD costs

Respondents were asked to provide the primary funding type for their immediate work setting. Figure 14 is arranged by respondent setting type.

Employer contribution for CE/PD

Respondents were asked to provide the approximate dollar amount that their employers contributed toward their own CE/PD costs over the past 12 months. Figure 15 is arranged by respondent setting type.
Participant perceptions and attitudes towards CE/PD

This section graphically depicts participant perceptions and attitudes towards CE/PD, including interest in CE/PD, reasons to seek out CE/PD, and identified factors that promote or discourage involvement in CE/PD.

**Figure 16.**

**Figure 17.**

**Important Factors in Selecting CE/PD Opportunities**
(Percent indicating "very" or "fairly" important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Archives/Hybrid Professionals</th>
<th>Libraries/Hybrid Professionals</th>
<th>Museums/Hist. Soc./Hybrid Professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt need</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer reputation</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor reputation</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector specific topics</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual option</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 2,480
Most important factors, by sector:
- **Archives/Hybrid**: Other costs of attending CE/PD offerings, such as travel and lodging (91% said this was very or fairly important)
- **Libraries/Hybrid**: Other costs of attending CE/PD offerings such as travel and lodging (91% said this was very or fairly important)
- **Museums/Historical Societies/Hybrid**: Sector-specific topics (90% said this was very or fairly important)

Least important factors, by sector:
- **Archives/Hybrid**: Instructor reputation (only 50% said this was very or fairly important)
- **Libraries/Hybrid**: Instructor reputation (only 56% said this was very or fairly important)
- **Museums/Historical Societies/Hybrid**: Option to engage virtually in CE/PD (only 44% said this was very or fairly important)

Likelihood of Using CE/PD Delivery Methods
(percent indicating "somewhat" or "very" likely to use)

![Likelihood of Using CE/PD Delivery Methods](image)

Figure 18.

Taken as a whole, respondents were most likely to use in-person offerings (82%) followed by live virtual offerings (78%). Respondents were equally likely to use publications and online resources (77%), with 66% likely to use recorded offerings.
Respondents were asked to indicate which, if any, of the above factors would enable them to benefit more from CE/PD. Since multiple factors could be selected by each respondent, in Figure 18 a count of all responses is displayed.

**Sector-specific results on CE/PD engagement**

The following pages provide results regarding CE/PD engagement that are broken out by each sector, including reasons for seeking CE/PD opportunities, as well as assets and barriers to engaging in CE/PD.

Figures 19-24 are aligned at the midpoint of the scale, so that positive responses are stacked to the left of the midline and neutral or negative responses are stacked to the right.
### Reasons for Seeking CE/PD Opportunities Among Archives/Hybrid Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Fairly important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Fairly unimportant</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging trends</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional interest</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace requirement</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential requirement</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 20.**

### Assets and Barriers to CE/PD Engagement Reported by Archives/Hybrid Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to CE/PD Engagement</th>
<th>Completely true</th>
<th>Somewhat true</th>
<th>Rarely true</th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate resources</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from leadership</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from colleagues</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace expectation</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate coverage</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate funding</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 21.**
Reasons for Seeking CE/PD Opportunities Among Libraries/Hybrid Professionals

- Knowledge: 79% Very important, 19% Neutral, 2% Not at all important
- Emerging trends: 69% Very important, 25% Neutral, 4% Fairly unimportant, 2% Not at all important
- Professional interest: 53% Very important, 38% Neutral, 6% Fairly unimportant, 2% Not at all important
- Networking: 30% Very important, 44% Neutral, 17% Fairly unimportant, 6% Not at all important
- Advancement: 34% Very important, 27% Neutral, 20% Fairly unimportant, 10% Not at all important
- Workplace requirement: 16% Very important, 37% Neutral, 25% Fairly unimportant, 11% Not at all important
- Credential requirement: 14% Very important, 18% Neutral, 27% Fairly unimportant, 13% Not at all important

Assets and Barriers to CE/PD Engagement for Libraries/Hybrid Professionals

- Adequate resources: 44% Completely true, 45% Somewhat true, 8% Rarely true, 3% Not at all true
- Support from leadership: 56% Completely true, 32% Somewhat true, 8% Rarely true, 4% Not at all true
- Support from colleagues: 50% Completely true, 37% Somewhat true, 9% Rarely true, 4% Not at all true
- Workplace expectation: 39% Completely true, 37% Somewhat true, 15% Rarely true, 9% Not at all true
- Adequate coverage: 37% Completely true, 38% Somewhat true, 18% Rarely true, 7% Not at all true
- Adequate funding: 30% Completely true, 42% Somewhat true, 18% Rarely true, 10% Not at all true

Figure 22.

Do you experience the following in your professional setting?

Figure 23.
### Reasons for Seeking CE/PD Opportunities Among Museums/Historical Societies/Hybrid Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Fairly important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Fairly unimportant</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging trends</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional interest</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace requirement</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credential requirement</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 24.**

### Assets and Barriers to CE/PD Engagement for Museums/Historical Societies/Hybrid Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you experience the following in your professional setting?</th>
<th>Completely true</th>
<th>Somewhat true</th>
<th>Rarely true</th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate resources</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from colleagues</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from leadership</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace expectation</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate coverage</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate funding</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 25.**
Cross-Sector Comparison - Selected Results

This section highlights selected cross-sector comparisons, such as competency self-rating by sector, self-rated confidence by specific competencies across sector, and themes for each competency domain that emerged from open-ended inquiry.

Number of Respondents Selecting Specific Competencies

Collection development, acquisition
Collection management, processing, cataloguing
Community engagement, outreach
Development, grants, fundraising
Digital resources
Direct patron services, reference
Education
Exhibitions
Facility operations
Financial management and budget
IT services
Planning, evaluation
Project management
Research
Senior leadership
Supervision and/or HR

Figure 26.
Collection development, acquisition
Collection management, processing, cataloguing
Community engagement, outreach
Development, grants, fundraising
Digital resources
Direct patron services, reference
Education
Exhibitions
Facility operations
Financial management and budget
IT services
Planning, evaluation
Project management
Research
Senior leadership
Supervision and/or HR

5: Fully confident both within my role and in other sectors or settings
4: Fully confident within my role
3: Mostly confident within my role
2: Somewhat confident within my role
1: Minimally confident within my role

Figure 27.
On the prior page, Figure 27 displays self-reported confidence in selected competency areas that respondents had previously indicated were related to their professional role on a regular basis.

Respondents were asked to select the top three competency areas most critical to success in their roles. The above figure depicts the percent of sector respondents who selected a particular competency based on this criteria.
Mean Competency Ratings by Area

Figure 29.

In Figure 29, a composite competency score was calculated to yield overall competency ratings for each of the six competency areas.

**Note:** Here, higher scores indicate lower competency ratings. A score of 1 corresponds with having the knowledge and skills for success in the area. A score of 2 corresponds with needing minor improvement to have the knowledge and skills for success in the area. A score of 3 corresponds with needing significant improvement to have the knowledge and skills for success in the area.
Thoughts on CE/PD within competency areas

At the close of each competency area in the survey, respondents were presented with opportunities for open-ended comment. The following figures summarize comments from each competency area for the following items:

"Please share any thoughts you have about CE/PD needs in the area of _______ competencies."

In a qualitative coding process, theme sets were developed for each competency area, aligning common themes where appropriate. See the Methods section for more information about this qualitative coding process.

![CE/PD Needs in Basic Competencies: Themes](image)

**Figure 30.**

Highlighted quotes: Thoughts on Basic Competencies CE/PD

"Working with intergenerational groups that incorporate millennials and older generations really could use some focused training - there's a real divide in my institution in this area, and not much acknowledgement of that fact."

"Learning how to manage volunteers and interns more effectively and how to navigate office/institutional politics and institutional relationships."

"The history of the profession and how we got the ethics we maintain is something almost universally absent from training in all new hires at my organization. The result: avoidable disasters."

"In any profession people usually have to deal with difficult co-workers, so that is a competency most people can use help with."

"Even though I have attended trainings on topics in the collaboration section above, I feel these trainings would be much more helpful if I attended them with other members of my team so that we could learn about each other's work styles and how our team works together."
CE/PD Needs in Collections Competencies: Themes
(number of responses within each theme)

- Born digital collections: 58
- Perceived barriers: 22
- Analog collections: 21
- Specific tools: 20
- Hands-on training: 19
- Institutional buy-in/support: 14
- Conservation techniques: 13
- Limited budget/resources: 12
- Advanced/specific training: 11
- Communication needs: 11
- Digitization: 10

n = 178

Figure 31.

Highlighted quotes: Thoughts on Collections Competencies CE/PD

"The biggest issue I've had to address/adapt to at my current employer is the issue of cultural sensitivities and the collision of ethics, copyright, and access in this area."

"I need to know more about linked data technology, LRM, and other new models and technologies which will cut across print and digital collections."

"Generally, CE/PD's in collections competencies are usually all similar in presentation and material. It would be nice to have a wider variety of CE/PD's."

"There need to be more advanced training in this area - so many of the workshop I've attended have been for beginners and were too basic. I need in-depth case studies and detailed plans for implementation and lists of concepts to consider in planning."

"Changing technologies make it difficult to keep up on the latest ones. this is where networking is extremely helpful."

"Increase availability of opportunities, especially at conferences. Additional funding would also be helpful."
**CE/PD Needs in Institutional Management Competencies: Themes**

(number of responses within each theme)

- Personnel management/ supervision: 21
- Communication needs: 18
- Perceived barriers: 17
- Budgeting/ finance terminology: 17
- Grantwriting/ fundraising: 11
- Legal issues/ regulations: 10
- Strategic planning: 7
- Limited budget/ resources: 6
- Institutional buy-in/support: 6
- Facilities management/ building maintenance: 4
- Advanced/ specific training: 3
- Hands-on training: 2

**n = 110**

---

**Highlighted quotes: Thoughts on Institutional Management Competencies CE/PD**

"More "real world" case studies would be helpful to all levels of museum professionals."

"There is little CE for new directors who have not worked their way up through that organization. Specifically regarding state laws and required state-by-state reporting. Human Resources, OSHA, Labor law."

"With regards to this topic, I need strategies to successfully engage others in my institution. It's an uphill battle to get some in Leadership to put plans, accreditation guidelines, etc. as a top priority."

"Often managers are hired for their knowledge of a particular area, but don't have the personnel management skills required to manage effectively."

"Working more effectively with library board, including getting them to help with fundraising, development of a foundation. Budgeting - persuasion techniques (writing, speaking) to advocate for budgets; learning more budgeting techniques."

"There are basic business/finance management class opportunities, but not as much for not for profit, museum-specific business management."

"In a large institution it is often hard to break through the silos. Communication is difficult. CE/PD relating to larger management issues would help."

"Finding myself as an ED of a small museum, I am suddenly thrust into the areas of HR and finance and, while I understand the importance of getting these areas 'right' (i.e. compliant, efficient, etc), resources for support are both limited and expensive. State-based free resources are really needed in these areas."
Highlighted quotes: Thoughts on Technology Competencies CE/PD

"The technology changes so quickly that the foundation I got in graduate school (4 years ago) is barely relevant anymore. Workshops on technological updates (like a "best of new technologies") at a CE/PD would be much appreciated!"

"Experiences geared toward staff who are not technology professionals but have to deal with technology because it happens to be one of the many hats they have to wear, would be helpful."

"I am in an EXTREMELY tech literate position. The majority of the CEs offered for me are VERY low level and not applicable."

"Digital is ubiquitous. However, there needs to be a raised awareness that analog materials are not automatically irrelevant and obsolete. I would suggest that this awareness be part and parcel of every workshop on the latest and greatest technology competency. ..."

"Conversations are needed for people in this area. Open conversations around topics, not passive presentations. Hands on learning. Apprenticeships. As someone who self-taught herself her job and skillsets, and went looking for help, having CE/PD opportunities where these open conversations could happen, and have mentors available would have really been helpful."

"More education is needed in the area of knowledge management. If libraries spent more time managing the knowledge of its workers, they would be better prepared to address issues as they arise as well as be more innovative."
Highlighted quotes: Thoughts on Leadership Competencies CE/PD

"We need to move out of specific library/museum/archive leadership and take our lead from private sector businesses and non-profits that are already doing a lot of these things."

"Often PD opportunities in this area are for senior management and directors, but not for middle management."

"Managing/leading up and to the side is just as challenging as managing down. I feel fairly competent in managing down; I don't feel so competent in managing/leading up and to the side."

"Leadership skills can be difficult to acquire, because skills need to be practiced and incorporated into everyday activities. Coaching, one-on-one interaction, and mentoring are important in the process. Many organizations want leaders, but do not know how to help employees develop those skills."

"General leadership training would be helpful- especially in regards to how to handle individuals that resist change."

"I feel that although I have many of the basic skills needed, I need CE/PD regarding using existing and emerging technology to enhance what I already know and to do it more efficiently, effectively and consistently. I would want to learn how to use websites, online training, data about collections, outreach, staff performance, etc. for planning, budgeting and training, etc."

"There is inability to discern or to have meaningful discussion between fad and sustainable change. Directors are often motivated by novelties either in management and organization or in services. They often make changes for change sake and present these as a sign of progress, rather than make change for targeted, strategically meaningful and sustainable growth. They often ignore the past and end up going nowhere."
CE/PD Needs in Public-Facing Competencies: Themes
(number of responses within each theme)

Communication needs - marketing/ community outreach: 28
Stakeholder engagement/ collaboration: 22
Advanced/ specific training: 15
Evaluation: 11
Limited budget/ resources: 9
Institutional buy-in/ support: 9
Strategy implementation: 6
Communication needs - general: 6
Communication needs - cultural sensitivity: 5
Communication needs - interpersonal: 4

n = 114

Figure 35.

Highlighted quotes: Thoughts on Public-Facing Competencies CE/PD

"Ensuring the library's community relevance is often difficult. Cooperation amongst community agencies is not well established; services are not shared or optimized."

"I've found that most people believe they know what they're doing, and they have a hard time admitting that they need training (especially docents/frontline staff who've been doing this for years). But when they are (re)introduced to the basics, it changes their perception of what and how they do their job."

"This is so so so important to keep our institutions relevant. So many archives are inwardly focused because of the precious things they hold but we need to find ways to create positive experiences with the public so that we remain a part of the community."

"Small museums always need to be up to date on this, especially if the changing nature of a small museum in a small community. It's tough with a small staff to be a museum and a public institution of culture, community, and meeting space."

"Given the complexities of our culture today, I think this is an area that can always use at least some additional training - the challenge is keeping current amidst all the other everyday duties that need to be fulfilled. Learning how to carve out reflective time to really do some of these things can be difficult."
Archives/Hybrid Professionals

This section reports on participants from the Archives sector; not only those who solely identified with this sector but also those who identify with this sector and at least one other sector or specialty (hybrid professionals). To review the full item text, refer to the Mapping the Landscapes Glossary (Appendix D).

To compare these results to those of other sectors, refer to page 44 (Libraries) and page 53 (Museums/Historical Societies).

Items regarding basic competencies were presented to all respondents.

![Research and Project Management](image)

![Communication and Collaboration](image)
### Basic Competencies

#### Professional Ethics

- **Draw on basic values and ethics of sector**: 83%
- **Laws, regulations, inst'l policies, ethical standards**: 66%
- **Culture of ethics/ accountability**: 57%

#### Awareness of Professional Context

- **Theoretical/historical professional underpinnings**: 65%
- **Basic professional models of practice**: 67%
- **Relationships with allied professions**: 61%
- **Record-keeping**: 48%
- **Professional standards and best practices**: 66%

*Figures 38 and 39.*
Figure 43.

Collections Competencies

Figure 44.
Archives/Hybrid Professionals

Institutional Management Competencies

Supervision and Human Resources

- Recruitment and selection of workforce: 14% (Not relevant) + 6% (Need significant improvement) + 35% (Need minor improvement) + 45% (Have knowledge/skill for success)
- Lead and empower employees: 6% (Not relevant) + 10% (Need significant improvement) + 42% (Need minor improvement) + 25% (Have knowledge/skill for success)
- Performance management strategies: 8% (Not relevant) + 12% (Need significant improvement) + 45% (Need minor improvement) + 25% (Have knowledge/skill for success)
- Performance management standards, requirements: 8% (Not relevant) + 10% (Need significant improvement) + 42% (Need minor improvement) + 25% (Have knowledge/skill for success)
- Work with consultants and volunteers: 6% (Not relevant) + 8% (Need significant improvement) + 32% (Need minor improvement) + 45% (Have knowledge/skill for success)
- Support staff career development: 13% (Not relevant) + 7% (Need significant improvement) + 35% (Need minor improvement) + 35% (Have knowledge/skill for success)

Organizational Planning, Policies, and Procedures

- Understand laws: 2% (Not relevant) + 12% (Need significant improvement) + 34% (Need minor improvement) + 52% (Have knowledge/skill for success)
- Policies/procedures: 2% (Not relevant) + 6% (Need significant improvement) + 34% (Need minor improvement) + 54% (Have knowledge/skill for success)
- Strategic planning: 10% (Not relevant) + 4% (Need significant improvement) + 45% (Need minor improvement) + 41% (Have knowledge/skill for success)

Facility Design and Management

- Encourage patron use: 13% (Not relevant) + 8% (Need significant improvement) + 40% (Need minor improvement) + 43% (Have knowledge/skill for success)
- Safe environment: 13% (Not relevant) + 10% (Need significant improvement) + 43% (Need minor improvement) + 43% (Have knowledge/skill for success)
- Well-run environment: 14% (Not relevant) + 9% (Need significant improvement) + 43% (Need minor improvement) + 43% (Have knowledge/skill for success)

Institutional Affiliations and Financial Management

- Institutional credibility: 11% (Not relevant) + 30% (Need significant improvement) + 24% (Need minor improvement) + 35% (Have knowledge/skill for success)
- Information, feedback from advisory bodies: 29% (Not relevant) + 10% (Need significant improvement) + 35% (Need minor improvement) + 26% (Have knowledge/skill for success)
- Basic budget finance understanding: 12% (Not relevant) + 10% (Need significant improvement) + 36% (Need minor improvement) + 37% (Have knowledge/skill for success)
- Financial processes: 16% (Not relevant) + 14% (Need significant improvement) + 33% (Need minor improvement) + 34% (Have knowledge/skill for success)
- Identify, pursue multiple funding sources: 26% (Not relevant) + 16% (Need significant improvement) + 16% (Need minor improvement) + 25% (Have knowledge/skill for success)
Figure 49.

Figure 50.
Innovative thinking about mission and goals

Assess organizational shortcomings/assets

Continuous improvement

Consider impact in community and beyond

Impactful ideas, environments, technologies

Anticipate problems/opportunities

Planning and Making Effective Decisions

Short-term/long-term planning

Identify clear outcomes

Evidence based decision making

Responsibility for decisions

Decisional transparency

Flexible and Reflective Thinking

Innovative thinking about mission and goals

Assess organizational shortcomings/assets

Continuous improvement

Consider impact in community and beyond

Impactful ideas, environments, technologies

Anticipate problems/opportunities

Figure 51.

Figure 52.
Leadership Competencies

Engaging, Motivating, and Inspiring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Relevant</th>
<th>Need Improvement</th>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Knowledge/Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivate individuals to contribute</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment of trust and integrity</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire others to think creatively</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment of active communication</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive feedback</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 53.

Leading through Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Internal/external support for change</th>
<th>Collaborate during change</th>
<th>Build community relationships</th>
<th>Environment that encourages problem solving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 54.

Cultural Competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Awareness of diverse cultures and beliefs</th>
<th>Foster an environment that respects cultures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 55.
Archives/Hybrid Professionals

Figure 56. Patron Services and Access

- Respond to patron research needs: 1% (Not relevant to role), 17% (Need significant improvement), 4% (Need minor improvement), 78% (Have knowledge/skills for success)
- Use online tools/communities for user engagement: 8% (Not relevant to role), 37% (Need significant improvement), 4% (Need minor improvement), 51% (Have knowledge/skills for success)
- Outreach services: 11% (Not relevant to role), 11% (Need significant improvement), 44% (Need minor improvement), 30% (Have knowledge/skills for success)
- Opportunities for information, education, entertainment, lifelong learning: 12% (Not relevant to role), 13% (Need significant improvement), 45% (Need minor improvement), 30% (Have knowledge/skills for success)

Figure 57. Education and Training

- Educational/training/interpretation programs: 10% (Not relevant to role), 40% (Need significant improvement), 37% (Need minor improvement), 13% (Have knowledge/skills for success)
- Public access technology: 7% (Not relevant to role), 34% (Need significant improvement), 42% (Need minor improvement), 17% (Have knowledge/skills for success)
- Publications/other information: 8% (Not relevant to role), 31% (Need significant improvement), 46% (Need minor improvement), 15% (Have knowledge/skills for success)
- Patron training: 6% (Not relevant to role), 30% (Need significant improvement), 47% (Need minor improvement), 17% (Have knowledge/skills for success)

Figure 58. Community Relations and Outreach

- Demonstrate value of institution through evaluation: 16% (Not relevant to role), 11% (Need significant improvement), 11% (Need minor improvement), 32% (Have knowledge/skills for success)
- Build support for institution: 12% (Not relevant to role), 10% (Need significant improvement), 35% (Need minor improvement), 36% (Have knowledge/skills for success)
- Communication, marketing, promotion of institution: 15% (Not relevant to role), 11% (Need significant improvement), 35% (Need minor improvement), 43% (Have knowledge/skills for success)
- Relationships with community orgs: 16% (Not relevant to role), 11% (Need significant improvement), 35% (Need minor improvement), 39% (Have knowledge/skills for success)
Libraries/Hybrid Professionals

This section reports on participants from the Library sector; not only those who solely identified with this sector but also those who identify with this sector and at least one other sector or specialty (Hybrid Professionals). To review the full item text, refer to the Mapping the Landscapes Glossary (Appendix D).

To compare these results to those of other sectors, refer to page 36 (Archives) and page 53 (Museums/Historical Societies).

Items regarding basic competencies were presented to all respondents.

For Research and Project Management:
- Methodologies for research: 92% have knowledge, 7% need minor improvement, 1% need significant improvement, 9% not relevant to role.
- Technological platforms for research: 90% have knowledge, 7% need minor improvement, 6% need significant improvement, 10% not relevant to role.
- Project management principles: 67% have knowledge, 8% need minor improvement, 17% need significant improvement, 6% not relevant to role.
- Lead work teams: 81% have knowledge, 12% need minor improvement, 8% need significant improvement, 8% not relevant to role.
- Monitor/ adapt project progress: 65% have knowledge, 14% need minor improvement, 17% need significant improvement, 6% not relevant to role.

For Communication and Collaboration:
- Variety of communication methods: 71% have knowledge, 29% need minor improvement, 6% need significant improvement, 2% not relevant to role.
- Communicate effectively with diverse audiences: 71% have knowledge, 29% need minor improvement, 4% need significant improvement, 3% not relevant to role.
- Situation-specific communication: 46% have knowledge, 54% need minor improvement, 10% need significant improvement, 10% not relevant to role.
- Develop relationships to achieve common goals: 62% have knowledge, 37% need minor improvement, 6% need significant improvement, 5% not relevant to role.
- Work effectively in teams: 59% have knowledge, 41% need minor improvement, 5% need significant improvement, 4% not relevant to role.
- Manage organizational politics, conflict and difficult coworkers: 46% have knowledge, 52% need minor improvement, 2% need significant improvement, 3% not relevant to role.

**Figure 59.**

**Figure 60.**
Figure 61.

Figure 62.
The focus of the following sections is on the level of skill in competency areas that were reported by professionals in the Archives sector as critical to success in their role. For the following competency areas (Collections, Institutional Management, Leadership, Public Facing) respondents were asked to identify the top three areas most critical to their roles, and were presented with only those items corresponding to their top three areas.
**Collections Competencies**

**Digital Collection Management**

- **Digital resources**: 14%
- **Organize digital collections**: 28%
- **Control/access to digital collections**: 30%
- **Digital curation software**: 26%
- **Integrate tools into workflows**: 30%
- **Sustain digital collections over time**: 34%

**Digital Preservation Principles and Skills**

- **Preservation/conservation of digital materials**: 44%
- **Ensure digital protection, authentication of collections**: 43%
- **Policies and procedures for digitization**: 41%
- **Policies and procedures for born digital materials**: 46%
Supervision and Human Resources

- Recruitment, selection of workforce: 9% have knowledge, 36% need minor improvement, 27% need significant improvement, 8% not relevant to role.
- Lead, empower employees: 40% have knowledge, 42% need minor improvement, 24% need significant improvement, 8% not relevant to role.
- Performance management strategies: 52% have knowledge, 48% need minor improvement, 20% need significant improvement, 5% not relevant to role.
- Performance management standards, requirements: 45% have knowledge, 38% need minor improvement, 12% need significant improvement, 8% not relevant to role.
- Work with consultants, volunteers: 45% have knowledge, 36% need minor improvement, 20% need significant improvement, 8% not relevant to role.
- Support staff career development: 38% have knowledge, 42% need minor improvement, 12% need significant improvement, 8% not relevant to role.

Organizational Planning, Policies, and Procedures

- Understand laws: 50% have knowledge, 45% need minor improvement, 27% need significant improvement, 9% not relevant to role.
- Policies/procedures: 41% have knowledge, 45% need minor improvement, 27% need significant improvement, 9% not relevant to role.
- Strategic planning: 36% have knowledge, 46% need minor improvement, 27% need significant improvement, 9% not relevant to role.

Facility Design and Management

- Encourage patron use: 47% have knowledge, 48% need minor improvement, 16% need significant improvement, 10% not relevant to role.
- Safe environment: 48% have knowledge, 43% need minor improvement, 15% need significant improvement, 10% not relevant to role.
- Well-run environment: 33% have knowledge, 33% need minor improvement, 15% need significant improvement, 9% not relevant to role.

Institutional Affiliations and Financial Management

- Institutional credibility: 40% have knowledge, 26% need minor improvement, 14% need significant improvement, 10% not relevant to role.
- Information, feedback from advisory bodies: 27% have knowledge, 34% need minor improvement, 14% need significant improvement, 10% not relevant to role.
- Basic budget/finance understanding: 20% have knowledge, 38% need minor improvement, 14% need significant improvement, 10% not relevant to role.
- Financial processes: 30% have knowledge, 49% need minor improvement, 14% need significant improvement, 10% not relevant to role.
- Identify, pursue multiple funding sources: 10% have knowledge, 34% need minor improvement, 23% need significant improvement, 11% not relevant to role.
Technology Competencies

**Core Technology**

- Basic computer functions and tasks: 65%
- Basic functions of email and web-based resources: 70%
- Apply technologies for learning/collaboration: 56%

**Intermediate/Advanced Technology**

- Automation systems: 23%
- Enterprise computing systems: 36%
- Network and security systems: 42%
- Server administration systems: 46%
- Technology planning: 24%
- Web design/development: 25%

---

Figure 72.

Figure 73.
Libraries/Hybrid Professionals

Figure 74.

Figure 75.
Figure 76.

Figure 77.

Figure 78.
Figure 79.

Figure 80.

Figure 81.
This section reports on participants from the Museums and Historical Societies sectors; not only those who solely identified with these two sectors but those who identify with one of these and at least one other sector or specialty as well (Hybrid Professionals). To review the full item text, refer to the *Mapping the Landscapes Glossary* (Appendix D).

To compare these results to those of other sectors, refer to page 36 (Archives) and page 44 (Libraries).

Items regarding basic competencies were presented to all respondents.

**Figure 82.**

Research and Project Management

**Figure 83.**

Communication and Collaboration
Figure 84.

Figure 85.
Museums/Historical Societies/Hybrid Professionals

The focus of the following sections is on the level of skill in competency areas that were reported by professionals in the Archives sector as critical to success in their role. For the following competency areas (Collections, Institutional Management, Leadership, Public Facing) respondents were asked to identify the top three areas most critical to their roles, and were presented with only those items corresponding to their top three areas.

Figure 86.
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**Figure 86.**

Figure 87.
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**Figure 87.**

Figure 88.

![Image](Image)

**Figure 88.**

56
Figure 89.

Digital Collection Management

Figure 90.

Digital Preservation Principles and Skills
### Museums/Historical Societies/Hybrid Professionals

#### Institutional Management Competencies

#### Supervision and Human Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Not relevant to role</th>
<th>Need significant improvement</th>
<th>Need minor improvement</th>
<th>Have knowledge/skills for success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment, selection of workforce</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead, empower employees</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management strategies</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management standards, requirements</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with consultants, volunteers</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff career development</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Organizational Planning, Policies, and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Not relevant to role</th>
<th>Need significant improvement</th>
<th>Need minor improvement</th>
<th>Have knowledge/skills for success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand laws</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/procedures</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Facility Design and Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Not relevant to role</th>
<th>Need significant improvement</th>
<th>Need minor improvement</th>
<th>Have knowledge/skills for success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage patron use</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe environment</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-run environment</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Institutional Affiliations and Financial Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Not relevant to role</th>
<th>Need significant improvement</th>
<th>Need minor improvement</th>
<th>Have knowledge/skills for success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional credibility</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, feedback from advisory bodies</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic budget/finance understanding</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial processes</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify, pursue multiple funding sources</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 95.

Figure 96.
Museums/Historical Societies/Hybrid Professionals

**Leadership Competencies**

**Figure 97.**

**Planning and Making Effective Decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-term/long-term planning</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify clear outcomes</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based decision making</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for decisions</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisional transparency</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 98.**

**Flexible and Reflective Thinking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovative thinking about mission and goals</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess organizational shortcomings/assets</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous improvement</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider impact in community and beyond</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impactful ideas, environments, technologies</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipate problems/opportunities</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motivate individuals to contribute
Environment of trust and integrity
Inspire others to think creatively
Environment of active communication
Constructive feedback

Engaging, Motivating, and Inspiring

- 3% Motivate individuals to contribute
- 4% Environment of trust and integrity
- 2% Inspire others to think creatively
- 1% Environment of active communication
- 1% Constructive feedback

Leading through Change

- 1% Internal/external support for change
- 2% Collaborate during change
- 5% Build community relationships
- 2% Environment that encourages problem solving

Cultural Competency

- 2% Awareness of diverse cultures and beliefs
- 5% Foster an environment that respects cultures

Figures 99, 100, and 101.
Museums/Historical Societies/Hybrid Professionals

Public-Facing Competencies

**Patron Services and Access**
- Respond to patron research needs: 14% relevant, 7% need significant improvement, 29% need minor improvement, 49% have knowledge/skills for success
- Use online tools/communities for user engagement: 16% relevant, 20% need significant improvement, 37% need minor improvement, 27% have knowledge/skills for success
- Outreach services: 20% relevant, 19% need significant improvement, 42% need minor improvement, 19% have knowledge/skills for success
- Opportunities for information, education, entertainment, lifelong learning: 15% relevant, 16% need significant improvement, 40% need minor improvement, 29% have knowledge/skills for success

**Education and Training**
- Educational/training/interpretation programs: 15% relevant, 12% need significant improvement, 44% need minor improvement, 37% have knowledge/skills for success
- Public access technology: 31% relevant, 15% need significant improvement, 25% need minor improvement, 16% have knowledge/skills for success
- Publications/other information: 42% relevant, 25% need significant improvement, 30% need minor improvement, 30% have knowledge/skills for success
- Patron training: 12% relevant, 12% need significant improvement, 35% need minor improvement, 30% have knowledge/skills for success

**Community Relations and Outreach**
- Demonstrate value of institution through evaluation: 12% relevant, 21% need significant improvement, 40% need minor improvement, 27% have knowledge/skills for success
- Build support for institution: 11% relevant, 19% need significant improvement, 43% need minor improvement, 27% have knowledge/skills for success
- Communication, marketing, promotion of institution: 16% relevant, 14% need significant improvement, 39% need minor improvement, 31% have knowledge/skills for success
- Relationships with community organizations: 12% relevant, 14% need significant improvement, 36% need minor improvement, 38% have knowledge/skills for success

**Figure 102.**

**Figure 103.**

**Figure 104.**
Additional explorative analyses

The results in the Competencies section were presented in a sector-by-sector format; however, for some stakeholders in this project, it may be useful to consider certain follow-up questions, such as the overall areas of greatest need (as identified by respondents) within each sector and determine where commonalities may arise.

### Overall Greatest Identified Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>Develop tools and systems that provide optimal control of and access to digital collections</td>
<td>78% in need of improvement (30% minor, 48% significant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Build internal and external support for change</td>
<td>71% in need of improvement (53% minor, 18% significant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Build internal and external support for change</td>
<td>72% in need of improvement (51% minor, 21% significant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 105.**

The table above indicates the overall greatest need within each sector (as defined by the highest percentage of respondents indicating they need "minor" or "significant" improvement in a competency.)
### Most Significant Identified Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archives/Hybrid Professional</td>
<td>Integrate different tools into workflows, selecting and implementing appropriate curation tools to manage digital resources</td>
<td>51% in need of significant improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries/Hybrid Professional</td>
<td>Integrate different tools into workflows, selecting and implementing appropriate curation tools to manage digital resources</td>
<td>38% in need of significant improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums/Hist. Soc./Hybrid Professional</td>
<td>[Tied] Integrate different tools into workflows, selecting and implementing appropriate curation tools to manage digital resources</td>
<td>41% in need of significant improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Tied] Sustain and improve digital collections over time</td>
<td>41% in need of significant improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 106.

The table above indicates the most significant need within each sector (as defined by the highest percentage of respondents indicating they need "significant" improvement in a competency.

To explore these results in more depth, see the link to the exploratory formatted spreadsheet in Appendix E.
Crosstab: Years in profession and factors increasing CE/PD benefit

The table below explores the relationship between years in the profession and factors that were perceived to increase benefit from CE/PD. Respondents were asked to select all of the factors that "would enable [them] to benefit more from CE/PD" from a list.

![Table]

Figure 107.

First, the similarity of percentages across cohort is notable - all within a few percentage points for most factors. Also of note, the greatest difference seen was regarding the need for more inexpensive CE/PD opportunities, with nearly one-third of all selections made by the "less than 6 years" cohort referencing this factor. This was higher than all other cohorts, with the sharpest contrast being the "more than 25 years" cohort at only 22%.
Assets and barriers to CE/PD and related competency gaps

The survey asked participants to self-rate the degree to which a gap existed between the requirements of their position, and their own competency in meeting those requirements. In addition to identifying the extent to which professional competency gaps exist across sectors and roles, an additional analysis was undertaken to offer context to these findings. Specifically, a series of heatmaps, found in Appendix E, and in thumbnail below) shows the relationship between the assets and barriers experienced in the work setting with respect to accessing CE/PD and self-rated competency.

The results of these analyses are too complex to easily narratively summarize; however, they bear close inspection as several intriguing patterns emerge. For instance, while self-ratings in the area of Basic competencies are generally positive (skewing toward the “I have necessary skills” end of the rating scale) regardless of the presence of assets and barriers, others such as Collections and Technology competencies skew in the direction of a greater need for improvement. These patterns are, in certain cases, moderated by the presence of selected assets. For example, among museum professionals the presence of adequate CE/PD funding appears to be associated with higher levels of competency in the Public-facing and Technology domains.

A close examination of these distinctive patterns within each sector reveals assets and barriers to access of CE/PD. The pattern of evidence suggests that improving certain of these factors (along with presumed follow through with CE/PD) may be associated improved performance in certain competency domains.

A thumbnail of the Archives/Hybrid Professionals heatmap is below; see Appendix E or the data visualization for full versions.

Figure 108.
Prevalence of hybrid, other sector, and multi-setting professionals

A notable set of findings in this study is the (perhaps) surprising number of respondents who identified as belonging to more than one sector, and/or work in more than one type of setting. Specifically, Figure 3 indicates that 21 percent of respondents identified with either more than one sector (“hybrid”), or a different sector than those listed (“other”). Figure 4 breaks these hybrid respondents down by category. Moreover, Figure 8 reports that fully 15 percent of respondents work in hybrid/other settings, that is, not in classically defined archives, library or museum venues.

It is likely that there is a great deal of overlap between individuals reporting themselves as hybrid professionals and those reporting their workplace in non-traditional terms. Given the Coalition’s mandate to facilitate cross-sector collaboration, the presence of a significant number of professionals who already see themselves in cross-sector or non-traditional terms bears further scrutiny. In addition to better understanding the unique circumstances of these professionals, it is likely that this population has important wisdom to share in regard to best practices and unique CE/PD needs—as well as cautions in such boundary-crossing work.

Summary and Next Steps

The Mapping the Landscapes needs assessment in continuing education and professional development offers a broad and statistically reliable overview of current perceptions, needs, assets and barriers, levels of competency and confidence across and within archives, library, and museum professions in the United States. This robust dataset provides a valuable opportunity for administrators and CE/PD professionals across sectors and across the country to engage in policy and decision making that is genuinely evidence-based, inasmuch as the survey was developed with the needs of end-user decision makers in mind.

Actionable information contained in this Viewbook as well as in the companion data visualization storyboard includes:

- Identification of barriers and drivers with respect to access to CE/PD.
- Detailed descriptive information regarding institutional, workplace, and other contextual factors that affect the use and effectiveness of CE/PD.
- Detailed information regarding the demand for specific competencies across settings.
- Self-reported gaps in current skill levels relative to the specific competencies required by particular roles.
- Patterns of reported confidence in skill level in specific competency areas that
suggest the potential value of situational learning and whole learning models of continuing education.

- Factors perceived to enhance the benefits of CE/PD.

Note that these and other data points may be scrutinized on many levels, using either this Viewbook or the data visualization storyboard. For example, sector-level reports on all of factors of interest are available in this document. Further, many key factors may be filtered by sector and/or geographic location in the data visualization, allowing a highly flexible examination of patterns in the data. Given this flexibility, it is now possible to answer a great many questions about CE/PD using robust data. The availability of the tools derived from Mapping the Landscapes means that for the first time CE/PD decision makers across sectors possess reliable and actionable information.

The next challenge will be to develop an action plan (or plans) that are systematically grounded in a disciplined understanding of these data. Specifically, it is essential to identify key findings that can serve as the evidentiary foundation for a strategic CE/PD action plan (or support and inform any plans already in place).

The logical next step to accomplish this is to “unpack” the Mapping data in a way that is consistent with the Coalition’s theory of change (alternatively, using the Survey Conceptual model from this study as a starting point). The goal should be to develop a set of testable planning principles that support systematic, concrete, and measurable initiatives in CE/PD (or align with initiatives already in process).

In principle, the Mapping the Landscapes data offers not only a rational evidentiary framework for conceptualizing such initiatives going forward, but also a basis for objective evaluation and refinement of such efforts by the Coalition and others.