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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Principal Research Questions and Summary Findings

#1 What are the factors that influence participation in continuing education (CE) programs for academic/research librarians located in northern New England (Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine) and western Massachusetts?
Survey question 3 asked respondents to rate the importance of various factors when deciding to participate in a CE event. The majority of survey respondents (91%) indicated that content was an extremely important factor when choosing to participate in a CE offering. Other factors considered important included travel distance (65.1%), transportation cost (55.6%), lodging expense (62.2%), and reputation of the speaker (65.6%). Attractiveness of the meeting location was deemed the least important criterion for choosing to attend a CE offering followed by time of the year and meal expense.

#2 What information and communication resources do academic/research librarians in northern New England and western Massachusetts use to obtain information about CE opportunities?
Survey question 2 asked “Which communication resources do you most like to use to get information about continuing education opportunities?” Overwhelmingly, survey respondents (95.1%) indicated they used E-mail and discussion lists to glean information on upcoming continuing education opportunities. Information from colleagues and brochures and flyers came in a distant second and third respectively. The results indicate that survey respondents still prefer more traditional means of communication over emerging ones such as Blogs, Wikis and RSS newsfeeds.

#3 What are the types of continuing educational formats preferred by academic/research librarians located in northern New England and western Massachusetts?
Survey question 6 asked respondents to rate their level of preference for various types of CE formats. Not surprisingly the data gathered correspond to the findings of the initial exploratory interviews—the expressed preference for face-to-face educational formats rather than online. Of the in-person options presented, the full day workshop was favored most.

#4 What are the topics for CE programs or courses that academic/research librarians located in northern New England and western Massachusetts would be likely to participate in during the next 18 months?
Survey question 9 asked respondents to rate their level of interest in 15 topic areas. Of the topics presented, the following three garnered the highest level of interest: Reference services (including Learning Commons), Emerging information technologies, and Library Instruction and Information Literacy. Among the categories in which at least 60% of survey respondents indicated a moderate level of interest or more were: Reference (73.4%), Emerging information technologies (72.4%), Library instruction (72.4%), Management & leadership (70.1%), Digital initiatives (67.6%), Instructional design/course management systems (67.6%), Collection development (67.5%), Assessment (66.2%), and Marketing (61.7%). Not surprisingly, the level of interest in reference, library instruction and instructional design topics reflects the relatively high percentage (26.7%) of survey respondents who identified Reference as their primary area of responsibility. Conversely, although a relatively small percentage of respondents identified systems (6.7%) or administration (13.8%) as their primary responsibility, information technology,
management, leadership, assessment and marketing topics still rated highly among the majority of respondents.

#5 Would greater access to the type of CE content and program delivery format indicated by survey respondents increase the likelihood of his/her membership in ACRL/NEC if not already a member?

The CEC admits that this question was not directly addressed by the Needs Assessment Survey. However, we believe that this question might be better answered through qualitative research methods such as a focus group or face-to-face interviews.

The Continuing Education Committee offers the following recommendations based on the results presented in this report.

- Sponsor programs at meetings/conferences of state and other regional organizations. The chapter has sponsored programs at the NELA annual conference, so there is a precedent for this form of outreach.

- Appoint an ACRL NEC liaison to the state library associations in order to facilitate communication, promote our organization, and better coordinate library continuing education offerings throughout New England.

- Move the most popular SIG programs (i.e., the ones for which people would be more willing to travel) to locations outside of the Greater Boston area or, alternatively, repeat popular programs at more than 1 location.

- Extend the ACRL NEC annual conference to 2 days. If additional programming is impracticable, partnerships with other professional organizations should be sought (For ex., ACRL NEC hosts its meeting on day 1 followed by NERCOMP on day 2). Hosting a pre-conference workshop is another option for encouraging attendance by academic library staff in the geographic areas targeted by the survey.

- Promote teleconferencing of SIG programs at multiple sites throughout New England as a means to fulfill the educational, proximity and social networking needs of academic library personnel throughout New England.

- Maintain a regional continuing events calendar that may be contributed to by SIG chairs and other regional library organizations and is searchable.
ACRL/NEC Continuing Education Committee (CEC)

Outreach Needs Assessment Survey

In Fall 2005, the Board of the Association of College & Research Libraries, New England Chapter (ACRL/NEC) charged its Continuing Education Committee (CEC) to investigate the continuing education needs of librarians in northern New England (Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire) and western Massachusetts, with specific attention paid to what would increase membership and participation in ACRL-NEC among librarians in those areas.

A. Research problem, questions, & goals

Few ACRL/NEC meetings, programs, and workshops are held in locations outside the Boston Metropolitan area or more than 1.5 to two hours from Boston. Thus, few academic librarians from Maine, western Massachusetts, New Hampshire, or Vermont are members of ACRL/NEC, active in ACRL/NEC or attend ACRL/NEC events.

Academic librarians in these non-Boston metropolitan locations have few alternative sources of professional development opportunities. New England's state associations and the New England Library Association are primarily focused on public and school libraries. North of the border, in Canada, there are few professional development opportunities for academic librarians either since provincial associations focus on public and school libraries. The Canadian Library Association’s academic branch, CACUL, has fewer than 700 academic librarians as members and does not seem to have an active presence in the areas geographically close to ACRL/NEC’s underserved area.

1. Principal questions

#1 What are the factors that influence participation in continuing education (CE) programs for academic/research librarians located in northern New England (Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine) and western Massachusetts?

#2 What information and communication resources do academic/research librarians in northern New England and western Massachusetts use to obtain information about CE opportunities?

#3 What are the types of continuing educational formats preferred by academic/research librarians located in northern New England and western Massachusetts?

#4 What are the topics for CE programs or courses that academic/research librarians located in northern New England and western Massachusetts would be likely to participate in during the next 18 months?

#5 Would greater access to the type of CE content and program delivery format indicated by survey respondents increase the likelihood of his/her membership in ACRL/NEC if not already a member?

2. Goals for research results

Support the ACRL/NEC Special Interest Groups (SIGs) and the Continuing Education Committee (CEC) with actionable results so they might continue to improve the development of and access to educational programs that help increase ACRL/NEC membership and activities in targeted areas.
B. Research Design & Methodology

1. Phase 1 description

Phase 1 of the study was exploratory in nature. The goal for this phase was to identify the relevant CE issues confronting academic/research librarians in the target geographic areas and to solicit ideas that would be tested later in the study using survey research. Conducted during fall 2005, the following steps were taken:

a) Contacted SIG Chairs & CEC members to solicit program ideas they might want tested.
   - Sought input from chairs and committee members about what feedback they might want relative to the programs and access services they could set forth with an eye to increasing membership and activities in target areas.

b) Developed & tested guide for conducting exploratory interviews with academic/research librarians in target geographic areas.
   - While anecdotal evidence supported the problem description, exploratory interviews were desired to help further refine questions.

c) Conducted six exploratory interviews (see Appendix A for detail). Please note that anonymity was promised to each interviewee so the results presented in Appendix A include only the state in which the interviewee was employed. Among the principal observations and suggestions noted for testing in the survey were:
   • Strong preference stated for in-person (face-to-face) educational format.
     Four interviewees supported this preference by noting how valuable the networking component of an educational experience is to them. Among the suggestions for how ACRL/NEC might help make in-person CE program more feasible were to:
     - Schedule longer (multiple days) rather than shorter (one day) programs. (For example one day programs often do not make sense if, when travel is included, participants must commit three days of their time to participate.)
     - Facilitate “sub-regional” in-person programs.
     - Develop joint programs with state associations.
     - Offer the same programs (sequentially) in multiple locations.
     - Develop regional meeting centers.
   • Strong preference stated for the inclusion of a video component if the educational opportunity precludes in-person contact.
   • Use of more “push” oriented communication vehicles to keep abreast of CE offerings.
   • Suggestion that ACRL/NEC support librarians’ development activities in research, writing, and publishing more actively by (a) sponsoring juried papers at its annual conference, and (b) publishing an e-journal that provides greater access to local publishing opportunities.

2. Phase 2 description

Phase 2 of the study sought to quantify the demand existing for certain types of CE programs and delivery formats. Building on the results from Phase 1, the following steps were taken during late winter 2005 and early spring 2006:
a) Developed and pre-tested survey instrument (Appendix B)
   - Incorporated results from exploratory interviews into instrument.
   - Distributed to ACRL/NEC Board & CEC for review
   - Pre-tested instrument using both (a) interviews to check on question wording and
     (b) survey software to uncover any problems in completing the survey or recovering data.

b) Developed and tested e-mail list for targeted survey respondents.
   - Sample design was not required since research sought to survey librarian population in
     targeted areas.
   - E-mail addresses were gathered from the *American Library Directory* and individual
     library web sites.

c) Administered the survey electronically using Perseus Survey Solution software.
   - A test message was sent out first to identify problem email addresses and to alert
     people to the upcoming survey.
   - Letter with survey link was sent to list on February 27, 2006. Closing date for survey
     was the end of March 2006.
   - Respondents to the survey totaled 226. This represents 19.7% of the target respondent
     database which totaled 1,146.

d) Analyzed and interpreted data.
   - Exported data from survey to SPSS and Excel for analysis in April 2006.
   - Additional cross-tabulations identified and completed in fall 2006.

C. Survey Research Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Number of Responses by State (Q20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Number of Responses by Employment Classification (Q16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff (Incl. Technology Support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Librarian with management or supervisory responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Responses by Area of Primary Responsibility (Q17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Responsibility</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Services (incl. ILL)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (incl. Instruction and Outreach)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services (cataloging, metadata, serials and preservation)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions (incl. bibliographic and collection development)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems (incl. digital and information technology)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collections (incl. archives, rare books and historical collections)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Administration</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Responses by degrees completed (Q18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Completed</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Science degree (e.g., MLS, MLIS)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Master’s degree (e.g., MA, MS, MBA)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D, DBA)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Degree (e.g., JD, MD)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Membership in professional organizations (Q15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization name</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Library Association</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of College and Research Libraries</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of College and Research Libraries/New England Chapter</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Library Association</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Library Association</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Library Association</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire Library Association</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont Library Association</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Number of CE activities participated in during 2005 (Q1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CE Events</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution varied slightly among those surveyed who identified themselves holders of the MLS or equivalent degree (n=146). 4.8% (n=7) reported not having attended any CE events during 2005, 49.3% (n=72) reported attending 1-3 events, 34.2% (n=50) reported attending 4-6 events, 10.3% (n=15) reported attending 7-9 events, and 1.4% (n=2) reported attending 10 or more events.

Table 7: Types of communications resources used to find out about CE offerings (Q2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail, Listservs</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS feeds</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures and Flyers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overwhelmingly, survey respondents (95.1%) indicated they used E-mail and discussion lists to glean information on upcoming continuing education opportunities. Information from colleagues and brochures and flyers came in a distant second and third respectively. The results indicate that survey respondents still prefer more traditional means of communication over emerging ones such as Blogs, Wikis and RSS newsfeeds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education format</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of year</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness of location</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day(s) of week</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration/tuition fees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel distance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation cost</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging expense</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal expense</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of speakers/instructors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attractiveness of the meeting location was deemed the least important criterion for choosing to attend a CE offering followed by time of the year and meal expense. The majority of survey respondents (91%) indicated that content was an extremely important factor when choosing to participate in a CE offering. Other factors considered important included travel distance (65.1%), transportation cost (55.6%), lodging expense (62.2%), and reputation of the speaker (65.6%).
Table 9: Types of CE formats used by survey respondents (Q5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CE Format</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>½ day, in-person, conference/seminar/workshop</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day, in-person, conference/seminar/workshop</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ days in-person, conference/seminar/workshop</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video conference</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streaming video</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live webcast</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streaming audio or podcast</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asynchronous online workshop</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit course – traditional</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit course – distance</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-study course</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded conference/workshop/seminar</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript of conference/workshop/seminar</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9a: Types of CE formats used by MLS holders (Q5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CE Format</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>½ day, in-person, conference/seminar/workshop</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day, in-person, conference/seminar/workshop</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ days in-person, conference/seminar/workshop</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video conference</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streaming video</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live webcast</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streaming audio or podcast</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asynchronous online workshop</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit course – traditional</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit course – distance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-study course</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded conference/workshop/seminar</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript of conference/workshop/seminar</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The in-person workshop, conference or seminar was the most common format of continuing education used by survey respondents, although slightly over 40% reported participating in live webcasts. The MLS degree holders surveyed were more likely to have taken part in both of these CE formats. Newer streaming and push technologies such as Podcasting and Blogging have not been used by the majority of survey respondents. Cross tabulations of responses by state and ACRL affiliation will be available in the near future.
Table 10: Types of CE formats PREFERRED by survey respondents (Q6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CE Format</th>
<th>Strongly do not prefer</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>No preference either way</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Strongly prefer</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>½ day, in-person, conference/seminar/workshop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day, in-person, conference/seminar/workshop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ days in-person, conference/seminar/workshop</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video conference</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streaming video</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live webcast</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streaming audio or podcast</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asynchronous online workshop</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit course – traditional</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit course – distance</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-study course</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded conference/workshop/seminar</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript of conference/workshop/seminar</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Anticipated amount of time devoted to CE activities in 2006 (Q7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have time to devote to continuing education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-day to one day</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two days</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One week</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two weeks or more</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vast majority of survey respondents (76.9 %) anticipated being able to devote two days or more to continuing education activities; and, more than half (52%) anticipated spending one week or more devoted to continuing education in 2006.

Table 12: Types of institutional support for continuing education (Q8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no support available</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release time</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary coverage at work</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration/tuition fee coverage</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation cost coverage</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging expense coverage</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal expense coverage</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the “other” ways cited were encouragement/moral support, partial reimbursement of fees/travel/lodging, use of work time for participating in webcasts and other forms of online training. The response frequency among MLS degree holders (n=146) did not vary substantially. 4.1 % reported receiving no support for continuing education, 82.9% reported receiving release time to attend CE events, 84.9% are reimbursed for registration expenses, and 72.6 % are reimbursed by their institution for transportation. However, a higher percentage of MLS degree holders reported reimbursement for lodging (65.1 %) and meals (62.3 %) compared with the general survey population. A cross-tabulation of the data by state will be available in the near future.
Table 13: Level of Interest in CE activities on the following topics: (Q9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Moderately Interested</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Extremely interested</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access services</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives, etc.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment (e.g., needs, outcomes)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging/Metadata/XML</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection development</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital initiatives</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging information technologies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional design/course management systems</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library instruction/Information literacy</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; leadership</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; community outreach</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation &amp; conservation</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference services (including learning commons)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials management</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s studies</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 15 topic categories presented, the following three garnered the highest level of interest: Reference services (including Learning Commons), Emerging information technologies, and Library Instruction and Information Literacy. Among the categories in which at least 60% of survey respondents were “moderately interested” or more are: Reference (73.4%), Emerging information technologies (72.4%), Library instruction (72.4%), Management & leadership (70.1%), Digital initiatives (67.6%), Instructional design/course management systems (67.6%), Collection development (67.5%), Assessment (66.2%), and Marketing (61.7%). Not surprisingly, the level of interest in reference, library instruction and instructional design topics reflects the relatively high percentage (26.7%) of survey respondents who identified Reference as their primary area of responsibility. Conversely, although a relatively small percentage of respondents identified systems (6.7%) or administration (13.8%) as their primary responsibility, information technology, management, leadership, assessment and marketing topics still rated highly among the majority of respondents.
Survey respondents overwhelmingly expressed the desire for continuing education events to be hosted closer to home. Over 75% (n=170) of respondents expressed a preference for sponsorship of CE events by smaller, regional groups. Similarly, offering programs at more than 1 location within the region was preferred by over 70% of respondents. Among the 3 broadcast options presented for the annual conference, recorded access faired the best (46%) followed by live webcast (40.3%). A follow up question asked those completing the survey to choose the one option from question 10 in which they would be most interested (tabulation below).

### Table 14: Preferred formats for broadcast of annual conference and new program initiatives (Q10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blogcast of ACRL/NEC’s annual 1-day conference</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live webcast of ACRL/NEC’s annual 1-day conference</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded access to ACRL/NEC’s annual 1-day conference</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth conferences/workshops/seminars that run at least 2 days</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller regional groups that sponsor conferences/workshops/seminars</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An e-journal to facilitate publishing opportunities on a local level</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juried paper competitions</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs offered at state library association conferences</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs offered at more than one location in the region</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A database of CE opportunities in the region</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A database listing professionals in the region willing to share expertise in specific areas</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15: Of the items checked in Question 10, please choose the one in which you would be most interested (Q11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blogcast of ACRL/NEC’s annual 1-day conference</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live webcast of ACRL/NEC’s annual 1-day conference</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded access to ACRL/NEC’s annual 1-day conference</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth conferences/workshops/seminars that run at least 2 days</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller regional groups that sponsor conferences/workshops/seminars</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An e-journal to facilitate publishing opportunities on a local level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juried paper competitions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs offered at state library association conferences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs offered at more than one location in the region</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A database of CE opportunities in the region</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A database listing professionals in the region willing to share expertise in specific areas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>100.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 16: Distance for a 1-day program that would be so great you would probably not go (check all that apply) (Q12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amherst, MA</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester, MA</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta, ME</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, ME</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord, NH</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover, NH</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keene, NH</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington, VT</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebury, VT</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of respondents who indicated they would not likely travel to the specified locations dropped dramatically when the length of the conference or program increased from 1 to 2 days. For example, Augusta, ME, the location deemed least desirable for a 1-day program fared much better (41.6% (n=94)) for a 2-day program. These results correlate to the stated preference by participants in the exploratory interviews of having more multiple day programs. A breakdown of responses by state will be available in the near future.

**Table 17: Distance for a 2-day program that would be so great you would probably not go (check all that apply) (Q13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amherst, MA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester, MA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta, ME</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, ME</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord, NH</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover, NH</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keene, NH</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington, VT</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlebury, VT</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18: If unable to attend a program, what ways would you find most useful for accessing its proceedings and materials (check 3 items at most)? (Q14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Response Frequency</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live webcast</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog(s)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archived copies of conference papers and presentations</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Board</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live chat room(s)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videoconferencing</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podcast(s)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principal Research Questions for Survey:

Q1. What are the factors that influence participation in continuing education (CE) programs for academic/research librarians located in northern New England (Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine) and western Massachusetts?

Q2. What information and communication resources do academic/research librarians in northern New England and western Massachusetts use to obtain information about CE opportunities?

Q3. What are the types of continuing educational formats preferred by academic/research librarians located in northern New England and western Massachusetts?

Q4. What are the topics for CE programs or courses that academic/research librarians located in northern New England and western Massachusetts would be likely to participate in during the next 18 months?

Q5. Would greater access to the type of CE content and program delivery format indicated by survey respondent increase the likelihood of his or her membership in ACRL/NEC if not already a member?

Summary of Exploratory Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Vermont (a)</th>
<th>Vermont (b)</th>
<th>New Hampshire</th>
<th>Maine (a)</th>
<th>Maine (b)</th>
<th>Western Massachusetts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE program participation &amp; experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- On-line copyright class</td>
<td>Worst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ACRU/NEC Annual Program '05</td>
<td>Best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ACRL/National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educause</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NELINET</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ACRL-Harvard Leadership Institute</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Innovative Interfaces</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NELA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NERCOMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NELIG</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ACRL Immersion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ALA Pre-conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ACRL webcast</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dartmouth conference</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations: Interviewees reported disappointment with recent on-line courses & webcasts; stated preference for face-to-face contact and networking with live sessions; preference for technology (if not live) with video component for visual connection with speakers/audience; seek out sessions with practitioners, hands-on exercises, & experts who are exciting presenters; use CE to address sense isolation when there are no local colleagues in specific functional area (e.g., preservation).
**B. Factors affecting CE decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vermont (a)</th>
<th>Vermont (b)</th>
<th>New Hampshire</th>
<th>Maine (a)</th>
<th>Maine (b)</th>
<th>Western Massachusetts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content &amp; program 'meatiness'</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple day sessions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance (proximity)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing load &amp; release time</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program cost (incl. registration/hotel/food)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing during AY</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group rates for hotels &amp; receptions</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Observations:* Given length of travel time required, overall preference seemed to be for longer sessions (depending on location, even a 1-day may not be worth the time: “1 day in Worcester is a 3 day commitment”); stated desire for multi-day programs (e.g., 2 to 3 day sessions) at end of week. School breaks (e.g., late May-early June), summer session, times when hotels offer discount rates may be better times to schedule multi-day events. Also consider “circuit programs” (include vendors & "expert" librarians) that travel to different locations.

**C. Communication channels for CE programs awareness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vermont (a)</th>
<th>Vermont (b)</th>
<th>New Hampshire</th>
<th>Maine (a)</th>
<th>Maine (b)</th>
<th>Western Massachusetts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listservs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites (&amp; calendars)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailings</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-O-M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Observations:* Listservs appear to be primary & preferred channel; snail mailing may also work to prevent forgetting registration deadline; use active communication vehicles (e.g., RSS feed, tickler mailings) to create program awareness. One librarian noted that websites were useful only if she remembered to check there.

**D. Support for CE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vermont (a)</th>
<th>Vermont (b)</th>
<th>New Hampshire</th>
<th>Maine (a)</th>
<th>Maine (b)</th>
<th>Western Massachusetts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library release time</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to professional development funds</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library staff development plan</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal funding</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>discouraged</td>
<td>not needed</td>
<td>assoc fees</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Observations:* No staff development plans reported; librarians supplement access to professional development (CE) funds with personal funds. One librarian noted that support for CE is different than reward system for CE – librarians may be motivated when tied to development plan, tenure process, otherwise dependant on individual.
E. Individuals’ suggestions for program content & SIGs:
- Back to basics workshops (e.g., weeding, genealogy)
- Learning styles & learning outcomes program with learning theory experts and practicing librarians, especially those associated with learning commons
- Program on the ‘nuances’ associated with gov’t docs (fed & state)
- Information Commons SIG
- Management & Leadership Development SIG

Observations: Consider multiple day programs with ‘competency’ tracks (e.g., summer camps).

F. Individuals’ Ideas for the developing & delivering ACRL/NEC programs:
- Offer workshops in multiple locations
- Facilitate “sub-regional” group coalescing & program offers (e.g., Maine & New Hampshire, Vermont groups)
- Have a “welcome wagon” contact for newcomers
- Sponsor competitions for research papers
- Identify local experts in content areas (e.g., develop database of individuals who can provide advice/consulting in specialized areas)
- Take seminars to libraries
- Explore Polycom-like media for conference access
- Develop regional meeting centers
- Connect programs with those of state and local organizations
- Offer programs via satellite transmissions
- Sponsor ‘juried’ research paper competition at ACRL/NEC annual meeting (research mentoring for publication)
- Create e-journal to offer local publishing opportunities

Observations: Focus of ACRL/NEC current program activities is on practice; consider adding research & publishing to chapter’s agenda; recent joint program development activity with MLA may be useful model for working with other state associations.

G. Membership & program participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vermont (a)</th>
<th>Vermont (b)</th>
<th>New Hampshire</th>
<th>Maine (a)</th>
<th>Maine (b)</th>
<th>Western Massachusetts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACRL national member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACRL/NEC member</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...thru ACRL National affiliation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>not active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...local chapter only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACRL/NEC program participation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>presenter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Needs Assessment Survey (Coded copy)

1. How many continuing education activities did you participate in during 2005? These can include courses, conferences, workshops, seminars, institutes, webcasts, and self-study programs in which you participated to keep abreast of what's happening in the library profession.
   1. 0
   2. 1-3
   3. 4-6
   4. 7-9
   5. 10 or more

2. Which communication resources do you most like to use to get information about continuing education opportunities? (please check three items at most)
   1. E-mail, listservs
   2. Blogs
   3. Colleagues
   4. Supervisor(s)
   5. Journals
   6. Web sites
   7. RSS news feeds
   8. Brochures and flyers
   9. Newsletters
   10. Other (please specify) ________________________

3. How important is each of the following factors in your choice of continuing education offerings?
   A1 Content Not at all important
   A2 Educational format (e.g., in-person, seminar, distance course) ...
   A3 Opportunity for networking Moderately important
   A4 Length (e.g., half-day, 1-day, 2+ days) ...
   A5 Time of year when offered Extremely important
   A6 Attractiveness of location
   A7 Day(s) in week when offered (e.g., weekdays, weekend)
   A8 Registration/tuition fee
   A9 Travel distance
   A10 Transportation cost
   A11 Lodging expense
   A12 Meal expense
   A13 Reputation of speaker(s)/instructor(s)

4. What other factors in addition to those listed above are important to you in choosing a continuing education offering?
   1. None
   2. Please specify ________________________

5. Which types of continuing education formats have you used? (check all that apply)
   1. Half-day, in-person, conference/workshop/seminar
   2. 1 day, in-person, conference/workshop/seminar
   3. 2+ days, in-person, conference/workshop/seminar
   4. Teleconference
   5. Videoconference
   6. Streaming video
   7. Live webcast
   8. Blog
   9. Streaming audio or podcast
6. Which of these same types of continuing education formats do you prefer to use?
   A1  Half-day, in-person, conference/workshop/seminar  Strongly do not prefer
   A2  1 day, in-person, conference/workshop/seminar  ...
   A3  2+ days, in-person, conference/workshop/seminar  No preference either way
   A4  Teleconference  ...
   A5  Videoconference  Strongly prefer
   A6  Streaming video
   A7  Live webcast
   A8  Blog
   A9  Streaming audio or podcast
   A10 Asynchronous online workshop
   A11 Credit course - traditional
   A12 Credit course - distance
   A13 Self-study course
   A14 Recorded conference/workshop/seminar
   A15 Transcript of conference/workshop/seminar

7. How much total time can you devote to continuing education activities in 2006?
   1  I don't know
   2  I don't have time to devote to continuing education
   3  Half-day to one day
   4  Two days
   5  One week
   6  Two weeks or more

8. What type of support for continuing education is available to you at your institution? (check all that apply)
   1  There is no support available
   2  Release time
   3  Temporary coverage at work
   4  Registration/tuition fee coverage
   5  Transportation cost coverage
   6  Lodging expense coverage
   7  Meal expense coverage
   8  Other (please specify) _________________________________
9. How interested are you in participating in continuing education activities on topics in the following areas?

- A1 Access services
- A2 Archives, special collections, records management
- A3 Assessment (e.g., needs, outcomes)
- A4 Cataloging/metadata/XML
- A5 Collection development
- A6 Digital initiatives
- A7 Emerging information technologies
- A8 Instructional design & course management systems
- A9 Library instruction & information literacy
- A10 Management & leadership
- A11 Marketing & community outreach
- A12 Preservation & conservation
- A13 Reference services (including learning commons)
- A14 Serials management
- A15 Women's studies

10. The Association of College and Research Libraries/New England Chapter (ACRL/NEC) is considering a number of different formats for making its annual 1-day conference available to librarians in the region. It also is considering a number of new program initiatives that might better address their continuing education needs. From the following list, please check all those that would be of interest to you.

- 1 a. Blogcast of ACRL/NEC's annual 1-day conference
- 2 b. Live webcast of ACRL/NEC's annual 1-day conference
- 3 c. Recorded access to ACRL/NEC's annual 1-day conference
- 4 d. In-depth conferences/workshops/seminars that run at least 2 days
- 5 e. Smaller regional groups that sponsor conferences/workshops/seminars
- 6 f. An e-journal to facilitate publishing opportunities on a local level
- 7 g. Juried paper competitions
- 8 h. Programs offered at state library association conferences
- 9 i. Programs offered at more than one location in the region
- 10 j. A database listing continuing education opportunities in the region
- 11 k. A database listing professionals in the region willing to share their expertise in specific areas
- 12 l. Other (please specify) ___________________________________

11. Of the items you checked in Question 10, please choose the one in which you would be most interested by selecting its corresponding letter from the list below:

Most interested in ___________________________________

12. Suppose ACRL/NEC were to offer a 1 day program on a topic in which you were interested. Which of the following locations would be so great a distance from you that you would probably decide NOT to go? (check all that apply)

1 Amherst, MA
2 Boston, MA
3 Worcester, MA
4 Augusta, ME
5 Portland, ME
6 Concord NH
7 Hanover, NH
8 Keene, NH
9 Burlington, VT
10 Middlebury, VT
13. Suppose ACRL/NEC were to offer a 2 day program on a topic in which you were interested. Which of the following locations would be so great a distance from you that you would still probably decide NOT to go? (check all that apply)
   1. Amherst, MA
   2. Boston, MA
   3. Worcester, MA
   4. Augusta, ME
   5. Portland, ME
   6. Concord NH
   7. Hanover, NH
   8. Keene, NH
   9. Burlington, VT
   10. Middlebury, VT

14. Suppose you were unable to attend a program in which you were interested. What ways would you find most useful for accessing its proceedings and materials? (check three items at most)
   1. Live webcast
   2. Blog(s)
   3. Archived copies of conference papers & presentations
   4. Discussion board
   5. Live chat room(s)
   6. Videoconferencing
   7. Podcast(s)
   8. Other (please specify) ___________________________________________________________________

15. In which professional organizations are you a member? (check all that apply)
   1. None
   2. American Library Association
   3. Association of College and Research Libraries
   5. Maine Library Association
   6. Massachusetts Library Association
   7. New England Library Association
   8. New Hampshire Library Association
   9. Vermont Library Association
   10. Other (please specify) ___________________________________________________________________

16. Which category best describes your current employment classification?
   1. Support staff (includes technology support)
   2. Professional librarian
   3. Professional librarian with management or supervisory responsibilities
   4. Administrator

17. Which category best describes your primary responsibilities?
   1. Access services (includes ILL)
   2. Reference (includes instruction and outreach)
   3. Technical services (includes cataloging, metadata, serials, preservation)
   4. Acquisitions (includes bibliographic & collection development)
   5. Systems (includes digital and information technology)
   6. Special collections (includes archives, rare books, historical collections)
   7. Library administration
   8. Other (please specify) ___________________________________________________________________
18. What a) undergraduate and b) graduate/professional degrees have you completed? (check degree(s) in each category as appropriate)
   a) Undergraduate
      1 Associates degree
      2 Bachelors degree
   b) Graduate / Professional
      3 Library science degree (e.g., MLS, MLIS)
      4 Other Masters degree (e.g., MA, MS, MBA)
      5 Doctoral degree (e.g., PhD, DBA)
      6 Professional degree (e.g., JD, MD)

19. Which institution type best describes the college or university at which you work?
   Institution type ________________________________

20. In what state is the college or university at which you work located?
   State ________________________________

Q. Comments
   We invite your comments on how the New England Chapter of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL/NEC) might better meet the continuing education needs of academic librarians in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and western Massachusetts.

   ______________________________________________
   ______________________________________________
   ______________________________________________

Thank you for completing this survey.