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Introduction

Archives that hold audiovisual materials need to take immediate action to safeguard at-risk media formats before the content they contain is lost forever. Yet, many in the cultural heritage communities do not have sufficient education and training in how to manage and preserve AV materials. The AV Competency Framework Working Group, which consists of concerned archive educators, practitioners, and students, aims to develop a set of competencies for audiovisual archive training of students in graduate level education programs and professionals in continuing education settings. Competencies are being developed via research into the current theories and practices of the field, using a variety of relevant data sources.

Using content analysis methods, Gracy recently analyzed multiple data sources to generate high-level and middle-level competencies for the moving image archiving field. She deduced high-level competencies from competencies and guidelines found in archives such as, conservation, and library science to determine their relevance to the audiovisual archiving and assess how they may contribute to development of AV-specific competencies. She also consulted AV-specific competencies found in key literature. For middle-level competencies, she analyzed several data sets, including ten years of conference programs (including session abstracts) from the Association of Moving Image Archivists, the International Association of Sound and Audiovisual Archives, and the Society of American Archivists, as well as program and course catalog descriptions from six graduate-level degree programs with a focus on AV archiving.

In this poster Gracy presents initial results from these analyses and explores how her results will be combined with results generated from research of other Working Group members on syllabi contents (Ceja and Schutzman) and employment advertisements (Benoit). She also outlines future work to build, test, and refine competencies using interviews, focus groups, and other protocols.

Methods of Data Collection and Analysis

Data sources included:

• 11 competency sets and educational guidelines from U.S. and international professional associations in the US, archival, museum, and conservation fields.
• 2 key texts relating to audiovisual archiving education (Edmondson and Harrison).
• Program and course information from 6 graduate-level audiovisual archiving programs (Charles Sturt University, George Eastman House, NYU, Ryerson, UCLA, University of Amsterdam).
• 15 years of conference program abstracts for the annual meeting of the Association of Moving Image Archivists (2004-2018).

This research involved content analysis of each document containing competency statements using qualitative data analysis software (NVIVO). Activities included:

• Tagging each topic or skill found in each document
• Grouping similar tags together and merging categories as needed to combine similar topics or skills
• Organizing them in a hierarchical fashion to identify competency groupings with broader scope and the more specific competencies that belong to those groupings
• Identifying patterns across disciplines to see how different archivists share certain competencies, and which competencies are specific to particular fields.

Results

Phase 1 Results: 322 initial nodes (tags) generated during coding of competency sets and guidelines. Nodes were then consolidated and organized into a hierarchical structure. After reorganization, the hierarchy features 19 top-level nodes, which correspond to high-level competencies for eight allied cultural heritage professions:

1. Accession and deposit of materials
2. Allied and complemented disciplines
3. Appraisal and selection
4. Assessment and evaluation of services and their outcomes
5. Classification, cataloging, arrangement, and description
6. Collection management
7. Communication, collaboration, and outreach
8. Concepts of archival theory, methodology, and practice
9. Format knowledge
10. History of cultural heritage institutions and the professions
11. Information science
12. Legal issues, concerns, and responsibilities
13. Literacies (digital, information, technological)
14. Management and administration
15. Original and applied research
16. Preservation and conservation
17. Professional and social responsibilities
18. Soft skills (people skills)
19. Technology (app. to cultural heritage work)

Phase 2 Results: 157 nodes (tags) were generated during coding of academic program/course descriptions. Nodes were organized under the 19 top-level nodes generated from phase 1. After the initial coding and sorting process, the hierarchy is more complete, but coverage is uneven. The following are the “top ten”:

• Preservation and conservation (50 sub-nodes, 1,141 coding instances in all documents)
• Communication, collaboration, and outreach (17 sub-nodes, 476 coding instances)
• Cataloging, classification, arrangement and description (18 sub-nodes, 343 coding instances)
• Collection management (15 sub-nodes, 311 coding instances)
• Management and administration (16 sub-nodes, 267 coding instances)
• Technology (Application to cultural heritage work) (12 sub-nodes, 240 coding instances)
• Information science (5 sub-nodes, 274 coding instances)
• Format knowledge (9 sub-nodes, 264 coding instances)
• Allied and complementary disciplines (15 sub-nodes, 232 coding instances)
• Social and professional responsibilities (4 sub-nodes, 194 coding instances)

Limitations of the Study

Current high-level and mid-level competencies underrepresent necessary knowledge in the following areas:

• Media histories and moving image and sound production technologies
• Assessment and evaluation of services and their outcomes
• Information science, particularly relating to information systems and aspects of search for AV Materials
• Soft skills (People skills, social skills, communication skills)
• Hand skills (handling, cleaning, treatments, repairs)

More variation and level of specificity from various programs and perspectives are needed to fill in the gaps:

• 8 additional graduate programs to be added (mostly international);
• 14 MLIS programs with relevant courses to be added;
• Dozens of continuing education offerings from associations and universities to be added.

These results must be aligned with analyses of recent job ads, syllabi, and professional communication (research done by other working group members). After alignment of these data sources, the results will also need to be validated by instructors, employers, practitioners, and students.

Next Steps to Fill in the Gaps

• Additional data collection and analysis:
  • Program and course data from other graduate and CE Providers
  • Syllabi and job advertisements (Ceja/Schutzman and Benoit)
  • Identification of core knowledge, building out of specialized knowledge areas:
    • Further analysis of key texts and professional communications (e.g., newsletters, proceedings, reports)
  • Establishing competency levels:
    • Match competencies to levels of expertise and to particular needs of learners at different stages of education and training
  • Community checks:
    • Interviews and focus groups with educators, employers, practitioners, and students to gather feedback
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