ABSTRACT
The convergence of libraries, archives, and museums (LAM) presents critical challenges to professional education. This panel introduces early results of a survey that explores the formal and informal relationships among LIS, archival studies, and museum studies programs. These results will serve as a starting point for a discussion about the qualitative dimensions of these relationships and how they present opportunities and challenges for students, faculty, and the field of LAM education.
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INTRODUCTION
During the past decade, increasing attention has been paid to the convergence of libraries, archives, and museums (LAM) as cultural organizations — through articles, conferences, workshops, and themed issues of *Library Quarterly* (80:1), *Museum Management and Curatorship* (24:4), and *Archival Science* (8:4). These conversations frequently center on the affordances of digital media to integrate collections and encourage institutional collaboration across the “silos of the LAMs” (Marty, 2008; Zorich, Waibel, & Erway, 2008; Tennis, 2012b). Digital tools and techniques are also shaping the competencies needed to successfully fulfill professional roles within libraries, archives, and museums (Marty & Burton Jones, 2008; Marty, 2007a, 2007b).

These changing needs have led researchers to turn their attention to the convergence of educational programs in library and information science (LIS), archival studies, and museum studies. Archival education has a lengthy history of integration within the LIS curriculum (Cox & Larsen, 2008). This integration has been accelerated by the need to deal with electronic records and long-term management of digital data (Constantopoulos & Dallas, 2008; Tibbo & Lee, 2010; Tennis, 2012a). While some museum studies programs have introduced courses that address 21st-century skills, additional research is needed to better understand models for integrating LAM educational curricula (Duff et al., 2009; Duff, Cherry, & Sheffield, 2010; Marty & Twidale, 2011). Thanks to tangible examples of institutional convergence and increasing professional awareness of the need for digital skills, educators are striving to understand the educational needs of the field (Marty & Twidale, 2011; Ray, 2009; Tibbo & Duff, 2008; Tibbo & Lee, 2010). Emerging frameworks, such as Lee’s (2009) *Matrix of Digital Curation Knowledge and Competencies* and Tennis’ (2006) Information Organization Framework are addressing the need to identify relevant theory and praxis across different cultural heritage contexts. This panel will continue the conversation about the opportunities and challenges of connecting library and information science, archival studies, and museum studies educational programs and communities.

AGENDA AND ACTIVITIES
This panel is organized around the results of a survey that documents the current formal and informal relationships among LIS, archival studies, and museum studies programs in North America. It builds on prior work that examined how LAM programs are collaborating to produce students capable of meeting the needs of 21st century cultural heritage organizations (Duff et al., 2010; Marty & Twidale, 2011). Invitations to participate were sent to 58 ALA accredited LIS schools and 24 responses are currently undergoing analysis. The survey captures current factual information such as:

- nature and duration of relationships among LAM programs and faculty.
- division of responsibility for programs, degrees, or certificates.
- informal cooperative relationships among programs.
- number of students engaged across different programs.
The results of this survey will inform a discussion about the qualitative dimensions of the relationships among LAM educational programs. The panel and attendees are invited to engage in a facilitated discussion around the following questions:

1. What are the current/future relationships among LAM programs at your university?
2. What are the perceived benefits of relationships among LAM educational programs for students, faculty, and the larger LAM community?
3. How are the benefits of this relationship manifested and/or evaluated? (i.e. joint degrees/certificates, student internships, interdisciplinary research and grants, etc.)
4. What are the disadvantages and/or hindrances to relationships among LAM programs?
5. What opportunities and challenges exist for closer relationships among LAM programs?
6. Who is the champion for convergence among LIS, archival studies, and museum studies programs?
7. What would the ideal LAM program look like?

Outcomes
Understanding the current scope and nature of the relationships among LAM educational programs can help the community make important decisions about its future direction. As researchers, we hope that the discussion leads to the development of a renewed research agenda that examines how LAM educational programs can best coordinate activities for the benefit of all stakeholders.

ORGANIZERS
Paul F. Marty is an Associate Professor in the School of Library and Information Studies within the College of Communication of Information at Florida State University. His research focuses on digital convergence and the evolving roles of information professionals in libraries, archives, and museums.

Laura Edythe Coleman is a graduate research assistant at Florida State University. Her research focuses on the co-creation of collective and individual identities in museums.

PARTICIPANTS
In preparing this proposal, the organizers have contacted faculty with demonstrated research and teaching interests at the intersection of LIS, archival, and museum studies programs. The following individuals have indicated an interest in participating in the session if approved:

- Costis Dallas, Director
  Museum Studies
  Faculty of Information
  University of Toronto
- Kris Morrissey, Director
  Museology Program
  University of Washington
- Wilson O’Donnell, Associate Director
  Museology Program
  University of Washington
  & AAM Committee on Museum Training (COMT)
- Joe Tennis, Associate Professor
  School of Information
  University of Washington
- Helen Tibbo
  School of Information and Library Science
  University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- Michael B. Twidale
  Graduate School of Library and Information Science
  University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
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