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This study evaluated how museums help their employees return to workplace normalcy after a natural disaster affects their institution and professional lives, and to address what policies they used to facilitate this transition. The study focused on three key policies: disaster/emergency preparedness plans, business continuity plans, and employee assistance programs (EAPs). Recently, the museum field has pushed for their organizations to develop and implement a disaster preparedness plan as a core institutional policy. While museum disaster preparedness plans are effective in encompassing mitigation, response, and recovery actions for artifacts, they rarely include guidelines for how museum employees are regarded during the recovery phase of the disaster plan. Natural disasters create high levels of stress which can affect worker productivity, and can lead to high employee absenteeism and turnover. Business continuity plans and EAPs can offer a means to address this thesis, as employees are considered a mission-critical resource. A questionnaire was sent to 80 midsize, California museums in the Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco Bay areas. The majority of museums (79%) indicated that they had a disaster preparedness plan in place, but not a business continuity plan (14%) or an employee assistance program (30%). Results concluded that museums are not utilizing these policies to help employees return to workplace normalcy.
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Glossary

**Absenteeism** – frequent withdrawal behavior where employees rather not confront work related stress and therefore do not come into work, resulting in an unexcused or unauthorized absence.

**Business Continuity/Resiliency Plan** – a series of procedures to restore normal operations following a disaster.

**Crisis** – an "upset" in an individual's baseline level of functioning and is generally thought to last no more than 4-6 weeks.

**Disaster Planning** – a process that takes place during and after a crisis, which is established to minimize interruption and help the organization recover by restoring some of its normal functioning as quickly and seamlessly as possible.

**Disaster/Emergency Preparedness Plan** – a series of written policies and procedures that prevent or minimize damage resulting from disasters (either man-made or natural) and help a museum recover.

**Distress** – a stressor that is associated with negative well-being.

**Employee Assistance Program** – employer-sponsored programs designed to alleviate and assist in eliminating a variety of workplace problems.

**Employee Burnout** – when an employee is physically or emotionally exhausted from prolonged stress or frustration.

**Emergency** – an unpredictable, acute situation that demands an immediate response.

**Eustress** – a stressor that is associated with positive well-being.

**Mission-critical** – an activity, device, service or system whose failure or disruption will cause a failure in business operations.

**Natural Disaster** – a large-scale natural event that causes potential damage and loss of life.

**Stress** – external pressures that produce strain within individuals.

**Trauma** – an emotional response to an extreme event like a natural disaster.

**Voluntary Employee Turnover** – the number of employees who voluntarily leave or quit an organization and are replaced by new employees.

**Workplace Normalcy** – the return to a normal work environment after a disaster.
Chapter One: Introduction

The purpose of this study is to evaluate how museums help their employees return to workplace normalcy after a natural disaster impacts the institution and address what policies museums use to facilitate this transition. The study will focus on three policies: disaster/emergency preparedness plans, business continuity plans, and employee assistance programs.

Disaster/emergency preparedness plans (disaster plans) are a series of written policies and procedures that prevent or minimize damage resulting from disasters to help a museum recover.¹ Disaster planning documents published by leading organizations in the field, such as the American Alliance of Museums (AAM), International Council of Museums (ICOM), and the Getty Conservation Institute focus disaster planning efforts to protect the artifacts they house; however, there is little focus and mention on how museums address the well-being of their employees after a natural disaster affects their institution.² These disaster planning guides mention that the safety of visitors and staff are their top priority.³ However, what happens beyond their initial safety is rarely discussed.⁴

Business continuity plans are a series of procedures to restore normal operations following a disaster.⁵ There is debate about the term itself as it applies to non-profits because non-profits do not view themselves as businesses.⁶ However, as natural disasters continue to

---

² See American Alliance of Museums, International Council of Museums, and Dorge and Jones. All are guides and standards for museum disaster planning.
³ Ibid
⁴ Ibid.
occur, there is a need to consider business continuity planning, especially since it is considered an “underutilized tool”.7

Employee assistance programs, also known as EAPs, are employer-sponsored programs designed to alleviate and assist in eliminating a variety of workplace problems.8 The occurrence of natural disasters in the workplace create stress within employees, and EAPs are becoming an avenue to help them cope with the stressors of disaster.9 While the amount of EAP efficacy research is thin, current studies show that EAPs can be beneficial and effective to the employees who choose to use them.10

Awareness of natural disasters occurring is increasing in today’s society and the wake of their destruction is known to bring communities together.11 After the devastation after Hurricane Katrina in 2005, and more recently with Hurricane Sandy in 2012, museums and cultural institutions started to recognize the need to worry about disaster planning and cultural property protection.12 According to Ready.gov, the United States Department of Homeland Security’s disaster preparedness website, natural disasters “affect thousands of people every year.”13 In California, the frequency of a natural disaster is higher than other areas in the United States.14 According to a study by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Los Angeles

---

7 Doughty, Business Continuity Planning, 9.
County has had 53 natural disasters since 1964\textsuperscript{15} and averages, “a little more than one disaster per year.”\textsuperscript{16} For these reasons, California was chosen as the geographical location to conduct the study.

The trauma from natural disasters not only impact individuals but also impact communities and organizations.\textsuperscript{17} Museums are regarded as keystones of local communities\textsuperscript{18} and centers of informal education.\textsuperscript{19} Museum staff are a driving force for museums and their missions, thus mission functionality depends on them.\textsuperscript{20}

\textbf{Methods Overview}

To address the research goals, this study distributed an online questionnaire to 80 California museums. The questionnaire was comprised of 22 questions. Organizations were selected based on the following criteria:

- Located in either the Los Angeles, San Diego, or San Francisco Bay areas;
- A non-profit organization;
- Annual budget between $400,000 and $4 million.

Fifteen questions were close-ended, using dichotomous and scaled questions with a contingency format. The other seven questions were unstructured and open-ended.

\textsuperscript{16} Ingraham, “Earthquakes, floods, and volcanoes: The most disaster-prone places in America,”
\textsuperscript{17} Ursano, Fullerton, and McCaughey, “Trauma and Disaster,” in \textit{Individual and Community Responses to Trauma and Disaster: The Structure of Human Chaos} edited by Ursano, Fullerton, and McCaughey, 1947, 5.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

This literature review draws on research from museology, psychology of disasters, business continuity planning, and employee assistance programs to provide a comprehensive understanding of the literature relevant to the research questions.

Museology

There is a plethora of “how-to” guides on how to build a disaster plan from many organizations such as the American Alliance of Museums (AAM), the International Council of Museums (ICOM), and the Getty Conservation Institute. According to the Getty Conservation Institute’s Building an Emergency Plan, there is a section that addresses the well-being of museum employees after suffering through a natural disaster at the institution. It says, “[t]aking care of yourself and your workers will help you better care for the collections after disaster strikes.”

The document states a need for debriefing and even involving a “local community mental health center [that] can help set up the debriefing and assist in incorporating crisis counseling into the plan.” The text also addresses the signs of stress employers should look for amongst their employees, such as fatigue, anger, and fear, which is key to the prevention of employee burnout. While the text does mention that a “human resource coordinator should be assigned to this role,” it does not address is how museums can incorporate these issues into the disaster plan in terms of where this information should be located within the plan. (See Appendix A).

---

22 Dorge and Jones, 85.
23 Dorge and Jones, 85.
24 Dorge and Jones, 85.
25 Dorge and Jones, 85.
In AAM’s “Developing a Disaster Preparedness/Emergency Response Plan,” the authors mention that museum disaster plans need to, “[address] staff, visitors, structures and collections.”26 In ICOM’s “Guidelines for Disaster Preparedness in Museums,” the authors mention that saving people is the top priority, but in the recovery process only mention to; “[p]lan and continue emergency services.”27

All three reviewed literatures for museology do acknowledge that staff and visitor safety is a top priority when responding to a disaster, but only the Getty Conservation Institute’s Building an Emergency Plan addresses employee well-being in the recovery stage.

Psychology of Disasters

Trauma in the workplace

Trauma and disasters are interconnected and Robert J. Ursano, Brian G. McCaughey, and Carol S. Fullerton in Individual and Community Responses to Trauma and Disaster, would describe it as, “a part of our everyday lives, despite our wishes.”28 Ursano et al. continues on to define traumatic events as they, “are recognized by the nature of the event, by the effects of the trauma on individuals and groups, and by the responses of individuals and groups to the event… They are marked by their extreme or sudden force, typically causing fear, anxiety, withdrawal, and avoidance.”29 In “The Ecstasy and the Agony: The Impact of Disaster and Trauma Work on the Self and the Clinician,” Amy Ehrlich Charney and Laurie Anne Pearlman link trauma and disasters by defining trauma as, “an inevitable component of disasters or crises, occurring

28 Ursano, Fullerton, and McCaughey, “Trauma and Disaster,” in Individual and Community Responses to Trauma and Disaster: The Structure of Human Chaos edited by Ursano, Fullerton, and McCaughey, 1947, 3.
29 Ursano, 5.
simultaneously within the individual and the community.⁹⁰ Like Ursano et al. Charney and Pearlman state that trauma affects the individual and the community.⁹¹

In Susan Klein and David Alexander’s “The impact of trauma within organisations [sic],” they says a work environment free of the fear of traumatic events leads to better productivity amongst employees.³² In “Trauma-organised [sic] systems and parallel process,” Sandra L. Bloom argues that trauma can be collective and not isolated to the individual because, “we are group animals, we identify with the institutions to which we are affiliated.”³³

**Emergency versus Crisis**

In Jay Callahan article, “Defining crisis and emergency,” he argues that we must make a difference between the definitions of *crisis* and *emergency*, because there is a lack of differentiation between the two in the mental health field.³⁴ Callahan defines *crisis* as; “an "upset" in an individual's baseline level of functioning - a disruption in homeostasis - and is generally thought to last no more than 4-6 weeks.”³⁵ He then defines *emergency* as a; “relatively unpredictable, acute situation that demands an immediate response. If no response is forthcoming, physical harm or serious biopsychosocial deterioration, with a poorer prognosis, may result.”³⁶ While the definitions are similar, the main difference between them is duration and time.³⁷

---

³⁵ Callahan, 166.
³⁶ Callahan, 167.
³⁷ Callahan, 168.
Effects of Stress

Susan Cartwright and Cary L. Cooper define stress in, *Managing Workplace Stress*, as external pressures and produce strain within individuals.\(^{38}\) They say stress can help increase performance by increasing blood supply to the brain and muscles, improve lung functions, and release glucose and fats into the bloodstream to help increase energy.\(^{39}\) However, Christine Dunning’s article, “Reducing Protective Service Worker Trauma through Preemployment Screening,” states this is only effective for short-term management, and is referred to as eustress.\(^{40}\) Similarly, Kelsey N. Parker and Jennifer M. Ragsdale regard eustress is a type of stressor and is associated with positive well-being, while distress is associated with negative well-being, in their article, “Effects of Distress and Eustress on Changes in Fatigue from Waking to Working.”\(^{41}\) According to Cartwright and Cooper, the lack of stress coping mechanisms only continues the stress response, which can become damaging to the body over time.\(^{42}\)

Eugene Schmuckler’s article, “Mental Health Considerations Following a Disaster,” states that distress can manifest itself in multiple ways with “emotional, cognitive, physical, and interpersonal effects.”\(^{43}\) In *Public Health Management of Disasters: The Practice Guide*, Linda Young Landesman goes into detail about the approximate chronological timeline of distress reactions, stating that shock as a symptom of trauma, occurs immediately after and can last from a few minutes to a few hours, and during the following days victims may feel grateful for

---

39 Cartwright and Cooper, 7.
42 Cartwright and Cooper, 7-8.
assistance and/or feel survivor’s guilt.\textsuperscript{44} She continues, saying, over the next several weeks, victims usually seek out others affected and seek assistance for recovery, and distressful symptoms in victims may include, “anger, emotional numbing, or a dissociation,” with cognitive symptoms including, “impaired memory, concentration, and decision-making ability.”\textsuperscript{45} Landesman notes long-term symptoms lead to risks in decreased self-esteem and self-sufficiency, with physical and somatic manifestations like insomnia, fatigue, headaches, and reduced appetite.\textsuperscript{46}

Cartwright and Cooper say stress amongst multiple employees can cause high absenteeism, high labor turnover, and poor quality control of work completed.\textsuperscript{47} In Michael T. Matteson and John M. Ivancevich’s book,\textit{ Controlling Work Stress: Effective Human Resource and Management Strategies}, they say absenteeism is a withdrawal behavior where employees would rather not confront work related stress and therefore do not come into work.\textsuperscript{48}

\textit{Coping Mechanisms}

Landesman states that normal behaviors and reactions to natural disasters, such as increased stress reactions, are expected.\textsuperscript{49} Commonly, people who experience trauma report the experience had a positive impact on their lives, according to Dunning.\textsuperscript{50} Landesman states that while some individuals do experience extreme stress, they “generally do not lead to chronic problems,” but should not be ignored by public health professionals.\textsuperscript{51} She goes on to say,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{45} Landesman, 99-100.
\item \textsuperscript{46} Landesman, 100.
\item \textsuperscript{47} Cartwright and Cooper, 14.
\item \textsuperscript{50} Dunning, “Reducing Protective Service…” 27.
\item \textsuperscript{51} Landesman, 99.
\end{itemize}
“counselors can help speed recovery and prevent long-term problems by providing information about normal reactions and educating victims about ways to handle these reactions.”

According to Schmuckler, there are three different coping mechanisms people use after a disaster: cognitive, emotional, and problem focused coping (See Table 1 below). He says that “personal recovery of the individual is a direct function of the coping mechanisms used by the [worker].” These groupings include positive and negative coping mechanisms, such as what is considered a healthy way of coping (positive) and an unhealthy way of coping (negative).

Table 1 – Categories of Coping Mechanisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Coping</th>
<th>Negative Coping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Logically analyzing impact</td>
<td>• Avoiding thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trying to prioritize efforts and needs</td>
<td>• Forgetting it happened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentally rehearsing</td>
<td>• Denying the impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Options – Making decisions using coping and imagery</td>
<td>• Having wishful thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Experiencing self-attrition or self-blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accepting and tolerating</td>
<td>• Suppressing emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experiencing a range of emotions</td>
<td>• Having emotional outbursts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regulating emotions through cognitive or physical needs</td>
<td>• Misdirecting feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Feeling resignation/fated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Waiting for time to help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-focused coping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seeking assistance</td>
<td>• Engaging in drinking, drugs, acting out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing plans</td>
<td>• Sinking into passivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Looking at life style and balance</td>
<td>• Engaging in overacting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


52 Landesman, 99.
54 Schmuckler, 20.
55 Schmuckler, 21.
Schmuckler cites Ginny Sprang’s article about the Oklahoma City bombings saying, “There are also substantial data to suggest that disaster workers will not seek out services, despite reporting significant emotional distress.”

**Business Continuity Planning**

*Business Continuity Planning and Non-Profits*

Certified Public Accountants Ron Matan and Bridgett Hartnett define business continuity planning for nonprofits as; “the comprehensive process of planning for, and retooling, the organization’s best practices so that the nonprofit can function successfully after the crisis has passed, getting back quickly to where it was before the interruption.”

They also provide their own definition of disaster planning, as; “a process that takes place during and after a crisis, which is established to minimize interruption and help the organization recover by restoring some of its normal functioning as quickly and seamlessly as possible.”

Matan and Hartnett note that business continuity plans differ from disaster plans in two strategic ways: timing and end-goals.

Another definition of business continuity plans for non-profits provided by Nancy Meyer-Emerick and Mehnaaz Momen’s “Continuity Planning for Nonprofits,” says the business continuity plan “goes beyond emergency response,” and “does not focus on specific risks.”

In business continuity planning for nonprofits, there can be confusion and debate over the term, “business continuity planning,” with the emphasis on “business,” and Meyer-Emerick and

---

58 Matan and Hartnett, 3.
59 Matan and Hartnett, 4.
60 Nancy Meyer-Emerick and Mehnaaz Momen, “Continuity Planning for Nonprofits,” *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, Volume 14, Number 1, Fall 2003, 68.
Momen, prefer to use the term “continuity planning” instead “in order to eliminate confusion because although business generally means routine agency operations, it also brings to mind private sector goals that are not the primary focus of nonprofit management.”

**Human Capital**

In Michael Armstrong’s book, *Armstrong’s Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*, he identifies employees as human capital and that they are “a key element of the market worth of a company.” He cites a study conducted by CFO Research Services, saying that “the value of human capital represented over 36 per cent of total revenue in a typical organization.” Moreover, Denver-based company, IQNavigator, identified human capital as “a company’s most precious resource,” and Keith A. Nelson, Chief Human Capital Officer for the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development acknowledges that employees are the Department’s “most important resources.”

In terms of business continuity planning, Ken Doughty’s book, *Business Continuity Planning: Protecting Your Organization’s Life*, cites that employees are, “vital to the success of the recovery, and their comfort and support should be given special attention.” International Business Machines Corporation (IBM) notes in its white paper, “In the spotlight: the human side of business continuity planning,” the importance to building resiliency into human capital.

---

cites the study, “2005 Disaster Preparedness Survey Report,” from the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) which found that 60% of companies have not, “fully addressed the human side of crisis preparedness.”⁶⁸ In Figure 1, companies were asked how their Human Resource functions related to disaster preparedness, where over 60% indicated they did not have, “adequate disaster plans.”⁶⁹ Such areas included maintenance of the disaster plan, coordination of drills and disaster training, and evaluating the effectiveness of the drill.⁷⁰ IBM agrees with SHRM that “human resource disaster recovery plans are often not comprehensive enough to meet the needs of employees and the business in a time of crisis.”⁷¹

**Figure 1 - HR functions related to disaster preparedness**

Adapted from International Business Machines Corporation, “In the spotlight: the human side of business continuity planning,” April 2009, 4.

---

⁶⁹ SHRM, 4.
⁷⁰ SHRM, 4.
⁷¹ International Business Machines Corporation, 4.
Furthermore, IBM acknowledges that “employee shock and grief can also lead to increased absenteeism, as well as to higher turnover and reduced productivity,” which echoes Cartwright and Cooper’s statement about stress and increased absenteeism and turnover, and decreased productivity.  

*Business Continuity Planning for Museums*

Unlike disaster plans, AAM does not list the business continuity plan as one of their core documents for museums. Moreover, ICOM does not provide standards or guidelines for business continuity plans. The Getty Conservation Institute identifies four aspects of disaster planning: prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery.

Katherine M. Petersen’s thesis, “Disaster Preparedness and Recovery for Museums: A Business Recovery Model,” surveyed museum directors’ opinions on business recovery models. She calls out the lack of disaster planning and recovery in museum studies in six major museum administration texts. The texts she reviewed were *Managing Museums and Galleries* by Michael A. Fopp; *Museum Governance* by Marie C. Malaro; *Museum Management* by Kevin Moore; *Museum Basics* by Timothy Ambrose and Crispin Paine; *The Handbook for Museums* by Gary Edson and David Dean; and *Museums in Motion* by Edward P. Alexander. Petersen says Barry Lord and Gail Dexter Lord’s book, *The Manual of Museum Management*, mentioned “the need for an emergency plan only briefly in their chapter on ‘Security’.” She goes on to say that this lack, “confirm[s] the need for a business and/or continuity plan as a section of a

---

72 International Business Machines Corporation, 6.
77 Petersen, 16.
comprehensive disaster plan for museums.” While her study mainly addressed the need for financial recovery as part of business recovery, it does address that museums need to seriously consider business continuity planning.

**Employee Assistance Programs**

The Employee Assistance Trade Association (EASNA) defines employee assistance programs (EAPs) as; “employer-sponsored programs designed to alleviate and assist in eliminating a variety of workplace problems.” Matteson and Ivancevich note that EAPs started as alcoholic assistance programs in the 1940s, but have developed today as outreach programs for employees seeking professional help with personal and work-related problems. They say that EAPs today are intended to “focus on short-term assistance and crisis resolution,” and Dunning mentions that they are not equipped to handle larger psychological issues such as post-traumatic stress disorder. Matteson and Ivancevich also say that EAPs provides outreach to employees who are seeking help and help those who have difficulty coping. In additions, they reference Keith McClellan’s article, “The Changing Nature of EAP Practice,” that says EAPs that are hosted on-site suggest a minimum of 2000 employees and others in the field suggest 3000 employees.

---

78 Petersen, 48.
79 Petersen, 48.
81 Matteson and Ivancevich, 260.
82 Matteson and Ivancevich, 265.
84 Matteson and Ivancevich, 265.
86 Matteson and Ivancevich, 275.
EAPs in Museums

AAM provides an employee assistance program as part of their employee’s benefit package, but the organization does not provide any kind of accessible resources for museums to use in terms of developing one.87 The Getty’s “Collections Theft Response Procedures” does indicate that Getty employees have access to an EAP, and the document indicates that the EAP is maintained and updated to “assist in dealing with staff injuries or trauma.”88 A search on ICOM’s website did not reveal relevant results for EAPs.

Location of the EAP document

A study conducted by the Center for Prevention and Health Services’ EAP Workgroup; aims to “help employers realize the strategic value of an employee assistance program and to acknowledge the contributions EAPs make in helping organizations achieve their business goals.”89 When asked about how they involved or incorporated their EAP, 61% of respondents used the EAP in disaster planning, 25% in strategic planning, and 25% in continuity planning.90 Thus, the study indicated that disaster planning was the highest ranking answer, while strategic planning and continuity planning were the lowest ranking answers. (See Figure 2 below).

90 Center for Prevention and Health Services, 13.
**Figure 2 – Involving the EAP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational development of EAP</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team conflict resolution</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated policy/procedure support</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy for core business</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster planning</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity plans</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Respondents could provide more than one answer.*


**Benefits of EAPs**

Matteson and Ivancevich cite J.A. Muldoon and M. Berdie, who identified the following four areas where an EAP can have a positive impact: organizational finances, employee well-being, labor relations, and public relations.91

1. Organizational Finances – Decreases in employee productivity, increased employee absenteeism, and high employee turnover costs organizations money.92 For nonprofit organizations money is already tight and EAPs can cost money, especially if they are outsourced; however, health benefits can help balance the costs.93 If the cost of managing an

---

92 Matteson and Ivancevich, 263.
93 Matteson and Ivancevich, 275.
EAP is less than what it would cost an organization to continually hire new employees because of employee turnover, then an EAP would be beneficial to the institution.94

2. Employee Well-Being – Matteson and Ivancevich also agree that the effects of stress can have significant impacts on individuals and communities.95 Therefore, when one employee has trouble coping, it can have an effect on co-workers and subordinates.96 They argue that this, “altruistic motive of wishing to operate a company in a humanistic manner is worthwhile in and of itself.”97

3. Labor Relations – Matteson and Ivancevich point out that labor relations can be an issue, especially if employees feel the organization has contributed or is responsible for their stress.98 Since these kinds of negative attitudes and feelings can create unrest amongst employees, an EAP can help clarify issues for staff members and help managers maintain positive relations with their employees.99

4. Public Relations – According to Matteson and Ivancevich, having an EAP can “lend credence to the notion that the organization cares about people,” and, “establish a more personal, human image for the organization.”100 Furthermore, the establishment of an EAP encourages the workplace community “to work together toward a common goal.”101

To further support Muldoon and Berdie’s argument, other professionals in the Human Resource field have spoken about the benefits of EAPs, such as Daniel Lanier and Tom O’Brien.102 Lanier was quoted in 1992 when he was president of the national Employee

---

94 Matteson and Ivancevich, 263.
95 Matteson and Ivancevich, 263.
96 Matteson and Ivancevich, 263.
97 Matteson and Ivancevich, 263.
98 Matteson and Ivancevich, 263.
99 Matteson and Ivancevich, 264.
100 Matteson and Ivancevich, 264.
101 Matteson and Ivancevich, 264.
Assistant Program Association saying “[c]omprehensive EAPs are high-visibility, low-cost benefits that enable employers to attract and retain highly skilled workers.” Joanne Wojcik, author an article titled, “Extended EAP role benefits employers and employees,” notes that there is a market pressure to expand EAP benefits so employers can attract “quality personnel.” Additionally, O’Brien acknowledges that “[e]mployers more and more are seeing their employees as very valuable resources,” which connects to Muldoon and Berdie’s public relations benefit.

Efficacy

Melissa K. Richmond and Ana P. Nunes from the OMNI Institute; Fred C. Pampel from the University of Colorado Boulder; and Randi C. Wood from the State of Colorado (Richmond et al.) came together to conduct a study on the efficacy of Colorado states’ EAP. The study asserts that the area of EAPs is still widely under-researched, but is slowly becoming a more studied subject with increases in current research. They say the efficacy of EAPs can be called into question due to the limited amount of evidence; however, recent studies are being conducted that show that EAPs are beneficial to the employees that use them. The study addressed two key hypotheses:

1. “Employees who receive EAP counseling services will demonstrate significant reductions in (1) absenteeism, (2) presenteeism (inability to be productive while at work),

103 Wojcik, 1.
104 Wojcik, 1.
105 Wojcik, 1.
107 Richmond, 2.
108 Richmond, 2.
and (3) workplace distress at follow-up compared to a matched group of similar employees who do not receive EAP.”

2. “The impact of EAP on workplace outcomes differed as a function of baseline (1) workplace outcomes, (2) depression, (3) anxiety, and (4) hazardous alcohol use.”

This study had a sample size of 344 participants out of the estimated 28,000 Colorado state employees. The study used incentives such as raffles for gift cards to encourage employees to participate in the study. Steve Albrecht’s article “Why Don’t Employees Use EAP Services?” from February 2014 in Psychology Today pinpoints four reasons why people do not use EAPs: (1) lack of confidentiality, (2) a negative stigma for asking for help, (3) thinking they have to get permission from their supervisor to use an EAP, and (4) they do not know that an EAP exists for their company. Richmond, et al. does mention that the difficulty of measuring efficacy is due in part because other studies “have not been able to adequately compare EAP clients to employees who did not receive the intervention.”

The results of this research supported the two hypotheses and found that employees who used this EAP had better functionality than those who did not. The study cites, “significant reductions in (1) work hours missed and (2) presenteeism at follow-up compared to a matched group of similar employees who did not receive EAP.”

---
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Chapter 3: Methods

This study distributed an online questionnaire to ascertain how museums help employees return to workplace normalcy by determining what related policies/documents they have or do not have. The process for the study included the creation of the questionnaire instrument, the selection of organizations, sending out the instrument to potential participants, and then analyzing the data of questionnaire respondents. This section includes:

- Instrument Creation
- Selection of Organizations and Method of Distribution
- Analyzation of Data

Instrument Creation

Structure

The questionnaire was comprised of 22 questions. Fifteen questions were close-ended, using dichotomous and scaled questions with a contingency format. The other seven questions were unstructured and open-ended. Then questions were created using SurveyMonkey.com using logics when applicable. The survey questions were informed by the Literature Review and were intended to fill in the gaps of the known literature.

Instrument Questions

1. What is the name of your institution?
2. How many full-time employees work at your institution?
3. How many part-time employees work at your institution?
4. How many volunteers does your institution have?
5. Does your institution have a disaster/emergency preparedness plan? If no, go to question 11.
6. Which natural hazards does the plan identify? (Select all that apply)
   - Earthquake
   - Flood
   - Fire
   - Tornado
   - Tsunami
   - Mudslide
   - Other (please specify)
7. Does your institution train employees for disaster response?
8. Has your institution suffered from a natural disaster?
9. Has your institution ever implemented your disaster/emergency preparedness plan? If no, go to question 11.
10. How would you rate the effectiveness of your disaster/emergency preparedness plan from 1-5? (1 being poor and 5 being excellent)
   - 1-5
11. Does your institution have a business continuity/resiliency plan? (A business continuity/resiliency plan is a document to ensure the continuation of operations of a business/organization after a disaster). If no, go to question 13.
12. How would you rate the effectiveness of your business continuity/resiliency plan from 1-5? (1 being poor and 5 being excellent)
   - 1-5
   - Never implemented the business continuity/resiliency plan
13. Does your institution use an employee assistance program (EAP)? (EAPs are programs to help employees deal with personal problems that might adversely impact their job performance, health, and well-being.) If no, go to question 16.
14. Which document is your EAP located?
   - The disaster/emergency preparedness plan
   - The business continuity/resiliency plan
   - In another document (please specify)
15. Has your institution ever implemented your EAP? If yes, go to question 19.
16. Please indicate reasons for not using an EAP (check all that apply).
   - Never heard of employee assistant programs
   - Does not have time to develop one
   - Does not have resources/money to develop one
   - Is not a top priority for the institution
   - Other (please specify)
17. Where would you expect to find the information regarding an employee assistance program?
   - In the disaster/emergency preparedness plan
   - In the business continuity plan
   - In another document (please specify)
18. Regardless of time and/or resources, would your institution be interested in developing an employee assistant program?
19. Please explain how your EAP has benefited the employees that have used it.
20. How would you rate the effectiveness of your EAP from 1-5? (1 being poor and 5 being excellent)
   - 1-5
21. Please describe the program to the best of your ability.
22. Are there any additional comments or questions?
IRB Exemption

Once created, the instrument was submitted to the University of Washington Human Subjects Division and was found exempt under category two.

Selection of Organizations

Criteria

Organizations were selected based on the three following criteria:

- Located in either the Los Angeles, San Diego, or San Francisco Bay areas;
- A non-profit organization;
- Annual budget between $400,000 and $4 million.

This study aimed to be as representative of the museum field as possible and targeted midsize museums. To ensure a large enough sample could be extrapolated, the budget range of $400,000 to $4 million was selected. An initial search for museums and similar institutions in the selected areas was done via Wikipedia and then narrowed down by non-profit status and annual operating budget using GuideStar.com. GuideStar.com is a website used to help break down and disseminate information about IRS-registered nonprofit organizations.116 Since GuideStar.com reports institutions who submit Forms 990, all institutions were therefore, non-profit. Once the institutions were selected, a web search was conducted for email contact information of Human Resource Managers, or Directors in lieu of a Human Resource Manager. When an email address could not be found for either position, an email for general information was sent out.

Confidentiality

Given the nature of this study, each contact was informed that they were not obligated to answer any questions they did not feel comfortable answering and that they and their institution

---

will not be directly identified in the study. The individual results are stored on the author’s password protected computer and will not be shared beyond this study.

Data Analysis

Coding

Once data was collected, results were converted to Excel. Open-ended questions were coded for themes based off of responses and quantified into proportions in Excel. Respondents were broken up into one of four categories of museums based on the subject matter of their organization: History, Art, Children’s, and Nature/Science. For the purpose of this study, organizations that fell into the “History” category included local history museums, military and aviation museums, and cultural museums. Art museums included cultural art, fine art, textiles, and photographic art while the nature and science group included science museums and botanical gardens. Zoos and aquariums fell outside the required criteria because of their operating budgets.
Chapter Four: Analysis and Findings

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to identify how museums help employees return to workplace normalcy after a natural disaster impacts the institution and determine what documents/policies they are using to help facilitate this transition. Of the 80 institutions contacted, a total of 27 responded to the survey either by taking it or replying they could not take it at that time and 24 took the survey, providing a 33% response rate. The survey was open from February 18, 2016 to March 14, 2016.

Figure 3 – Categorization of Museums

The majority of museums that answered were either history (33%) or art museums (37%), making up for over two-thirds of the survey respondents. Children’s museums made up for 17% and 13% were Nature and Science museums (Figure 3).

Survey Questions

Question 1: What is the name of your institution?

This question was not intended for data collection and was only used to organize responses.
**Question 2: How many full-time employees work at your institution?**

From the 24 respondents, full-time employee size averaged 26 (SD = 80). The median was 6 and the mode was 4. See Table 2 and Figure 4 below.

**Question 3: How many part-time employees work at your institution?**

Twenty-three respondents answered this question and part-time employee size averaged 11 (SD = 13). The median was 5 and the mode was 3. See Table 2 and Figure 4 below.

**Question 4: How many volunteers does your institution have?**

Twenty-two participants replied and the average volunteer size averaged 53 (SD = 84). The median was 22 and the mode was 10. See Table 2 and Figure 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Number</th>
<th>Full-Time Employees</th>
<th>Part-time Employees</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average/Mean</td>
<td>26.91666667</td>
<td>11.04347826</td>
<td>53.90909091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 5: Does your institution have a disaster/emergency preparedness plan?

The majority of respondents (79%) said that they had a disaster/emergency preparedness plan. Of those, seven were history museums, six were art museums, three were children museums, and 2 were nature/science museums (See Table 3 below). These respondents were taken to questions six through ten to gain an understanding of the scope of their disaster plan. The 21% that indicated they did not have a disaster/emergency preparedness plan were directed to question 11.

Question 6: Which natural hazards does the plan identify?

Participants were asked to select from a list of natural hazards that could occur in their area and were told to select all that applied. They also had the option to specify another hazard that was not listed. All participants who answered this question indicated that their disaster plan addressed the hazards of earthquakes and fires. Sixty-one percent (61%) named floods as a
hazard, 11% for tsunamis, 5% for fires, and 5% for mudslides. The 16% that chose the “Other” category identified technological and man-made hazards, such as terrorism, power outages, and active shooters (See Table 3 below).

**Table 3 – Which natural hazards does the plan identify?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Hazard Type</th>
<th>Type of Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>E, FL, FR</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>E, FL, FR</td>
<td>Nature/Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E, FL, FR</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Indicated No Plan</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E, FR</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>E, FL, FR</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>E, FL, FR, T</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>E, FL, FR, TO, T, M,</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>E, FL, FR</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>E, FR</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>E, FL, FR</td>
<td>Children's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Indicated No Plan</td>
<td>Children’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E, FR</td>
<td>Nature/Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Indicated No Plan</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Indicated No Plan</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>E, FL, FR</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Identified No Hazards</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>E, FR</td>
<td>Children's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>E, FL, FR</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>E, F, O</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>E, FR, O</td>
<td>Children's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>E, FL, FR, O</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>E, FR</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Indicated No Plan</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E = Earthquake   FL = Flood   FR = Fire   TO = Tornado   T = Tsunami   O = Other**

**Question 7: Does your institution train employees for disaster response?**

Respondents were asked to identify if their institution conducts training in some form as part of their disaster plan, and 68% of respondents affirmed they had something in place. Of those who responded “yes” to this question, 26% were history museums, 20% were art museums, 11% were children’s museums, and 11% were nature/science museums.
Question 8: Has your institution suffered from a natural disaster?

Seventeen percent (17%) replied “yes” to being impacted by a natural disaster while the other 83% said their institution has not been impacted by a natural disaster.

Question 9: Has your institution ever implemented your disaster/emergency preparedness plan?

Seventy-eight percent (78%) said they have not implemented their disaster plan where 22% said they did have to implement their plan. Those who have not implemented their disaster plan were directed to question 11. Those who did have to implement their plan were taken to question 10.

Question 10: How would you rate the effectiveness of your disaster/emergency preparedness plan from 1 to 5?

For this scale, one indicated a “Poor” rating, five indicated an “Excellent” rating and three was “Neutral.” Efficacy averaged 3.25 (SD = .96).

Question 11: Does your institution have a business continuity/resiliency plan?

Terminology was defined for the participant in the question. Twenty-two participants responded to this question, with 86% saying they did not have a business continuity plan. Nine of those respondents were history museums, six art, three children’s, and one was a nature/science museum. These participants were directed to question 13. Of those who said “yes,” (14%) two were art and one was a nature/science museum. These respondents were taken to question 12.

Question 12: How would you rate the effectiveness of your business continuity/resiliency plan from 1-5?

For this scale, one indicated a “Poor” rating, five indicated an “Excellent” rating and three was “Neutral.” They were also given the option, “Never implemented the business
continuity/resiliency plan.” One respondent gave it a neutral rating while the other respondents said they never used the plan before.

**Question 13: Does your institution use an employee assistance program (EAP)?**

Terminology was defined for the participant in the question. Seventy percent (70%) indicated that they did not have an EAP, where seven were history museums, seven art, two children’s, and one was a nature/science museum. These respondents were directed to question 16. The 30% who said they did have an EAP, where three were history museums, one art, two children’s, and one was a nature/science museum. These respondents were taken to question 14.

**Question 14: Which document is your EAP located?**

Respondents were asked if their document was in their disaster plan, business continuity plan, or in another document. All replied “In another location” and were asked to specify where the document was located. One respondent said it was provided to them from an outside source, while the others indicated it was in some form of a Human Resources document, such as a handbook or manual.

**Question 15: Has your institution ever implemented your EAP?**

Of the seven participants who indicated that they had an EAP, four said that they have had employees use it. One of each of the museum types was represented in the data. The other three respondents skipped the question. The four participants were taken to question 19.

**Question 16: Please indicate reasons for not using an EAP**

Participants that indicated that they did not have an EAP were asked to select from a list of reasons for not having one and were told to select all that applied. They also had the option to specify another reason that was not listed (See Figure 5 below). Money and resources (58%) was the top explanation for not having an EAP. Not a top priority (47%) and never heard of an EAP
(41%) came in as the second and third reasons, respectively. Eleven percent (11%) specified a different reason for not having an EAP and indicated the institution size was too small.

**Figure 5 – Reasons for not having an EAP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never heard of employee assistance programs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not have time to develop one</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not have resources/money to develop one</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not a top priority for the institution</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 17: Where would you expect to find information regarding an employee assistance program?**

Forty-two percent (42%) thought the EAP would be located in the disaster plan, 21% believed it would be located in the business continuity plan, and 36% believed it would be located in another document other than a disaster plan or a business continuity plan. Three of those respondents thought that it would be in an employee handbook or manual, one said it would be its own plan, and the other did not know where it would be located.

**Question 18: Regardless of time and/or resources, would your institution be interested in developing an employee assistance program?**

Sixty-two percent (62%) said they would be interested while 38% said they were not interested. Of those who said they would be interested, history and art museums had 4 responses each, 2 responses from children’s museums, and no responses from nature/science museums.
**Question 19: Please explain how your EAP has benefited the employees that have used it.**

This open-ended question allowed participants who said they have an EAP to expand on the benefits their EAP brought to their employees and organization. Responses were coded and keywords were found amongst responses. Half of these respondents addressed the issue of confidentiality for the employee(s) who used the EAP. Three quarters indicated that their employees used their EAP before, and half mentioned that their EAP benefitted their employee individually.

**Question 20: How would you rate the effectiveness of your EAP from 1-5?**

For this scale, one indicated a “Poor” rating, five indicated an “Excellent” rating and three was “Neutral.” Efficacy averaged 3.5 (SD = .58).

**Question 21: Please describe the program to the best of your ability.**

This open-ended questions allowed participants to describe in more detail about their EAP. The responses were coded into three themes: Other Provider/Contact, Groups/Workshops, and Obligation. Twenty-five percent (25%) mentioned that they had an obligation as employees to remain mindful of their well-being, and 25% also contracted the EAP through someone else, whether it was a company or a specific contact. Fifty percent (50%) said a group or a workshop was incorporated into the EAP (Figure 6).
Figure 6 - Please describe the program to the best of your ability.

Question 22: Are there any additional comments or questions?

This question was asked to allow participants to ask questions or make personal comments about the study. Answers included respondent emails and any requests made by them.
Chapter 5 – Results and Discussion

This section will discuss the results from findings and analysis. It will review the questions asked in the survey and discuss and illuminate the findings.

Questions 2, 3, and 4

These questions provided a groundwork for assessing the number of employees and volunteers each institution had. The majority of both full-time and part-time employees fell between 0 and 10, which illustrates that many institutions operate with a smaller staff size. This employee size differs greatly than the large staff size mentioned by Matteson and Ivancevich for an on-site EAP. Staff sizes of at least 2000 were suggested for such a program.

Although the focus of this study is on museum employees, the number of volunteers for each organization provides a different dichotomy to employees. Amongst volunteers, there was a more even spread of data plots, but also had greater numbers than full-time and part-time employees combined. While half of the volunteer base were between 0 and 25 people, the other half represents a volunteer base over 26 people, and often in the triple digits.

Questions 5 through 10

Questions five and seven were created to affirm the fact that disaster planning for museums is a highly talked about and well-researched field at the moment and that museums are taking disasters and disaster training seriously. A web search for “museum disaster plan” yields a variety of resources and the first three hits are the literature published by AAM, the Getty Conservation Institute, and ICOM. In regards to question seven, more history and art museums than children’s and nature/science museums indicated that they implemented employee disaster training.
For question six, participants were asked to identify the natural hazards in their disaster plan. Earthquakes, fires and floods made up for the top responses, which correlates to FEMA’s Disaster Declarations Summary. Flooding was identified as the most frequent hazard, while wildfires and earthquakes were not as common. Since the “Other” category identified man-made and technological hazards, these results are not relevant to the study.

Questions eight, nine, and ten addressed the use of the disaster plan by looking at frequency of use and efficacy of the plans. Results show that museums are not having to implement their disaster plans, which means that the number of museum employees being affected by a natural disaster are low. For those who did have to implement their disaster plan, they found it somewhat effective (M = 3.25, SD = .96).

**Questions 11 and 12**

Because the research on business continuity planning and museums is thin, these questions were asked to establish a baseline for museums with business continuity plans and their thoughts on its efficacy. There is no literature to compare these statistics to, but it does provide an insight about how many museums have business continuity plans. All of the history and children’s museums indicated that they did not have a business continuity plan, while some art and nature/science museums do have one in place. As for the efficacy, the results are inconclusive, as the majority of respondents have not implemented their business continuity plan.

**Question 13**

Similar to the reasoning for question 11, the amount of research about EAPs and museums is almost non-existent and was asked to create a baseline within the literature. More organizations indicated that they had an EAP than a business continuity plan, where history and children’s museums were the top two categories for having such policies/documents.
Questions 14 and 15

These questions were asked to get a better insight on those who answered that their institution did have an EAP. According to the study conducted by Richmond et al, the majority of businesses indicated that they used their EAP in correlation with a disaster and incorporated the EAP as such. The data from this study contradicts Richmond et al. slightly, where all respondents said that their EAP was located in a Human Resource document. However, the second highest response in the study by Richmond et al. was “organizational development of EAP,” and the results from this study correlates more with that response.

Questions 16, 17, and 18

Participants who answered these three questions indicated that their institution did not have an EAP and the questions were structure to gain a better understanding as to why they did not have one. Question 16 was asked to create a foundation in the literature as to why museums do not have EAPs. Like question 14, question 17 sought to gain a better understanding as to the location of an EAP document.

Responses echoed more closely to the study by Richmond et al, than respondents who answered that they had an EAP from question 14. Forty-two percent (42%) of respondents said the EAP would most likely be in the disaster plan, 36% believed it was in a different location such as an employee handbook, and 21% thought it would be in the business continuity plan. This is compared to the results from Richmond et al. where 61% said disaster planning, 36% said integrated policy/procedure support, and 25% said continuity plans.

Question 18 sought out to measure the amount of interest in developing an EAP for those institutions that did not have one. History and art museums were more receptive of developing an EAP than children’s and nature/science museums.
Questions 19, 20, and 21

These three questions were asked to participants who indicated that they implemented their EAP. Questions 19 and 21 provided no significant findings relevant to the research goals.

However, question 20 did provide enough data to establish a baseline in the literature. Half of the institutions sampled expressed EAP efficacy to be “Neutral” and the other half as “Great.”
Chapter Six: Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to evaluate how museums help their employees return to workplace normalcy after a natural disaster impacts their institution and address what policies museums use to facilitate this transition. The results show that museums have disaster preparedness plans but do not have business continuity plans or EAPs, and that museums are not utilizing these documents to help employees return to workplace normalcy should a natural disaster impact their institution.

Limitations

A sample size of 80 is a small representation of the museum community in major urban cities in California. Additionally, this study focuses on California museums and the major natural hazards they identify in their disaster planning may not be indicative of the rest of the United States. Furthermore, this study focused on natural disasters and did not include man-made or technological disasters.

Data size was limited because it was difficult to obtain documents for a potential document analysis because of the nature of the study. Follow-up emails to most respondents indicated they were not comfortable sharing this information.

Recommendations

Since museum disaster plans are a well-established and researched topic in the field, they can provide the foundation to incorporate business continuity plans and EAPs as part of a comprehensive disaster document. Business continuity plans have great overlap with the disaster plan recovery stage. Furthermore, because recent literature in business continuity plans address human capital and resiliency, it offers an avenue to incorporate an EAP. Even though EAP research is still developing, museums can look to EAPs as a way to help facilitate employees
back into workplace normalcy. Moreover, further research in this field could lead to a design and implementation of an in-house EAP for smaller staff sizes.
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Appendix A – Getty Conservation Institute’s Outline for Staff Debriefing

Build debriefing and counseling sessions into the plan

Taking care of yourself and your workers will help you better care for the collections after disaster strikes. Depending on the size of the institution, this is an important and time-consuming responsibility that cannot be assumed by the communications coordinator, the ERC, or the EPM. A human resources coordinator should be assigned to this role.

Debriefing for all workers participating in the response and recovery effort should take place every day from the beginning of an incident. A debriefing is a specific, focused intervention to help employees deal with the intense emotions that are common at such a time. Encourage staff members to voice their concerns and feelings. A local community mental health center can help set up the debriefing and assist in incorporating crisis counseling into the plan. It is normal to feel depressed to some degree after a disaster. Discuss this and other stress reactions with staff. You may want to arrange for a mental health professional to address the debriefing. People may have strong and conflicting emotions to deal with, particularly if there is death or widespread destruction.

Staff members who feel the need to stop working must be allowed to freely communicate this to officials. Look for signs of stress among workers (e.g., fatigue, anger, and fear). Early identification and intervention are key to preventing worker burnout. Breaks should be mandatory, particularly when it becomes evident that worker effectiveness is diminishing. Bathroom facilities—even if they are improvised—must be provided, as well as food and beverages, shelter, and a place to sit or lie down. Paying attention to—and planning ahead for—the mental well-being of workers conserves a precious resource that is necessary for the months or years it may take for the institution to fully recover.

---