

**LG-41-08-0019-08 Michigan Museums Association Final Report
Connecting to Collections Planning Grant –IMLS 6/27/2012**

This planning grant was applied for in 2007 and our grant was received by Michigan Museums Association (MMA) to begin 5/1/2008, under former executive director Teresa Goforth's leadership. After two extensions, this project was completed 4/30/2012. We used all IMLS funds and far exceeded our required cost share of \$15100 (our cost share was \$36683).

The purpose of the Connecting to Collections Planning Grant was to:

- 1) locate the institutions in the state of Michigan who held heritage collections
- 2) survey them about their knowledge of collections care standards and practices
- 3) ask about the state of collections stewardship in these institutions
- 4) compile a list of the most important items in the state's museums
- 5) produce a report (called a "white paper" in the application) that summarized the survey results in order to help argue for resources to better care for these collections.

Under MMA Executive Director Teresa Goforth, MMA requested \$40,000 from IMLS and MMA stated it would offer \$52,300 in cost share to complete a very ambitious Connecting to Collections project. The Board of Directors voted to create a fundraising plan in order to secure the matching funds for the project. Most important, the Board determined the organization would not work on this grant until the entire cost share or matching funds were received. This set the grant back in time very significantly. Happily, in 2009, MMA received \$10000 from Michigan Council for Arts and Cultural Affairs to support this project (primarily for staff support, mileage, and printing of white paper).

Challenges with the Economy

Unfortunately, Michigan felt the effects of the economic downturn at least a year before other states did as its auto industry teetered on the brink of bankruptcy. Michigan fell into a true depression and MMA realized, by early 2009, that it would be impossible to find cash in Michigan at that time. The Board put the project on hold for financial reasons (ultimately resulting in a request for extension).

Soon after, MMA's executive director Teresa Goforth left the organization. New executive director Susan Steele took over in late 2009. Ms. Steele soon realized the project would have to be revised as she knew that MMA would likely not be able to raise over \$50,000.

Revised Project

In April 2010, Susan Steele and MMA Board of Directors revised the budget, cost share, and scope of the project for re-submission to IMLS. The project now included a steering committee headed by two prominent state cultural leaders, the creation of a survey, the hiring of several local coordinators who would assist with the survey, an analysis of the survey, and completion and dissemination of a white paper. IMLS accepted these revisions, noting that MMA cost share was reduced to \$15100. Susan Steele replaced Teresa Goforth as project director, and MMA Board President Nancy Bryk became the AOR.

Steering Committee

Sandra Clark and Timothy Chester, cultural leaders in Michigan, graciously led a steering committee to help guide this project (**see appendix #1 for Steering Committee members**). The MMA Board, Clark, and Chester together crafted a steering committee that included leaders from libraries/archives and museums

**LG-41-08-0019-08 Michigan Museums Association Final Report
Connecting to Collections Planning Grant –IMLS 6/27/2012**

from both peninsulas. Job description for steering committee members were devised and face-to-face meetings and conference call dates were set.

The Steering Committee met several times between September 2010 and February 2011. Under its leadership, Michigan Museums Association decided what information the survey would seek. While MMA looked at surveys we received from other state Connecting to Collections initiatives, we focused less than others about collections care issues in storage. Sandra Clark specifically requested that Michigan's Connecting to Collections survey ask each respondent to list their three most significant items in their collections. This list is attached to the email report.

Creating the Survey

In February 2011, the Steering Committee asked Angela Riedel, Collections Manager at Central Michigan University's Museum of Cultural and Natural History, Frank Boles, Director of the Clarke Library at Central Michigan, and Nancy Richard, Archivist at Grand Valley State University to create the survey instrument. They spent dozens of hours creating the final version of the survey. Upon completion, a museum person [REDACTED] and an archivist [REDACTED] filled this out to determine how long it took them to respond. The work on this survey was completed in October of 2011. **(Survey is in appendix #3.)**

Creating our Museum and Archive List for Survey Dissemination

As the survey was being created, Susan Steele spent many hours creating a list of museums, archives, aquaria, zoos, libraries, and nature centers that might have some historical or cultural collections. Susan was surprised by the numbers as she estimated that there was about 400 institutions in the state but found about 600 in the state (about 150 more would be found later). Added to this were libraries/archives from the Michigan Library Association, putting the number of these institutions at over 2000.

Changes in the Budget due to Size of Survey Field

Originally, MMA envisioned it would be able to capture and interpret the results of this survey on its own and would use money in the budget to have others help write this, do the graphs, and digitally capture and create a website relating to this survey. However, as numbers kept growing, Susan realized that she could not handle the data from such a large project.

MMA and the Steering Committee decided to engage a firm or group with expertise in receiving and interpreting the data. Johnson Center for Philanthropy became our survey work consultant, and we worked together to send out and interpret the data we received.

Susan Steele Leaves MMA and Change in Project Director

Susan Steele announced her departure from MMA beginning March 1, 2012. Nancy Bryk, President of the Board, took over the project direction in a volunteer capacity. MMA Treasurer Ron Bloomfield became the AOR (Bryk was formerly AOR). Bryk reconnected with Sandra Clark and Tim Chester about work to date and completing the grant.

Johnson Center for Philanthropy and MMA

Nancy Bryk and JCP met via phone regularly, getting a schedule for the project so that the data could be received and interpreted in time for the "white paper" to be done and printed by April 30th. JCP received the

**LG-41-08-0019-08 Michigan Museums Association Final Report
Connecting to Collections Planning Grant –IMLS 6/27/2012**

survey from MMA and with some re-formatting, By February 26, 2012 the instrument was sent out in hard copy and via email (if we had email addresses).

Refining the List—What Museums and Archives are in Michigan?

The list of over 2000 libraries and museums was problematic. It included public school libraries (no collections), jails, and for-profit corporate archives and many duplicate entries. MMA and JCP split up refining this list. Nancy Bryk spent 50 hours working on the museum list, eliminating duplications but also located additional small museums not in other directories. Similarly, JCP spent about 50 hours cost share to eliminate duplications, find emails and contact information for libraries on the list. The final list included 1513 museums and libraries/archives.

Hiring Local Coordinators

Because Michigan is so vast and rural that we knew we would need a cadre of local coordinators who would contact museums to offer assistance about the survey and to encourage them to fill it out. MMA recruited 19 local coordinators through Steering Committee members. We devised a job description for these candidates, asked them to send a resume and letter of interest in they wanted the position; successful candidates were paid \$450 for their work on this project when they accomplished the following activities:

1. Participate in webinar training on the survey instrument and its goals.
2. Contact all the museums on the list they were given (about 75 museums per person) to introduce themselves, give their contact information, and encourage participation.
3. Keep a log of all contacts with museums and archives on their list.
4. Write up a short synopsis of their conversations with institutions about the survey.

These local coordinators were crucial in the success of this project as they nudged museums to get their surveys in. We include one journal report (**appendix #2**).

The Survey Goes Out

On February 26 the survey was sent both electronically and via surface mail to **1513 Michigan museums and libraries/archives. The survey was in the field about six weeks. The return on these was about 30%; 458 institutions responded to the survey.** Since Nancy Bryk's name and contact information was on the introductory survey letter she estimates she spent 25 hours on inquiries—from coordinators and survey respondents—over the six week period.

Disseminating the White Paper

The summary of survey results was written by the project director in late April 2012. JCP provided many of the graphs and all interpretation of the data. The entire report, in both pdf format and printed copy, has been sent to major cultural organizations in the state (universities, larger museums), funders in the state, every museum and library/archive that completed a survey, the Steering Committee and local coordinators. To date, we believe that over 550 people or organizations have received a copy of the report in Michigan. The pdf of the report is on MMA's home page on its website (www.michiganmuseums.org). The report will be given to specific politicians in Lansing in autumn when new director Lisa Craig Brisson comes on board.

**LG-41-08-0019-08 Michigan Museums Association Final Report
Connecting to Collections Planning Grant –IMLS 6/27/2012**

Finances

MMA's cost share obligation was \$15,100; however, because of considerable volunteer assistance from the Steering Committee, Board President Bryk, and JCP, we far exceeded that obligation. MMA brought \$36,683 cost share to the project.

Results

458 institutions out of 1513 responded to the survey. Their responses revealed this information:

- Michigan has many small institutions with significant staff and funding constraints. Nearly 20% have budgets of less than \$10,000 and 30% have no full-time professional staff. Thus, MMA and partners must provide affordable training and economical suggestions for implementation of best practices in collections management and care.
- The responding institutions hold at least 40 million artifacts and about 90,000 linear (shelf) feet of historical documents in trust for the people of this state.
- The majority of institutions provide primary access to their collections through site visits. Researchers who seek images and additional information may not get these from a visit. Those who cannot make the trip for some reason have no access to the items.
- Digitization of collections provides online access to collections databases, images, and information. Digitization is in place in 58% of institutions. However, only half of this 58% put any part of their collections online—and 64% put a small portion (10%) online. Institutions need assistance with digitization planning and implementation. Many require help with finding financial support for digitization.
- About half of the institutions have some collections management policies in place. However, about 60% do not have emergency plans that strategize action and care for collections if disaster strikes. Michigan Museums Association offers workshops on developing policies but clearly more outreach is needed about their importance.
- Nearly 35% report that they do not know if their storage or exhibition areas conform to accepted conservation standards, suggesting that either they are not aware of these standards or do not know how to measure the appropriateness of these areas. Working with our library and archives partners in the state, MMA must effectively communicate these standards and help institutions assess and plan for remediation of these areas.
- All in all, outside funding for training, consultation, and implementation of collections management and care is recommended. Many institutions cannot afford to train staff and have limited resources to document, share, and safeguard Michigan's collections.

Michigan Museums Association is now poised to work with other cultural leaders in the state, and with funders, to find resources for simple and straightforward training on conservation standards, policies and procedures assistance, and digitization and access programs.

--Submitted by Nancy E. Villa Bryk, Project Director and Board President, Michigan Museums Association

APPENDIX #1: Steering Committee

Chairs

Sandra S. Clark, Director, Michigan Historical Center, Lansing

Timothy J. Chester, President Emeritus of the Public Museum of Grand Rapids

Members

Ronald Bloomfield, Director of Operations and Chief Historian
Bay County Historical Society, Bay City

Frank Boles, Library Director, Clarke Historical Library,
Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant

Sharon Carlson, Archivist, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo

Ken Miller, Executive Director, Bayliss Public Library, Sault Sainte Marie

Erik Nordberg, University Archivist, Michigan Technological University, Houghton

Angela Riedel, Collections Manager, Museum of Cultural and Natural History,
Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant

Marcus Robyns, University Archivist and Records Manager
Northern Michigan University, Marquette

APPENDIX #2: Local Coordinator Journal (example)

Helen Dixon, Ann Arbor District

The MMA's "Connecting to Collections" survey, for which I managed 73 Ann Arbor area institutions, was well articulated, organized, and monitored. All my questions were answered quickly, thoroughly, and clearly. In fact, very little of the work I did with individual institutions dealt with problems with specific survey questions. Most of my time was spent navigating three general areas of concern or confusion, as detailed below.

1. Those who had not received the hard copy of the survey (either because the contact person for the institution had changed, or because one copy was not sufficient, as in the case of campus museums or libraries which had been reconfigured) and who felt uncomfortable with the electronic format of the survey. These recipients contacted me about getting a "preview" of the survey, so that they could arrange to have all the questions in front of them before beginning the online survey. It's my impression that those who presented this concern were worried that because the survey was anonymous, it would not "save" their place, and might time out or otherwise force them to start all over again if something happened along the way. In these cases, I sent the .doc version of the survey Nancy had emailed the regional coordinators, and they were able to work from that version (some eventually submitted via the online survey, and just wanted the .doc version to guide them). Some examples in response to my personalized emails:
 - a. "I am pretty sure I did not get a request to complete this survey – the request was sent to the curator of our Labadie Collection. I don't think either of us has seen a paper copy of the survey.... The paper copy is helpful because with it one can see the questions before one embarks on completing the survey." [REDACTED]
[REDACTED])
 2. Those who were unsure whether their collections "counted," in some cases because the survey was attributed to the Michigan "Museums" Association – a designation some took literally and limitedly. This especially came up with respect to the Nature and Discovery Centers on my list. Because they didn't have formal accession procedures, there were some concerns about whether they were really collections at all. Though I encouraged each center to fill out its own survey, and otherwise directed these concerns to Nancy, it was great to learn how many more Nature Centers there were in my district than the MMA list had originally included:
 - a. "Since you inquired about Stony Creek Nature Center (which we don't consider to be a museum), I'm wondering if you want to survey all the nature centers? We have nature centers at Lake St. Clair, Stony Creek, Oakwoods, Kensington and Stony Creek Metroparks in addition to the facilities at Lake Erie and Wolcott. We also have an environmental center at Indian Springs and two farm centers," [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- Further on this issue:
- b. The University of Michigan Jean Paul Slusser Gallery wrote that "We don't have a permanent collection at the school, so I don't think the survey would be relevant to us,"

**LG-41-08-0019-08 Michigan Museums Association Final Report
Connecting to Collections Planning Grant –IMLS 6/27/2012**

[REDACTED] and was asked to send back a copy with “doesn’t apply” written on it, as per Nancy’s request.

- c. The Washtenaw Library for the Blind and Physically Disabled reported that they “had no unique collections,” ([REDACTED]) and didn’t fill it out.
- d. The Ford Museum filled out the survey, writing “The survey is for the Museum. The Library is not included--what archival materials are included in our survey response are in the Museum. The survey gets extremely complicated if the Library holdings are included--we assumed that it was a "museum" survey since it was titled as such,” ([REDACTED] [REDACTED]). I wrote back urging the Library to complete a second survey, and passed [REDACTED] email on to [REDACTED] for questions ([REDACTED] reiterated how important both collections would be).

3. Those whose institutions had been combined / restructured with others, and who were unsure how to count themselves. This was a problem that arose in dealing with the University of Michigan library collections. Many of the health services libraries had been “collapsed” into the Taubman Library system, and were worried that counting their holdings would result in “double count” numbers for the totals.

- a. “PHISA [Public Health Informatics Services & Access] is no longer a separate library, and the collections have been integrated with those of the Taubman Health Sciences Library. I’m cc’ing Nadia Lalla, our health sciences collections coordinator, on this email. We’ve already received a request to respond to the survey from [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] has shared the request with [REDACTED], the University Library’s Associate University Librarian for Collections,” ([REDACTED])
- b. “I’m sorry, but the Dentistry Library has been closed for some years now, and I was assigned to new duties,” ([REDACTED]), who went on to write that its collections had been absorbed by the Taubman Health Sciences Libraries.

The rest of the U-M library system also voiced this concern. I had a long exchange with [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) at the University of Michigan’s Special Collections:

- c. On 3/19 she wrote: “I would like to know which other units on the UM campus have also been asked to complete the survey.” After sending her a brief summary of all the University of Michigan units we were contacting, she wrote back.
- d. Later on 3/19: “I would like to know who in each library has been contacted and/or completed the survey. This just so I know how a response from Special Collections will fit in with the overall response from campus libraries and the University Library (of which most of the libraries you list are a part).” I sent her a full list of the library units and contacts, and she was able to proceed with the survey from there.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

APPENDIX #3: SURVEY

Hello,

We are sending this letter and attached survey with the hope that your institution will participate in an important statewide research initiative, led by the Michigan Museums Association (MMA). In 2006, the Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS) created a new program called *Connecting to Collections*, “intended to raise public awareness of the importance of cultural collections care now and for future generations.”

MMA received funding from IMLS and the Michigan Council for Arts and Cultural Affairs to create and implement a survey to assess the holdings and needs of Michigan’s collecting institutions, including the state of care of their collections. The two of us have volunteered to chair an advisory committee of leaders in the library, archival and museum communities across our state to guide this work.

We hope you will fill out the enclosed survey about the collections in your institution’s care and return it to us in the enclosed postage-paid business reply envelope by MARCH 16th. Or, if you prefer, you may complete the survey online at: www.michiganmuseums.org/treasures. The intent of the survey is not to seek out deficiencies in individual institutions. Rather, it is to gather information which will provide a snapshot of collections conditions and conservation/preservation activities across the state and to identify the needed resources to help all concerned libraries, museums and archives. ***With the data you submit, we will be able to produce a white paper that will build a strong case for increased funding at both the state and federal levels for Michigan museums’ collections care issues.***

Completing the Survey

Any institution holding cultural collections (archival items such as books, documents, prints, ephemera, etc., and/or artifact collections of any kind) should participate. Complete the questionnaire for collections that are a permanent part of your holdings or for which you have accepted preservation responsibility. ***Include all collections in your care, not just those associated with Michigan.***

If your historical society or library operates more than one building, we have sent separate surveys to each of these museums or branch libraries as different buildings often house different collections. It’s up to you if you prefer to fill out one single form for your entire museum, historical society, or library system.

Do not include living collections in your responses, even if they are a part of your institution’s preservation responsibilities. Libraries should **exclude** general circulating materials.

It will take you approximately 30 minutes to complete this survey.

Assistance

We have hired local coordinators throughout both peninsulas to assist institutions in their areas in filling out this survey. They are very familiar with the survey and understand the intent behind the questions asked. To find out the contact name of your local coordinator, **please** [REDACTED]

**LG-41-08-0019-08 Michigan Museums Association Final Report
Connecting to Collections Planning Grant –IMLS 6/27/2012**

and she'll make sure the local coordinator contacts you. They may call or email you if you don't turn in a survey! If you are unsure how to answer a question or don't understand it, do not skip the question or leave it unanswered. Just ask your local coordinator for assistance.

Confidentiality

Your individual responses will be incorporated into aggregated data in the public report for this project. Your responses will not be recognizable or presented individually. Contact information is requested for the sole purpose of enabling MMA staff and project consultants to contact you with any follow-up questions.

MMA is conducting this work with the Johnson Center for Philanthropy and Nonprofit Leadership at Grand Valley State University. FAQs about this project are found at www.michiganmuseums.org/treasures. You can also contact Nancy Bryk, Project Director, for help: [REDACTED].

Please help us make a case for increased funding for our state's treasures by filling out the survey either by mail or through the web link! We appreciate your participation in this important state-wide project.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY J. CHESTER
Director Emeritus, Grand Rapids Public Museum

SANDRA SAGESER CLARK
Director, Michigan Historical Center

INSTITUTIONAL CONTACT INFORMATION

1. Please provide identifying information about your institution.

Name of person completing this questionnaire: _____

Title: _____

Institutional name: _____

Street address: _____

City: _____ ZIP/Postal code: _____

Email address of person completing this questionnaire:

Phone number of person completing this questionnaire: _____

2. If MMA has follow-up questions about your survey, what is your preferred method of contact? (Select one.)

- Email Phone Surface Mail

3. Please list or describe the three most important objects or documents in your collections.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

Type of Institution

4. Which of the following most closely describes your institution? (Select one.)

- Archives (business, college, public, religious, etc.)
- Library (business, college, public, religious, etc.)
- Governmental Office (county clerk, city manager, etc.)
- Historical site
- Historical society (city, county, etc.)
- Museum (art, children's, historical, natural history, etc.)
- Genealogy society

5. If your institution provides additional functions, please indicate what they are.

- Archeological depository
- Archives (business, college, public, religious, etc.)
- Library (business, college, public, religious, etc.)
- Government agency
- Historical site
- Historical society
- Museum
- Conservation services
- Genealogy society

Public Accessibility

6. Is your institution open to the public on a regular, scheduled basis?

- Yes No

7. Does your institution have public hours all year?

- Yes No

8. If your institution has public hours year round, how many hours per week is it open?

- Less than 10 hours 11-40 More than 40 hours

9. If your institution is seasonally operated, please indicate the number of months and hours per week it is open to the public.

- Months
 - Less than 3 3 to 6 7 to 9 10+
- Hours per week
 - Less than 10 40 Open by appointment only
 - 11-39 More than 40

10. Is your institution accessible according to the Americans with Disabilities Act?

- Yes No Partially Not sure

11. Is any of your collection digitized?

- Yes No

12. Are any of your digitized collections available online?

**LG-41-08-0019-08 Michigan Museums Association Final Report
Connecting to Collections Planning Grant –IMLS 6/27/2012**

- Yes No

13. If you have material online, what percentage of your collection does it represent?

- Less than 10% 50%-74% Don't Know
 11%-24% 75%-99%
 25%-49% 100%

14. How many people visit your institution in person on an annual basis?

- Less than 1,000 10,000-99,999 More than 500,000
 1,000-9,999 100,000 – 499,999 Don't know

15. How many online visits does your institution receive on an annual basis?

- Less than 1,000 10,000-99,999 More than 500,000
 1,000-9,999 100,000 – 499,999 Don't know

16. How many reference or research inquiries do you receive on an annual basis? (This includes requests in person, on the phone, via email or via a web-based form.)

- Less than 100 1,001 to 5,000 10,000 or more
 101 to 1,000 5,001 to 9,999 Don't know

Budget and Staffing

17. What was your total annual operating budget for the most recently completed fiscal year? (Select one.)

- Less than \$10,000 \$100,000-\$499,999 \$2.5 million or more
 \$10,000-\$49,999 \$500,000-\$999,999 Don't know
 \$50,000-\$99,999 \$1 million to \$2,499,999

18. How many people work in this institution? (Select one answer for each row.)

	0	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-20	>20	Don't Know
Full-time professional paid staff							
Part-time professional paid staff							
Full-time other paid staff							
Part-time other paid staff							
Full-time volunteers							
Part-time volunteers							

If you need some help in defining "professional" staff, please contact your Local Coordinator.

Policies

19. Please check all areas for which your organization has a written policy that has been officially adopted. (These components may be included in one or multiple documents depending on your organization.)

**LG-41-08-0019-08 Michigan Museums Association Final Report
Connecting to Collections Planning Grant –IMLS 6/27/2012**

- What you collect
- How you acquire the collection
- How you process the collection (make it ready for use)
- How you store the collection
- How you display the collection
- How you will preserve the collection
- How you clean around the collection
- How you provide access to the collection by patrons
- How you provide reproductions and photocopies of the collection
- How you will deal with a disaster that affects the collection
- How you provide for the security of the collection
- How you document the condition of the collection
- How (or if) you loan the collection to other organizations
- No written policies

COLLECTIONS PROFILE

20. Estimate how many items you have in your collection (Please estimate a single number for all collections, not range.) For collections that are not counted individually (i.e., archival collections) please see next question.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 10,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> 100,000-499,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2.5 million or more |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 10,000-49,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> 500,000-999,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 50,000-99,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 million to 2,499,999 | |

21. For those collections that are not counted by individual objects, please estimate the size of any collections measured in linear feet.

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1-50 | <input type="checkbox"/> 101-500 | <input type="checkbox"/> More than 1,000 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 51-100 | <input type="checkbox"/> 501-1,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |

22. If you have digital collections, please estimate the size of your entire holdings (including back-ups and multiple formats of the same item) in gigabytes. (This would include items you have digitized and reported in Question 11.)

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 gigabyte | <input type="checkbox"/> 50-499 gigabytes | <input type="checkbox"/> More than 1,000 gigabytes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1-49 gigabytes | <input type="checkbox"/> 500-999 gigabytes | |

23. Of the categories of things that are found in your collection, please estimate the percentage of the material found in each category. For example, a library might hold 80% books, 15% paper-based archival material and 5% photographic material.

- _____ Art objects
- _____ Archaeological objects
- _____ Historical objects
- _____ Ethnographic objects made primarily of leather, skin, grasses, bark, etc.
- _____ Natural science specimens

**LG-41-08-0019-08 Michigan Museums Association Final Report
Connecting to Collections Planning Grant –IMLS 6/27/2012**

- _____ Letters, diaries, financial records and other one-of-a-kind (archival) paper-based material
- _____ Books, brochures, maps, and other printed paper-based material
- _____ Photographs or other still images
- _____ Moving images and/or recorded sound (non-digital)
- _____ Digital materials and/or any form of electronic records (including dvds, cds, vhs tape, etc.)

24. How many (by count, not percentage) of the following do you have?

- _____ Large objects other than buildings that are stored outside
- _____ Historic buildings

25. How does your institution keep track of its documentation related to its objects?

- Paper-based (card catalog, files, register book)
- Combination of paper-based and computerized
- Computerized (database, spreadsheet, etc.)
- Don't know

26. How does the public access your collections? (Check all that apply)

- Online collections
- Site visits
- Email correspondence
- Don't know

27. What percentage of your institution's collections has been inventoried?

- None
- 25%-49%
- 75% -99%
- Don't know
- Less than 25%
- 50%-74%
- 100%

28. What percentage of your archival collections has finding aids?

- None
- 25%-49%
- 75% -99%
- Don't know
- Less than 25%
- 50%-74%
- 100%

29. What percentage of your institution's collections is fully catalogued?

- None
- 25%-49%
- 75% -99%
- Don't know
- Less than 25%
- 50%-74%
- 100%

STORAGE/EXHIBIT CONDITIONS

Environment

30. Which of these environmental factors are you able to control in storage areas?

	Yes, in all areas	Yes, in some areas	Partially	No	Don't know
Temperature					
Humidity					
Light levels					
Air circulation and filtration					

**LG-41-08-0019-08 Michigan Museums Association Final Report
Connecting to Collections Planning Grant –IMLS 6/27/2012**

31. Which of these environmental factors are you able to control in exhibit areas?

	Yes, in all areas	Yes, in some areas	Partially	No	Don't know
Temperature					
Humidity					
Light levels					
Air circulation and filtration					

32. In those storage areas where you have environmental controls, do these controls generally conform to recommended conservation standards?

	Yes, in all areas	Yes, in some areas	No	Don't know
Temperature				
Humidity				
Light Levels				
Air circulation and filtration				

33. In those exhibit areas where you have environmental controls, do these controls generally conform to recommended conservation standards?

	Yes, In all areas	Yes in some areas	Yes, with micro-climates	No	Don't know
Temperature					
Humidity					
Light Levels					
Air circulation and filtration					

34. How much of your entire collection is stored and/or exhibited in areas that generally conform to recommended conservation standards?

- None 25%-49% 75% -99% Don't know
 Less than 25% 50%-74% 100%

35. Does your institution store its collections:

- On-site Off-site Both No storage Don't know

36. Are any of your institution's collections (not including historic buildings) stored outside?

- Yes No Don't know

37. How would you describe your collections storage area(s):

- Adequate Full Over-crowded Room for expansion

Fire Protection

38. Are there fire/smoke detection devices in the building(s) where your collection is stored and/or exhibited?

- Yes Partially No

**LG-41-08-0019-08 Michigan Museums Association Final Report
Connecting to Collections Planning Grant –IMLS 6/27/2012**

39. Are the fire detecting devices local (a stand-alone smoke alarm) or connected to a monitoring agency such as the police, fire department, your own security unit or department or a private company?

- Local Some connected All connected

40. Is there within the building an automatic fire suppression system (sprinklers or some other system)?

- Yes No

41. Do you have a pre-action or dry pipe system in areas where collections are stored or exhibited?

- Yes No Don't know

42. In the past 5 years has there been a fire in your institution?

- Yes No Don't know

Lighting

43. Are there windows, sky lights or other sources of sunlight in either your exhibit or storage areas?

- Yes No

44. If there are windows or sky lights in either area, are there devices in places such as curtains or filtered glass to control ultraviolet (UV) radiation?

- Yes No Partially Not sure

45. In storage areas, is the artificial lighting filtered to eliminate UV radiation?

- Yes No Partially Not sure

46. In exhibit areas, is artificial lighting managed to minimize or eliminate UV radiation?

- Yes No Partially Not sure

Buildings

The following questions are for historical sites, where the building itself is part of the collection.

47. What is the general condition of the building? (Select all that apply. If your site has more than one building, skip to Question 48.)

- Building is structurally sound with no known need for major repairs or no known water leakage
- Roof leaks
- Exterior walls leak
- Exterior windows leak
- Foundation is cracked or leaks
- Interior systems (heat, plumbing electrical) are in need of substantial repair or renovation

48. What is the general condition of the buildings? (Select all that apply.)

- All buildings are structurally sound with no known need for major repairs, no known water leakage
- Some buildings are structurally sound with no known need for major repairs and no known water leakage. However in some buildings:

**LG-41-08-0019-08 Michigan Museums Association Final Report
Connecting to Collections Planning Grant –IMLS 6/27/2012**

- Roof leaks
- Exterior walls leak
- Exterior windows leak
- Foundation is cracked or leaks
- Interior systems (heat, plumbing electrical) are in need of substantial repair or renovation
- All buildings have either major structural problems and are in need of major repairs

49. How would you characterize the maintenance routine for your building(s)?

- Nominal: Little is done until there is a major need.
- Preventive: Routine items are done on a calendar basis to ensure general upkeep (e.g., clean gutters, minor roof repairs, general housekeeping) to retard deterioration of the facility.
- Proactive: a list of maintenance needs is compiled annually, incorporated into the institution's budget, and resolved.
- Cyclical Maintenance: There is a multi-year plan which is the basis for capital expenditures (e.g., a plan that provides for future maintenance, failings, etc.)
- Don't know

50. How many buildings contain storage or collection items? _____

51. How many historical buildings are a part of your collection? _____

The following questions are for buildings where collections are stored or displayed, but are non-historical.

52. What is the general condition of the building? (Select all that apply. If your site has more than one building, skip to Question 53.)

- Building is structurally sound with no known need for major repairs or no known water leakage
- Roof leaks
- Exterior walls leak
- Exterior windows leak
- Foundation is cracked or leaks
- Interior systems (heat, plumbing electrical) are in need of substantial repair or renovation

53. What is the general condition of the buildings? (Select all that apply.)

- All buildings are structurally sound with no known need for major repairs and no known water leakage
- Some buildings are structurally sound with no known need for major repairs and no known water leakage. However in some buildings:
 - Roof leaks
 - Exterior walls leak

**LG-41-08-0019-08 Michigan Museums Association Final Report
Connecting to Collections Planning Grant –IMLS 6/27/2012**

- Exterior windows leak
- Foundation is cracked or leaks
- Interior systems (heat, plumbing electrical) are in need of substantial repair or renovation
- All buildings have either major structural problems and are in need of major repairs

54. How would you characterize the maintenance routine for your building(s)?

- Nominal: Little is done until there is a major need.
- Preventive: Routine items are done on a calendar basis to ensure general upkeep (e.g., clean gutters, minor roof repairs, general housekeeping) to retard deterioration of the facility.
- Proactive: a list of maintenance needs is compiled annually, incorporated into the institution's budget, and resolved.
- Cyclical Maintenance: There is a multi-year plan which is the basis for capital expenditures (e.g., a plan that provides for future maintenance, failings, etc.)
- Don't know

General Security

55. Are the storage areas of the building separately locked from the rest of the building's rooms?

- Yes Some but not all No Don't know

56. Is material on exhibit displayed in secured cases or in some other way protected from theft?

- Yes Some but not all No Don't know

57. After hours, does the building have a security system that is connected to a monitoring agency which would respond to an alarm or contact an appropriate agency (police) who would respond?

- Yes No

58. In the past 5 years has anything from your collection been stolen or vandalized?

- Yes No Don't know

59. Is material on display protected from damage by motion? (e.g., seismic activity, accidents, etc.)

- Yes No Partially Not sure

60. Does your institution perform an inventory audit of collections on a regular basis?

- Yes No Don't know

PRESERVATION AND CONSERVATION PLANNING AND ACTIVITIES

61. Are any institutional resources (whether money, staff time or volunteer time) regularly and specifically set aside for preservation and conservation activities?

- Yes No Don't know

62. Has anyone on your institution's staff received conservation training?

- Yes No (if no, skip to question 64)

63. If individuals on your institution's staff received conservation training, what type of training was

**LG-41-08-0019-08 Michigan Museums Association Final Report
Connecting to Collections Planning Grant –IMLS 6/27/2012**

it?

- Personal reading of conservation literature
- Attended a short (one or two day) workshop
- Attended an extensive workshop (one week or more)
- College level coursework involving a semester or more
- Don't know

64. Has a general preservation or conservation assessment ever been performed at your institution?

- Yes, one has been performed within the last 5 years
- Yes, one was performed more than 5 years ago
- No
- Don't know

65. Does your institution have a written, long-range collections management plan for the care of the collections, or is such a plan currently being developed? (Select one.)

- Yes
- Yes, but it is not up to date
- No, but preservation is addressed in overall long-range plan or other institutional reports
- No
- Don't know

66. Does your institution perform a conservation audit of collections on a regular basis?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

EMERGENCY AND DISASTER PLANNING

67. Has your institution prepared a written emergency/disaster plan?

- Yes
- No

68. If a written emergency disaster plan exists, when was it written or last updated?

- Within the last 2 years
- Within the last 5 years
- Within the last 10 years
- It is more than 10 years old and has never been updated
- Don't know

69. In the past five years has your institution experienced an incident or disaster which has damaged your collections?

- Yes
- No

70. If in the past five years your institution experienced an incident or disaster which damaged collections, how much of the collection was damaged?

- Less than 25%
- 25-49%
- 50-74%
- 100%

~END~