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Funded by a grant from the Institute for Museum and Library Services as part of its national Connecting to Collections initiative, the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources Connecting to Collections project successfully sought to identify and assess collections preservation and disaster preparedness activities in the state's cultural heritage community and to facilitate deeper partnerships among individual entities and their professional associations and build relationships within the state’s cultural heritage institutions. Through a series of 8 regional forums paired with workshop components, the project served 314 staff and volunteers from 147 institutions. An additional statewide meeting held in Raleigh was also attended by stakeholders including legislators and the Secretary of the Department of Cultural Resources. A working group of professionals from the archives, library, and museum fields developed a survey to gauge preservation and preparedness activities; facilitated the forums and statewide meeting to seek methods to build relationships; assisted project staff; and established a foundation for future educational outreach for professionals, pre-professionals, and non-professionals working to preserve the state’s cultural heritage.
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C2C and ECHO: Building on a Strong Foundation

The C2C project benefitted from an earlier survey performed by the NC ECHO (Exploring Cultural Heritage Online) project. Sponsored by the North Carolina State Library through IMLS funds, ECHO staff travelled around the state to document the state’s cultural heritage institutions beginning in 2001. ECHO’s final report and survey results were published in 2010 and can be seen on at www.ncecho.org.

The overall findings of the ECHO survey relative to the purposes of the C2C project will be summarized in this report where appropriate. The C2C survey sought to update and add to the previous ECHO survey. Throughout this review of the C2C survey findings, comparisons will be drawn to show how our state has either improved, stayed the same, or declined in the primary areas of disaster preparedness and collections care.

The ECHO survey results mirror the findings of the Heritage Health Index (HHI), completed in 2004, and comparisons to the HHI will be made where possible.
NC ECHO Survey Findings

There are 950 Cultural Heritage Institutions in NC, of this number, there are:

- 236 Library Special Collections
- 31 Archives
- 458 Museums
  - 140 Historic House Museums/Sites/Parks

NC’s cultural heritage institutions care for more than 13 million objects and more than 200 million linear feet of archival materials
More findings of the ECHO Survey

• 72 % of institutions have no disaster response plan
• 60 % describe storage as inadequate
• 86 % have no professional conservation staff

Identified needs and priorities for improvement
– 81 % boost staff training
– 80% preservation of collections
– 92% an increase in funding
C2C Survey Findings
Survey Development

The C2C Working Group designed the survey to complement the existing ECHO survey and to build upon the knowledge gained as a result of the extensive ECHO process. The Working Group also desired this survey to be brief and to target the two largest problems identified by ECHO and the Heritage Health Index – collections care and disaster preparedness.

Participants at regional forums were asked to complete the online survey.
Connecting To Collections Survey

1. Institutional Information

This survey is a needs assessment tool designed to gather information from North Carolina’s cultural heritage institutions for the Connecting to Collections project, administered by the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources. The survey should take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

* 1. Name of institution (Example: Allison-Deaver House):

* 2. Parent institution (Example: Transylvania County Historical Society):

* 3. Mailing address of institution:

* 4. City:

* 5. Zip Code:

* 6. County:

  7. Street address, if different from above:

  8. City:

  9. Zip Code:

  10. Phone number of institution:

  11. Web address of institution:

  12. Email address of institution:

* 13. Person in charge:

* 14. Position title of person in charge:
Connecting To Collections Survey

15. Name and title of contact person if different from person in charge:

16. Contact person’s phone number:

17. Contact person’s email:
Connecting To Collections Survey

2. Disaster Planning

1. Does your institution have a written disaster response/recovery plan?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don't know

2. If you have a written disaster response/recovery plan, is your staff familiar with it and trained to carry it out?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don't know

3. How often are disaster response training exercises held?
   - Once a month
   - Quarterly
   - Every 6 months
   - Annually
   - Biennially
   - Never
   - Other (please specify)

4. What components are included in your written disaster response/recovery plan? (Check all that apply)
   - Building evacuation plan
   - Staff phone tree
   - Emergency contacts (police, fire, security, etc.)
   - Suppliers/services information (freezer storage, disaster clean-up companies, etc.)
   - Instructions for collections salvage
   - Insurance information
   - Risk mitigation activities (routine building inspections, routine inspections of fire extinguishers, etc.)
5. Does your institution have a relationship with first responders (e.g. fire, police)? Examples of “relationship”: Have first responders evaluated your disaster plan? Are they familiar with your facility? Do they know where the most important collections are? Do they know where hazardous materials are?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know

6. Does your institution maintain a kit of supplies for emergency salvage of collections onsite?
   - No
   - Yes; basic supplies only (mops, buckets, sponges, plastic sheeting)
   - Yes; for significant damage (boxes, freezer paper, flashlights, absorbent paper, tape, wet-vacuum, fans, etc.)
   - Yes; for major damage (as above, but with larger amounts plus protective gear, generators, bubble wrap, tarps, etc.)

7. Does your institution maintain copies of records vital to resuming institutional services (e.g. collections records, insurance policies, financial and administrative records) at a secure location at least 25 miles away?
   - Yes
   - Some, but not all
   - No
   - Do not have copies
   - Don’t know

8. Are emergency backups of all unique electronic data (e.g. digital collections, collections data, administrative data) maintained regularly and stored at a secure location at least 25 miles away?
   - Yes
   - Some, but not all
   - No
   - Do not have unique electronic data
   - Don’t know
9. What type of fire protection equipment does your institution use? (Check all that apply)
- None
- Manual fire alarms
- Fire extinguishers
- Chemical fire suppression systems
- Automated fire detection system
- Automated fire suppression system monitored 24/7 by an off-site provider

10. Would your institution be interested in collective purchasing of disaster supplies?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know
Connecting To Collections Survey

3. Collections Care

1. In the past three years, have your collections
   - Increased
   - Decreased
   - Stayed the same
   - Don’t know

2. What methods do you use in cataloging your collections? (Check all that apply)
   - Paper catalogs, indexes or finding aids
   - Electronic catalog, indexes or finding aids created in-house
   - Proprietary cataloging software system (please identify system below)
   - Don’t know

What proprietary cataloging software system do you use? (e.g. PastPerfect, Miharet, InMagic, ReDiscovery, etc).

3. Have you added improvements to your collections storage in the last 3 years? If yes, please indicate approximate percentage of storage improved with each change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year-round temperature controls</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year-round humidity controls</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire detection (smoke/heat alarms)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire suppression (sprinklers, chemical fire suppression)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security systems (motion detectors, locks, surveillance cameras, alarms)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air filtration system</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections protected from excessive or harmful light</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

[Blank space for comments]
Connecting To Collections Survey

4. Has your institution experienced the loss of items due to any of the following in the last 3 years? (Mark all that apply)
   - [ ] Water (flood, leaks)
   - [ ] Fire
   - [ ] Theft
   - [ ] Misfiles
   - [ ] Vandalism
   - [ ] Mold outbreaks
   - [ ] Pests
   - [ ] Other (please specify)

5. Do you have any comments regarding the collection loss in the above question?

6. What security methods does your institution use to help prevent theft and vandalism of the collection?
   - [ ] None
   - [ ] Alarms on doors and/or windows, but no off-site 24 hour monitoring
   - [ ] Security system, monitored 24/7 by an off-site provider
   - [ ] Security system, monitored 24/7 by an off-site provider, plus on-site guards or security staff

7. Does your institution have a pest management system? (Check all that apply)
   - [ ] Routine maintenance and housekeeping
   - [ ] Preventative pest management techniques (e.g. elimination of water and food sources, sealing windows and doors)
   - [ ] Routine pest monitoring using traps
   - [ ] Examination of incoming collections for pests
   - [ ] Preventative use of pesticides (e.g. periodic treatment whether or not there are signs of pests)
   - [ ] Use of pesticides to treat specific infestations
   - [ ] Use of non-chemical methods to treat infestations (e.g. freezing)
Connecting To Collections Survey

4. Budget

[Note: Collections management for museums and archives includes personnel, operating costs (heating, A/C, humidification, dehumidification, etc.), and supplies and equipment. Libraries should only consider budgets for special collections. If these figures are not readily available, please respond "Don't know."]

1. In the most recently completed fiscal year, what was the budget for collections management?
   - Less than $1,000
   - $1,001-$10,000
   - $10,001-$50,000
   - $50,001-$100,000
   - $100,001-$250,000
   - More than $250,000
   - Don't know

2. During the last 3 years, has the funding for collections management:
   - Decreased
   - Remained Stable
   - Increased

3. In the next 3 years, do you expect the funding for collections management to:
   - Decrease
   - Remain stable
   - Increase
Connecting To Collections Survey

5. Collections Training

1. Please indicate areas of interest for collections training. (Mark all that apply)

☐ Grant writing
☐ How to write a disaster response/recovery plan
☐ Disaster response/recovery training
☐ Proper storage environments (including shelving, housing artifacts in proper containers)
☐ Registration methods
☐ Safeguarding collections on exhibit
☐ No, I am not interested
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Questionnaire completed by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affiliation with institution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
76 Valid Survey Responses

• Is this a valid survey? Yes

• Total population from workshops: 314.

• Response rate: 24%  (same as for HHI)

See [http://www.berrie.dds.nl/calcss.htm](http://www.berrie.dds.nl/calcss.htm) for a calculator to determine valid survey samples.
(Population = 314 [number of forum attendees requested to complete survey], confidence =95%, margin of error 10%)
Of the 76 valid responses, they were almost equally representative of the museum and library fields. Smaller numbers of responders were from archives and historic sites.

The NC ECHO and Heritage Health Index surveys reflected similar ratios of institutions by category. Therefore, comparison of this data and that of the ECHO and HHI surveys can be considered fair.

** Both NC surveys indicate that standards of disaster preparedness and collections care in libraries and archives far exceed the standards found in museums and historic sites.
Disaster Preparedness
Some Recent Disasters.....

Descriptions of images on preceding page, clockwise from top left:

- Fire at Chatham County Courthouse 3/25/2010

- Preparations for Hurricane Irene at Tryon Palace State Historic Site
  August 25-26, 2011

- Tornado destruction at Elaney Wood House, Greene County, NC
  4/16/2011

- Tree damage from tornado at North Carolina State Archives 4/16/2011

All of these disasters happened during the planning grant!
The ECHO survey found that 72% of institutions did not have a written disaster plan. Further the HHI survey found that 80% of US institutions do not plan for their collections in the event of disaster. The results of this followup survey shows that the efforts to encourage institutions to develop written disaster plans by partner institutions such as the North Carolina Preservation Consortium were successful.

However, subsequent questions in the C2C survey asked for more detail regarding preparedness. Although institutions may have a written disaster plan, the survey results show that the plans are not updated regularly and that staff members are un-trained in implementing the plans.

It seems as if the basic tenets of disaster planning that have been presented by various groups both locally and nationally have encouraged the beginning stages of preparedness. Nonetheless, deeper planning and staff training is needed to fully prepare institutions for disasters, large or small.
If you have a written disaster response/recovery plan, is your staff familiar with it and trained to carry it out?

Respondents replied almost evenly regarding whether or not staff members are familiar with, and prepared to carry out, a written disaster response and recovery plan.

The Heritage Health Index found that the largest percentage of institutions of un-trained staff were small with few staff members and no written plans.
Although almost half of the institutions feel their staff is adequately trained to carry out their plan, most do not hold training exercises. This disconnect should be explored and institutions should be encouraged to do more to prepare their staff to react accordingly when disaster strikes.

Alarmingly, 63% of institutions never have training exercises.
Comments about Disaster Response Training

- infrequent, due to changes in personnel over the years, needs updating, 2002 current plan
- We have had some exercises but not on a regular schedule. Closest guess is biennially but probably a bit more erratic (more at some times but then long periods of inactivity and participation rates vary).
- We have evacuation plans for our valuable genealogical and historical materials, but not the collection at large.
- We have a partial plan; we utilize PReP, and have completed emergency instruction booklets for each staff person and work area.
- We have just completed one for the library. We are still getting it approved and finalized.
- Our plan is part of the County of Johnston's Continuity of Operations Plan - no set schedule for training exercises.
- Have not had one in the past but will start monthly.
- Every 4-5 years
- last time was over 5 years ago
- Not yet. The plan is still new and we're working the bugs out before we train.
- Staff has not been trained since the plan was drafted.
- We have annual fire drills, but have not had regular disaster training exercises.
- We had some initial training with our College Safety Officer about two years ago but need to review procedures and provide training for new library staff.
What Components are included in your written disaster response/recovery plan?
(Check all that apply)

- Building evacuation plan: 21%
- Staff phone tree: 15%
- Emergency contacts (police, fire, security, etc.): 19%
- Suppliers/services information (freezer storage, disaster clean-up companies, etc.): 14%
- Instructions for collections salvage: 12%
- Insurance information: 7%
- Risk mitigation activities (routine building inspections, routine inspections of fire extinguishers, etc.): 12%

Analysis of the responses to this question, answered only by institutions who have a written plan, show that most plans focus on staff safety and communication. Fewer institutions included response and recovery information in their plans.
Does your institution have a relationship with first responders?

- Yes: 45%
- No: 34%
- Don't know: 21%

It is almost evenly split between institutions who do have a relationship with first responders and institutions who do not.
Does your institution maintain a kit of supplies for emergency salvage of collections onsite?

- No: 3%
- Yes; basic supplies only (mops, buckets, sponges, plastic sheeting): 18%
- Yes; for significant damage (boxes, freezer paper, flashlights, absorbent paper, tape, wet-vacuum, fans, etc.): 40%
- Yes; for significant damage (boxes, freezer paper, flashlights, absorbent paper, tape, wet-vacuum, fans, etc.): 3%

The split is almost even between institutions who have basic supplies for recovery and those who do not. A smaller percentage have items in place for significant damage.
Does your institution maintain copies of vital records at a secure location at least 25 miles away?

The largest percentage of respondents do not have copies of their vital records at a secure location at least 25 miles away. This component of a disaster plan is important for regions prone to flooding and hurricanes.
Are emergency backups of all unique electronic data maintained regularly and stored at a secure location at least 25 miles away?

- Yes: 24%
- Some, but not all: 15%
- No: 20%
- Do not have unique electronic data: 41%
- Don't know: 0%

The largest proportion of respondents also do not keep copies of electronic data at secure locations separated from their main facility. More said “no” to electronic records than traditional records.
What type of fire protection equipment does your institution use? Check all that apply.

Many institutions have at least fire extinguishers and manual fire alarms with others augmenting this basic form of fire suppression with automated fire detection systems. A small percentage also have an automated system monitored by an off-site provider.
Would your institution be interested in collective purchasing of disaster supplies?

The NC C2C project has been investigating ways in which regional groups could participate in collective purchasing. With many groups using a variety of methods to purchase supplies from a number of providers, it is a daunting task to find a “fit” for a diverse purchasing group. The model offered by the Mountain Plains Museum Association is currently being reviewed as a viable option. [http://www.mpma.net/purchasingCO-OP.php](http://www.mpma.net/purchasingCO-OP.php)
Collections Care
In the past three years, have your collections increased, decreased, or stayed the same?

- Increased: 89%
- Decreased: 4%
- Stayed the Same: 7%

An overwhelming majority of respondents reported that their collections have increased over the last three years. The NCECHO survey found that 57% of institutions felt they would reach storage capacity within five years (30% reported they would be at capacity in 1 year).
What methods do you use in cataloging your collections? (Check all that apply)

- Paper catalogs, indexes or finding aids
- Electronic catalog, indexes or finding aids created in-house
- Proprietary cataloging software system (please identify system below)
- Don't know

This statistic is not surprising since ECHO found that 97% of institutions had at least some degree of intellectual control over their collections and that many had either online public access or a website. This statistic is skewed by institution type since ECHO found that libraries were more likely to have their collections in electronic databases as compared to museums, where only 10% of those institutions had electronic records. The HHI also found that libraries lead all other institutions in making their collections accessible through catalogs.
Further analysis of record keeping

- 19 reported electronic in-house only
- 12 proprietary software only
- 4 paper only

Software used to catalog and track collections:

- Access
- Collectorz.com
- ContentDM
- EmbARK Collections Management System
- Excel
- FileMaker Pro
- InMagic (2)
- Innovative Interfaces Inc. (2)
- MUSARC
- Past Perfect (12)
- Re:Discovery (8)
- SIRSI (3)
- The Library Corporation’s Library.Solution
- The Museum System/TMS (2)
All respondents improved storage area temperature controls and most improved 100% of their storage areas. The ECHO survey found that 76% of institutions surveyed had year round temperature controls. Therefore, it is encouraging to see that some institutions are working to improve existing systems, however, since only 30% of the survey takers responded to this question, it would seem that the majority of survey takers have not improved their systems.
The largest percentage of respondents have made improvements to all of their collections storage areas. However, only 24% of all survey respondents answered this question. ECHO found that only 36% of institutions have year-round humidity controls and these survey results confirm that humidity controls still lag behind temperature controls in institutions. HHI also reflected similar problems in environmental controls, particularly in addressing humidity issues.
29% of survey takers responded to this question and, of those who responded, the largest majority have improved fire detection systems in all of their collections storage areas. The ECHO survey found that 70% of institutions have fire detection systems installed. It appears that the majority are relying on existing systems to maintain a degree of fire safety for staff and collections.
21% of survey participants answered this question.

ECHO found that 29% of institutions have fire suppression systems so it follows that few would be improving such systems. It is a positive observation that, for those institutions who have suppression systems, the systems are being updated.
30% of respondents answered this question.

ECHO found that 68% of collections had security systems. These survey results show some institutions are improving at least a portion of their security systems.
17% of respondents answered this question. ECHO found that 69% of institutions have air filtration systems in place. The findings of this survey imply that only a small percentage of institutions are improving their HVAC filtration systems.
30% of survey respondents answered this question. ECHO found that 73% of institutions have UV filters in place. It is good to learn that some institutions are improving existing systems but they need to do more, especially since some UV filters have a limited life of effectiveness.
Comments on improvements to collections storage over last 3 years

- All of this was done when the building housing the Heritage Center was renovated prior to opening in 2000.
- Budget shortfall has not permitted necessary repairs of HVAC system.
- Have had year-round temp/humidity, fire detection, air filtration, fire detection for more than 3 years.
- Have not added improvements, but switched Halon system out for Sapphire fire suppression system.
- Improved storage system to utilize vertical racks, shelving, and flat file storage. Currently working to improve humidity controls and monitoring systems.
- Moved to a new building in 2006. Although controls are not archival standard, they are a huge improvement over the previous conditions.
- New locks and keying system for all archive areas; surveillance cameras at building entrances and exits.
- No changes have been made in the past three years.
- No improvements.
- None of the above.
- Only applies to vertical file materials.
- Our three art storage rooms were already equipped with humidity and temperature controls - we just replaced the old pneumatic equipment with digital controls, which manage the temp and RH more effectively. Art storage already protected with Fire detection devices; already protected from excessive/harmful light; already protected with a Security system. Chemical fire suppression only in two of three storage rooms. Third room has neither chemical nor sprinkler suppression.
- Recently installed a compact rack/rail system for boxes of artifact storage and new shelving.
- Some filtering has been added to the large windows.
- The year round and others that are checked above are for the Collections room as storage currently is only fire protected at the moment. Both are on the same security system as the library as a whole, which is turned on/off on a schedule. I am working to improve both and to make the storage area (where 95% is stored) better but the process is slow.
- We have not have done any security or environmental improvements in the last 3 years. However, we are about to begin a renovation project which should improve all of the above.
- We have some off-site storage in a location with no HV/AC; there are leaks overhead and windows with no protection from sunlight.
- We have stored and wrapped items in archival boxes and paper.
Has your institution experienced the loss of items due to any of the following in the last 3 years? (Check all that apply)

- Water (flood, leaks): 8%
- Fire: 11%
- Theft: 12%
- Misfiles: 23%
- Vandalism: 28%
- Mold outbreaks: 28%
- Pests: 0%

The ECHO survey found that 29% of institutions had experienced some sort of loss, with the highest category being theft, followed by misfiles. This survey follows the same profile.
Comments on Collections Loss

- we did a mold abatement for some historic docs that came to us in that condition.
- Unsure if it happened in the past three years, but it has happened
- all problems were do to the above mentioned storage location and not at the Museum
- misfiles due to poor organization.
- shelves have been redesigned
- The loss, due to a roof leak, was preventable as the roof was known to need replacement.
- no losses and no improvements
- We have had some Collection Damage but we have not had the loss of any objects and the object are now currently in a new Storage unit which has better climate controls.
- pure frustration at lack of funds for flood/fire/theft prevention
- Primarily laptops and a camcorder
- The theft was by a former employee of the library
- mechanical malfunctions
- Damage due to movement and vandalism
- vibration, objects shaken off shelves by loud music
- have had some roof leaks, but no artifact damage
What security methods does your institution use to help prevent theft and vandalism of the collection?

- 42% None
- 17% Alarms on doors and/or windows, but no off-site 24 hour monitoring
- 17% Security system, monitored 24/7 by an off-site provider
- 24% Security system, monitored 24/7 by an off-site provider, plus on-site guards or security staff

Many institutions use off site monitoring for security. However, an alarming 24% do not have any security procedures in place to safeguard collections. These statistics mirror the ECHO statistics in that libraries and archives have a higher degree of security measures in place than do museums.
A small percentage of institutions use only routine maintenance and housekeeping to monitor for pests. Most of the institutions use a combination of preventive techniques in conjunction with routine cleaning. Many use traps, examination of incoming collections, and pesticides to manage their pests. Study of Integrated Pest Management Systems were not a part of the ECHO survey.
Besides those who replied “don’t know,” the largest group of respondents operate on a budget of $1000 or less for collections management. The HHI found that most institutions operate on less than $3000 for collections preservation.

From the ECHO survey, we know that 54% of institutions in NC operate on overall budgets of less than $50,000 and, of that number, 36% operate on budgets of $10,00 or less. Collections care typically receives a small fraction of overall operating expenses.
Earlier statistics showed that 89% of institutions have growing collections yet funding for collections care has decreased for the majority of institutions.

ECHO did not survey for collections care budgets but, instead, focused on overall budgets for institutions. In that framework, most institutions reported to ECHO that their budgets had remained stable in the last three years and forecasted that their budgets would remain stable, or even increase, in the next three. Given the current economic downturns, those statistics would be much different if the ECHO survey were given today. The C2C survey is reflective of a much less vibrant economy.
In the next 3 years, do you expect the funding for collections management to decrease, remain stable, or increase?

Even though the economy and institutions are suffering, survey respondents felt that their budgets for collections management would remain stable in the next three years.
Respondents almost equally want training on grant writing, storage environments, preservation of collections on exhibit, and disaster response/recovery training.
Public Forums

Asheville, Greenville, Greensboro, Raleigh, Wilmington, Hickory, Morehead City, Wilson, Windsor
Forum locations and dates

Public forums were held in 9 locations around the state between December 2009 and June 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop location</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>total # attendees</th>
<th>professional</th>
<th>non-professional</th>
<th>pre-professional</th>
<th>docent</th>
<th>volunteer</th>
<th>staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asheville</td>
<td>12/7/2009</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>1/15/2010</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro</td>
<td>2/8/2010</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>5/20/2010</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>12/6/2010</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickory</td>
<td>1/31/2011</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehead City</td>
<td>3/30/2011</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>6/13/2011</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>6/20/2011</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>314</strong></td>
<td><strong>166</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>264</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback from Public Forums

• Participants in the public forums were asked to complete evaluation forms and to participate in brainstorming sessions.
• Brainstorming sessions were led by working group members and focused on asking institutions to share challenges and offer solutions.
• The questions asked in evaluations were standard questions about whether or not the meeting met attendee’s expectations, the quality and clarity of presentations, usefulness of presentations, and requests for future workshop topics/programs.
• Overall comments on the presentations and their content were positive.
• A multitude of suggestions for workshops resulted.
Brainstorming Sessions: Concerns

Working group members began brainstorming sessions by letting representatives from various institutions “vent” about their most pressing problems and concerns.

Given the knowledge that institutions across the state were facing similar problems regardless of size, funding, or focus, it isn’t surprising that there was consensus in that most institutions were worried about the same sorts of things.

Concerns expressed in the brainstorming sessions covered a broad variety of subjects but can broken down into three general categories: collections care, disaster preparedness, and general topics. Some themes applied to both collections care and disaster preparedness and some were also over-arching problems such as deficient technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>collections care</th>
<th>disaster preparedness</th>
<th>general</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>collections management</td>
<td>cheap alternatives to</td>
<td>inadequate staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental controls</td>
<td>no plans/policies</td>
<td>inadequate funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>board education</td>
<td>damage to collections</td>
<td>security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volunteer training</td>
<td>building problems</td>
<td>digitization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incoming objects</td>
<td>no recovery strategies</td>
<td>access to collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exhibits</td>
<td>untrained staff</td>
<td>building problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storage</td>
<td>pests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheap alternatives to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deficient computers/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no plans/policies</td>
<td></td>
<td>board education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damage to collections</td>
<td></td>
<td>volunteer training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no space for collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deficient computers/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brainstorming Sessions: Solutions

Once participants in the brainstorming sessions saw their concerns written on poster sheets, and some realized that their battles were similar to other problems faced at neighboring institutions, they began to move into finding solutions.

Participants were encouraged to help session leaders, and, in turn, the C2C project, find the best ways in which to address their concerns and problems. The resulting set of solutions mirror what was learned through the survey as well as feedback received in post-meeting evaluation forms.

One common theme was that institutions wanted a centralized “place” they could go to for help and resources and they would further like to C2C to offer specialized staff resources on topics related to disaster preparedness and collections care. This feedback led to the model established in the implementation project of two staff members travelling the state providing a variety of workshops on requested topics. Participants knew about some regional groups such as NCMC or NCPC but did not know about the wide variety of other institutions offering assistance in the state and now look to C2C to provide centralized guidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solutions (in alphabetical order)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• centralized digital repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• collections assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• collections management tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• co-op purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• establish a speakers bureau by topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• funding for centralized staff to facilitate workshops, help lines, regional networking, and other outreach inside NC DCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• generating consultants lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• help line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• internships/jobs postings list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• mentoring programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• online resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• provide sample disaster plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• regional disaster teams/supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• regional storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• re-grant programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• training in FEMA’s Incident Command System program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• travelling conservator program similar to Travelling Archivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• workshops (low cost/regional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluations Feedback
Other topics: museum educational programming, oral history projects, planning/management/writing policies, programs for small museums, volunteers, administrative staff/board training, advocacy, anything, book repair/care for rare books, building partnerships, caring for historic structures, collections planning, copyright, databases/software, genealogy, IRS Rules/legal topics, marketing/website design/web publishing, membership
Popular Workshop Topics

• Most popular collections care topics: box making, collections management, environmental monitoring, handling, mount making, numbering, object-specific conservation, packaging for storage/shipment, pest management, storage, exhibits

• Most popular archival topics: Preservation of paper-based materials including documents and photographs, preservation of a/v materials, finding aids
Open-ended comments from Evaluations

- “Wonderful-helpful-inspiring-empowering. I feel I gained tools for dealing with issues that are a source of frustration and confusion.”

- “I felt the workshop was well worth the time. I have been reluctant to attend any workshops; because I felt inadequate. After attending workshops I found that my problems were not unique & I was not alone.”

- “can't wait to get back to the office and apply the new knowledge!”

- “It was great to learn from real life stories presented by people who are so experienced & positive.”

- “I am especially grateful for the various refresher courses. Despite the years I've been in the field, it is always very helpful to be reminded of the best or new ways to solve various collections issues.”

- “through both presentations and break out discussions I've accumulated many good ideas to take back to my team”
Anticipated changes at home institutions after learning new information at forums?

- learned about consortiums I didn't know about
- yes, we will work on the disaster plan
- need for a disaster plan and talking to local emergency services personnel
- yes, want to follow up on some of the ideas
- very helpful, good information for followup
- hopefully, once again, I'm reminded that we really need a disaster plan
- It was an excellent refresher and introduced me to organizations of which I was unaware
- Yes, I plan to share information with staff
- Yes. We are in the midst of addressing all these issues.
- Definitely--This has given me specific information, ideas about resources and lots to think about.
- I'll be sharing my notes with my colleagues.
- most definitely, we have a long way to go
- being a small museum all knowledge helps make informed decisions
- absolutely; we are really in a start-up place and need lots of guidance
- yes, FEMA, wheel
- yes. I think it will spur me to get to work on writing a disaster plan specifically targeted to my unit within the library
- yes in that it provided baseline info about unfamiliar programs
Website

www.c2c.ncdcr.gov
Goals for website

Based on feedback received in forum brainstorming sessions, the Working Group decided to develop a more comprehensive website than originally called for in the grant application. The GIS floodplain map was developed as planned and added to a larger site developed solely for the C2C project. The planning grant extension enabled the full development of the GIS map plus the separation of the new C2C website from the main ECHO website so that now each entity has its own web presence.

www.ncecho.org  www.c2c.ncdcr.gov
GIS Floodplain Maps

• The floodplain mapping system assigned GIS coordinates to cultural heritage institutions in the ECHO database (approximately 950 institutions were mapped).
• Users can zoom in on the map to see their location relative to 100-year and 500-year flood predictions.
• It is hoped that this map will be useful for institutions as they develop disaster recovery, response, and mitigation plans as well as for other users such as emergency management personnel and county planners.
GIS map featuring institutions in eastern section of NC
Sample search: Location information and flood scenarios for Pocosin Arts, Tyrell County.
Other Web Resources

The bones of the new C2C website were created through the planning grant and are being built upon during the Implementation Grant.

Resources offered through the website include information on disaster preparedness and response, collections care, and other tools and information that our constituents ask for and need.
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Workshops and Training
C2C is offering workshops across the state on a variety of topics. Click here for a list of upcoming workshops.
For more information on our workshops click here.

NC ECHO
NC ECHO (Exploring Cultural Heritage Online) was a project of the State Library of North Carolina. The project sought to identify and survey cultural heritage institutions (archives, libraries, museums, historic sites) across the state. Learn More

GIS Floodplain Map
The GIS floodplain map will help identify the institutions most at risk for flooding.
Special attention can then be directed to at-risk collection storage areas, and trained flood-artifact-recovery teams can be created.
Go To The Map

Disaster Help
Disasters come in many forms—natural, human-generated, intentional, and unintentional—and all are capable of causing significant damage to collections and historic buildings. Through C2C, we are giving cultural institutions the tools and training to start their disaster planning and response preparations. Learn More

Latest News
Get the slide shows from the recent grantwriting session!
About

Connecting to Collections is a federal grant project administered by the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources. NCDCR was awarded grants from the Institute of Museum and Library Services to assist the state’s archives, museums, library special collections and historic sites with traditional preservation of collections and disaster preparedness and response.

The NC ECHO Project visited North Carolina’s cultural heritage institutions and conducted a needs assessment survey. Survey findings show that collections preservation and disaster preparedness are universal concerns. The Connecting to Collections project will address these concerns and assist North Carolina’s institutions in facilitating deeper partnerships and planning for sustainable, long-term success in these activities.

The Connecting to Collections Project is currently offering a series of workshops and regional forums on a variety of topics related to collections care, preservation, and disaster preparedness. An online re-survey of institutions is being conducted to augment the data collected in the initial NC ECHO Survey. Additionally, a database of collections preservation and disaster preparedness tools will be created as well as a database of geolocation information for every institution which can be used to assess risk in a natural disaster situation.

IMLS offers implementation grants to carry out the activities designated by the Connecting to Collections Working Group. NCDCR will submit an application for a 2010/2011 implementation grant. To be successful, the project needs your support and input. Please attend one of the regional forums and complete the survey of institutions.

Have questions? Contact the Connecting to Collections Project Manager, LeRae Umfleet at LeRae.Umfleet@ncdcr.gov
Working Group

Statement of Purpose

The Connecting to Collections Working Group provides informed recommendations and advice to the Department of Cultural Resources and the Connecting to Collections staff to help assure a successful, responsive program. Members freely share experience and expertise in order to enhance the collective body of knowledge the NC ECHO project provides North Carolina’s cultural heritage community. The Connecting to Collections Working Group represents the concerns of cultural heritage professionals and serves as a communications link between the project and relevant institutions and government agencies.

Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Campbell</td>
<td>Collections Section Chief, North Carolina Museum of History</td>
<td>5 East Edenton Street, Raleigh, NC 27601-1011</td>
<td>919.837.7964</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.campbell@ncdcr.gov">john.campbell@ncdcr.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen Godsey</td>
<td>College Archivist, Guilford College</td>
<td>3900 West Friendly Avenue, Greensboro, NC 27410</td>
<td>336.216.2264</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ggodsey@guilford.edu">ggodsey@guilford.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Haas</td>
<td>Director, Cape Fear Museum</td>
<td>814 Market Street, Wilmington, NC 28401</td>
<td>910.796.4357</td>
<td><a href="mailto:RHaas@nhrp.gov">RHaas@nhrp.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Battle</td>
<td>Curator of Technology, North Carolina Historic Sites</td>
<td>4620 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27609-4620</td>
<td>919.733.7852</td>
<td><a href="mailto:martha.jackson@ncdcr.gov">martha.jackson@ncdcr.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert James</td>
<td>Executive Director, North Carolina Preservation</td>
<td>PO Box 2651, Durham, NC 2771-2651</td>
<td>252.328.6114</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robertjamesncp@gmail.com">robertjamesncp@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Partners

Federation of North Carolina Historical Societies
The Federation of North Carolina Historical Societies is a statewide coalition of societies, associations, and commissions that are dedicated to preserving and promoting history in North Carolina. The Federation is a nonprofit organization, administered through the NC Office of Archives and History, whose mission is to promote local history, to foster cooperation among local and regional historical organizations, and to support history education.

www.fnchs.org

North Carolina Museums Council (NCMC)

The purpose of NCMC is to enhance public education by improving the administrative, interpretive, and collections practices of museums, historic sites, science centers, and related facilities in North Carolina. NCMC also strives to stimulate public support for the work these facilities undertake, to provide a forum where council members can exchange ideas, and to foster cooperation and improved communication between member organizations and the communities they serve.

www.ncmuseums.org

North Carolina Preservation Consortium (NCPC)

NCPC is a nonprofit organization dedicated to the preservation of collections in our State’s libraries, archives, museums, historic sites, and other heritage institutions. Our preservation mission addresses the proper care and handling of materials; storage and environmental control; disaster preparedness and recovery; the repair, reformating, and conservation of damaged items; and collection security. NCPC supports the preservation of information content and the medium as artifact, in new and traditional formats for present and future generations. NCPC also informs the general public about preservation for private collections and family treasures.
Forums and Workshops

The North Carolina Connecting to Collections Project (C2C) will be hosting a series of workshops throughout the state on a variety of topics related to collections care and disaster preparedness. Staff, board members, and volunteers who are interested in improving the ways in which their collections are managed and preserved are encouraged to attend these workshops. Led by experienced professionals in the fields of conservation, disaster response, digitization, and collections management, the workshops will benefit small to mid-size institutions including libraries, archives, museums, and historic sites. Larger institutions will profit from networking, access to current trends, and development of regional and statewide resource sharing associations.

Many of the workshops will be interactive; participants are encouraged to share specific situations and challenges they may be facing in their own institutions. Participants will also receive helpful hand-outs, examples, and resources—take-away materials which may facilitate far-reaching instruction among staff and volunteers who do not have the opportunity to attend. Hands-on activities in a variety of settings will add to participants’ understanding of handling and cleaning items, recovering from a disaster, and facing the myriad of scenarios institutions encounter on a daily basis.

The workshops will open with an information session about C2C and NC ECHO, encouraging questions, feedback, and networking. Participants in the C2C sessions have a unique opportunity to help improve how cultural heritage institutions (museums, archives, libraries, and historic sites) care for a wide variety of artifacts, books, papers, and other objects of our state’s cultural past. C2C project staff continues to seek input on what types of workshops are needed as they search for solutions to challenges facing collections statewide.

The North Carolina Connecting to Collections Project is an IMLS grant-funded initiative aimed at helping institutions better care for their collections. A variety of partner organizations have made this project possible: Federation of NC Historical Societies, NC Museums Council, NC Preservation Consortium, State Historic Records Advisory Board, and Society of NC Archivists.

Visit http://c2c.ncdcr.gov/ to learn more and sign up for our Listserv — the fastest and easiest way to learn more!
The link for the survey is now disabled and the findings of the survey will be posted here along with the final report for the planning grant.
"Disaster Preparedness" Resources

The sub-headings take users to lists of links to helpful online resources. These tools are being expanded in the implementation grant.
“Collections Care” Resources

The sub-headings take users to lists of links to helpful online resources. These tools are being expanded in the implementation grant.

Collections Care

Overwhelmed by storage conditions, record-keeping problems, and basic artifact care? Our workshops, links to helpful documents, and availability for individual guidance can help you make improvements in manageable steps. Adrienne Bemey, C2C’s Collections Care Trainer, will work to assist any staff member from a North Carolina museum or historic site by offering ideas, resources, and hands-on training in preventative conservation. Please call or email for quick advice or plan to attend one of the workshops scheduled throughout the state.

Collections Care Resources:

- Helpful Links
- Training
- Finding A Conservator
- Vendors
Grants Information

This ever-changing, ever-growing list of granting organizations can be a helpful start when thinking about searching for funding for projects, exhibits, conservation, or capital projects. Be sure to carefully read requirements and be mindful of deadlines.

Grantor: Federal Highway Administration: Transportation Enhancement Funds

Web link: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/TE

Description: The Federal Highway Administration provides funds for transportation enhancements to state departments of transportation. These funds must be used in a way that relates to surface transportation and that fits one of 12 eligibility requirements. The following eligible activities may be of special interest to museums and historical societies: acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites (including historic battlefield), historic preservation, archaeological planning and research, and establishment of transportation museums. Please visit the Web site for more information and to find a link to North Carolina’s Transportation Enhancement coordinator. This coordinator can discuss a potential project with you as well how to request funding.

Grantor: Institute for Museum and Library Services: American Heritage Preservation Program

Web link: http://www.imls.gov/collections/grants-bpa.htm

Description: Deadline: September 15. Bank of America is partnering with IMLS to provide grants of up to $3,000 to small museums, libraries, and archives. The grants will raise awareness and fund preservation of treasures held in these small cultural organizations. Grants will help to preserve specific items, including works of art, artifacts, and historical documents that are in need of conservation. Applicants should build on completed conservation assessments of their collections.
“Consortia” lists on this page refer users to a variety of specialized organizations that provide services to members.

Name: Society for the Preservation of Natural History Collections
WebLink: http://www.spanhc.org
Description: "SPNHSC is an international organization devoted to the preservation, conservation and management of natural history collections. The Society was founded in 1985 in Toronto, Ontario, and was incorporated in 1988 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania as a non-profit organization."

Name: Southeastern Museums Conference
WebLink: http://www.semdirect.net
Description: "SEMC fosters professionalism, mutual support, and communication among its members and the larger museum community. A nonprofit membership organization, SEMC strives to increase educational and professional development opportunities, improve the interchange of ideas and information, and encourage respect and collegiality."

Name: Southeastern Registrars Association
WebLink: http://www.seregistrars.org
Description: "SERA initiates the supports activities and projects which help create an atmosphere of cooperation and communication among and between registrars, other museum professionals, and those in related service fields, and pursues further development of professional practices in the field."
Contact Us

NC Connecting to Collections
NC Department of Cultural Resources
4610 Mail Services Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-4610

Lerae Umfleet
C2C Project Director
lerae.umfleet@ncdcr.gov
Phone: 919-807-7289
Cell: 919-389-6096

Michelle Vaughn
C2C Administrative Assistant
michelle.vaughn@ncdcr.gov
Phone: 919-807-7422

Adrienne Barney
C2C Collections Care Trainer
adrienne.barney@ncdcr.gov
Phone: 919-807-7618

Matthew Hunt
C2C Disaster Preparedness Coordinator
matthew.hunt@ncdcr.gov
Phone: 919-807-7293

Visit Us On Facebook

The North Carolina Connecting to Collections project is funded by a grant from the Institute for Museum and Library Services and administered by the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources.
Feedback indicated that the use of a list serv is still viable for NC. The combined C2C/ECHO list has 592 active members.
ECHO and C2C are kindred spirits!