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3. Project Partners:
   
   Tennessee State Museum  
   Society of Tennessee Archivists  
   Tennessee Association of Museums  

4. Description, brief

Tennessee designed and implemented the project to complete a statewide survey of as many historic and cultural sites as possible. The survey supported the evidence of the need for basics of museum and archival care. The grant was able to include a commitment to educational training that reflected the survey and help jump start improvements of collections storage of historic significance. Tennessee successfully completed the survey and five two part workshops titled “Collections Care and Management, 101” and “Collections Care and Management 201.” The Connecting to Collections workshops were held in an extensive set of locations representing the diversity of repositories across the state. They included Rocky Mount Historic Site in Upper East Tennessee, Nashville Public Library in Nashville, Buford Pusser Historic House Museum in West Tennessee, and many more.

5 & 6  Part 2

Institution Name: _____ Tennessee State Library And Archives _____

Grant #:  LG -41-08-0018-08

A. SITE SPECIFIC PROJECT ACTIVITY: ___Caring for Collections Workshops____

1. _________ Total # of collection items conserved, relocated to protective storage, rehoused, or for which other preservation-appropriate physical action was taken.

2. _________ Total # of collection items digitized, scanned, reformatted, or for which other electronic or digital preservation action was taken.

3. _________ Total # of collection items with new or enhanced accessibility (include items that were cataloged or for which finding aids or other records were created or computerized) [includes _____ items made accessible to users other than grantee staff for the first time, _____ items with new or enhanced access for staff only].

4. _________ Total # of lectures, symposia, demonstrations, exhibits, readings, performances, concerts, broadcasts, Webcasts, workshops, multi-media packages, or other learning opportunities provided for the public (do not include PSAs or other promotional activities) [includes _____ out-of-school or after-school programs, _____ exhibits].
5. _______ Total # of tools created, improved, or produced for searching, information management, or information analysis by users other than or in addition to grantee staff.

6. _______ Total # of conferences, programs, workshops, training sessions, institutes, classes, courses, or other structured educational events provided.

7. _______ Total # of internships, apprenticeships, mentoring opportunities, or other extended educational opportunities provided.

8. _______ Total # of degrees/certificates earned as a result of the grant [includes ______ Master’s, ____ Ph.D. degrees, ______ other (specify): ____________________].

9. _______ Total # technology upgrades or improvements (specify): ____________________________.

10. If your grant engaged in other activities not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.

B. PORTABLE PRODUCTS (relating to the activity named in section A.)

11. _______ Total # of research reports, papers, books, reprints, or other publications generated.

12. _______ Total # of Web sites developed or improved [include URLs/addresses:
__________________________________________________________].

13. _______ Total # of learning resources produced [includes ______ oral histories, ______ curriculum resources, ______ curriculums, ______ Web-based learning tools, or ______ other (specify): ____________________].

14. _______ Total # of key management documents created [includes ______ emergency plans, ______ conservation surveys, ______ strategic plans, ______ other (specify): Workshops’ homework was to create disaster plans or calling tree similar to PREP Template (COSA) ].

15. If your grant created one or more quantifiable products not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.

C. PARTICIPANTS/VISITORS/USERS/AUDIENCE (relating to the activity named in section A.)

16. _______ Total # of community organization partners [includes ______ informal partners, ______ formal partners].
17. ________ Total # of schools (pre-K through grade 12) that used services provided by your grant (include only schools that actively participated, not those to which material was simply distributed or made available) [includes _____ students participating in field trips].

18. ________ Total # of teachers supported, trained, or otherwise provided with resources to strengthen classroom teaching or learning.

19. ________ Total # of pre-K through grade-12 students served [includes ____ youth 9-19 who used, participated, visited, or otherwise interacted with activities, experiences, resources, or products offered by your grant].

20. ________ Total # of viewers and listeners for radio, television, and cable broadcasts (for series, include total actual audience for all broadcasts; do not include audience for PSAs or other promotional activities or Webcasts; do not report potential audience).

21. ________ Total # of users of Web-based resources provided by your grant (include all individuals the project served). Choose the measure that best represents your use rate (choose only one): _____ visits (hits), ____ unique visitors, ____ registered users, ____ other measure (specify): ________________________________.

22. _275_ ______ Total # of individuals benefiting from your grant (include all those from questions 18-21 plus others the project served, including staff or others in your field). Only include those who actually participated or used your project services in some way.

23. This number includes: ___ 75 professionals, ___ 75 non-professionals or pre-professionals, ____ docents or interpreters, __100 volunteers, _____________ staff that received services provided by your grant.

24. If your grant served one or more quantifiable audiences not covered by the categories above, please briefly identify and quantify them here. Attach another sheet if necessary.

Directions for submitting this report are available at http://www.imls.gov/recipients/administration.shtm. For assistance or questions contact your Program Officer.

Burden Estimate and Request for Public Comments: Public reporting burden for this collection of information (Final Report, Parts 1 and 2) is estimated to average eight to thirteen hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comment regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Institute of Museum and Library Services, Chief Information Officer, 1800 M Street, NW, 9th Floor, Washington, DC 20036-5802, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 3137-0029, Washington, DC 20503.
7. Analysis with quantitative data.

Year 1 of Grant: Statewide Survey.
Completed the goal of statewide comprehensive survey and providing valuable database of Tennessee’s cultural Repositories.
Survey Results
Compiled by Heather Adkins, IMLS Intern 2008 -2009

I. Who participated?

During the summer of 2008, year one of the grant cycle, the Tennessee State Library and Archives (TSLA) Preservation Services, distributed a survey to assess the collections and environments of Tennessee museums, archives, public and academic libraries, special collections in universities, historic sites, and historical societies and associations.

As a premise for those whom the survey was to be sent, definitions of museum and archives were established. Following the TAM (Tennessee Association of Museums) guideline, a museum is “a public or private nonprofit agency or institution organized on a permanent basis for essentially educational or aesthetic purposes, which, utilizing a professional staff, owns or utilizes tangible objects, cares for them, and exhibits them to the public on a regular basis. (Museum and Library Services Act)” (TAM Constitution and Bylaws, Article III – “Purpose”). Also, in accordance with the Society of American Archivists (SAA), archival repositories are institutions that house “non-current records of individuals, groups, institutions, and governments that contain information of enduring value” and products of everyday activity that provide researchers with administrative and personal use (SAA website, Article “So You Want to Be an Archivist: An Overview of the Archival Profession”).

By these definitions, a database of 900 institutions was established. All 900 were sent the Connecting to Collections Survey. 234 surveys were returned with answers (207 were fully completed; additionally another four were returned with a not-applicable heading and were not added into the final total).

In the final results of the survey, it was shown that 44.3% of institutions were funded by federal, state, or municipal means; 38.3% received some funding from corporation or company, foundation, or individual donors/private philanthropist. Forty-seven percent have received no funding from external sources or are not aware of consistent revenue stream.

Many of the government-funded institutions include (though are not limited to) county museums and archives, city museums, special collections in academic libraries, and historic sites. Individually managed institutions include museums with a narrowly defined discipline (example, the Buford Pusser Home and Museum in Adamsville, TN), historical societies and associations, and independent research libraries.

II. The Importance of Preserving Tennessee Collections

Tennessee has developed a rich culture and people, and as historians, it is our job to preserve what has become unique to our state. Through the survey results and different site visits, many interesting places have been discovered to have various items essential to telling Tennessee’s story.

Tennessee possesses a diverse history. It was originally part of the North Carolina colony and has produced many well known legends such as Texas heroes Sam Houston and Davy Crockett, pioneer Daniel Boone, and military-man Alvin C. York. Not unlike its many peoples, Tennessee has withstood many battles of various lengths and kinds. Tennessee’s part in the Civil War remains to be
one of the most controversial, containing thirty-eight battle sites—second largest and only exceeded by Virginia’s 123 (The American Battlefield Protection Program: Civil War Sites Advisory Commission Report on the Nation’s Civil War Battlefields). Contained in its history is also the conflict with evolution, which is memorialized in the Rhea County Heritage and Scopes Trial Museum and Bryan College’s Special Collections. There are also several museums with Native American holdings, remembering the tradition and sufferings of Tennessee tribes.

To accommodate its history, there is a large variety of historic institutions in Tennessee. From the survey results, it was determined that of those who completed the survey 44.3% of these institutions recognized themselves first and foremost as an archives, 30.4% as a history museum, and 23.5% as a historic site or house. Over the course of three years, the site visits that were made reinforced these results. Most of the institutions visited were county archives and museums and occasionally house sites (such as Oaklands Mansion in Murfreesboro and Cragfont House, in Gallatin).

All institutions hold vital collections and records which tell our history. Among site visits and numerous other travels, some items of particular interest have surfaced. Examples encountered include artifacts such as Civil War General George Dibrell’s Colt revolver and a large pottery collection at the White County Heritage Museum (directors there are currently in the processes of buying the revolver). Other artifacts found in Middle Tennessee include tobacco agricultural products at the Robertson County Museum and the historic Cookeville Train Depot and Train in Putnam County. In West Tennessee, items such as a rare photo of an executed man of the Mier Expedition in Tipton County, Buford Pusser’s burnt Corvette in McNairy County, and a local photograph collection in Obion County have surfaced. And in East Tennessee, there are examples of rare Confederate Army flag at the Children’s Museum of Oakridge, a Grand Army of the Republic banner in Union County (which used to be carried in parades after the Civil War), materials from a German POW Camp at the Military Memorial Museum of the Upper Cumberland, and materials of Andrew Johnson and a medal of honor at the Nathaniel Greene Museum in Greene County. All of these facilities now have examples of improved museum storage by having staff and volunteers who participated in the workshops.

An extensive amount of archival agencies found ways to improve environmental controls for collections by having attended this grants educational programs or received site visits. In Middle Tennessee, examples are; Letters of Civil War refugees on the mountain at Beersheba Springs, Davy Crockett’s first marriage (in Jefferson County) and last marriage (in Franklin County) certificates, and Tennessee County’s (now part of Montgomery County) first record books (1788-1796). In East Tennessee, Washington County deed books (1778, our first county’s records) and original maps of Rugby Colony in the Upper Cumberland region have surfaced. And in West Tennessee, we encountered letters and diaries of famous Memphis citizens during the Yellow Fever epidemic (1820s), the Civil Rights Movement (1960s), original land surveys of West TN region, and Obion County citizens’ history of Reelfoot Lake. Other items that can be found across Tennessee include: original photographs of Lookout Mountain battlefield, the Battle of Franklin, Overton, and Shiloh; and historic records of the Smoky Mountains National Park and families who lived there. While there are many others that could be mentioned, there is no doubt that no matter the artifact, paper, book, or picture, these items not only reflect Tennessee history, but they advocates who participated in the grant funded workshops and who take preservation more seriously.
III. Conditions of Tennessee Collections

Tennessee State Library and Archives and Tennessee State Museum promote the standards for stable environmental for collections. Included in these regulations are temperature (65° to 70°), relative humidity (45% to 48%), and light level monitoring. Based on the survey, it is evident that these standards are the biggest challenge to institutions. The top results for these regulations 36.1% of institutions replied that they did not monitor temperature in any area of their institution. 48.3% do not monitor relative humidity, and 52.2% do not monitor light levels.

Institutions were also asked about their storage units for collections. While the answers were spread nearly evenly, the largest amount of responses, 18.7%, indicated that 80% to 90% of collections were stored in what the institution deemed adequate storage. Second largest, 14.8% of responses, answered 60% to 70% of their collections were in adequate storage, and third largest, 13.5% of responses, answered 0% of their collections to be in adequate storage. (See chart 6 below for extended synopsis).
Additionally, institutions were asked the degree of improvement needed for inadequate storage in the following categories: additional on-site storage, new or additionally off-site storage, renovated storage space (either on-site or off-site), new or improved storage furniture/accessories (e.g., shelves, cabinets, racks), new or improved exhibit furniture, and exhibit space. The largest responses in each category were as follows: 48.9% NEED in additional on-site storage; 39.4% NO NEED in new or additionally off-site storage; 39.8% NEED in renovated storage space (either on-site or off-site); 54% NEED in new or improved storage furniture/accessories (e.g., shelves, cabinets, racks); 45.9% NEED in new or improved exhibit furniture; and 43.1% NEED in exhibit space. (See chart 7 below for extended synopsis.)

For the storage areas that are not adequate, indicate the degree of improvement needed in each of the following six categories. If all of your areas are adequate, select "Not applicable."

(Chart 7)
Having analyzed the survey results and made numerous site visits, it was not surprising that most institutions find it very difficult to follow the environmental condition guidelines and standards. Most organizations do not have the funds to get the technology needed to monitor their collections’ environment; however many make do with what they can obtain on what little they have. Most sites that were visited did their best to check the temperature in the building and use dehumidifiers throughout their storage units in order to keep a controlled space. The problem, however, with keeping the temperature and humidity manually lies with the workers. Most institutions we visited were volunteer run (31.4% of responses) and some kept unusual hours. For these institutions, workers must come in almost daily to check on the state of the machines being used.

In regard to storage, most institutions are in need of it. As the organizations are growing constantly, space becomes limited quickly. From the survey results, collections range from record books, to paintings, to large and small 3D artifacts, photos and papers items, etc. Many institutions become a dumping ground for unwanted “attic items” from the community, aiding in the lack of space. Through some site visits we found that not many small institutions have a way to prevent this, so it was discussed in the workshops that to cut down on this, a collections policy should be put into place.

In addition to a collections policy, institutions were asked on the survey as to whether or not their mission statement for the organization included a preservation/conservation plan. Of the 72.1% that answered “Yes” to being a collecting institution, 75.7% have a preservation plan addressed in their mission statement. In long-range terms, only 5.8% have a written long-range preservation plan (46.5% answered “No, but preservation/conservation is addressed in overall long-range plan). 57.5% Do not have a written emergency/disaster plan. All of these policies were addressed in the workshops, with exception to protecting digital collections in a mission (55.1% answered “No”); though 52.9% expressed interest in participating in consortia purchases of supplies, software, etc, and 57.8% in digital projects.

**IV Recommendations**

Recommendations were obvious as result of our survey. They were:

- Improved education in environmental conditions for archival and artifact storage from temperatures and light levels to proper storage techniques and components.
- Improved education for preservation plans as part of small collections storage.
- Improved preparedness in event of emergencies and disasters.

These recommendations and survey results provided the focus on year two of the Planning Grant.
Year Two and Year Three (Extension for 2010-2011)  
Educational Workshops  
Compiled by Carol Roberts, Grant Coordinator and Director Preservation Services, TSLA

The Connecting to Collections Planning Grant Survey indicated educational needs so dramatically, that the project staff, Carol Roberts, Myers Brown, Amber Gilmer and the Advisory Committee moved forward quickly with educational workshops. The result was a set of two; Caring for Collections 101 (or Part 1) and Caring for Collections 201 (or Part 2). The restructuring of the 3 originally planned workshops resulted in the two parts and completed 5 locations increasing awareness across the state.  

With great help of other “unofficial” project partners, we were able to stretch our workshop shop funding to allow the total of 10 workshops. Almost every Advisory Committee member hosted a workshop at their facilities at no charge. This enabled more volunteer staff of historic sites to participate and such a huge percentage of our state’s cultural sites are staffed almost completely by volunteers.  
The greatest “non surprise” of the grant was the level of facilities staffed by volunteers only, AND the commitment of these volunteers to take time to attend the workshops. (Tennessee continues its traditions of “The Volunteer State.”)

The original goal was to carry out three regional workshops to develop awareness for the environmental conditions of cultural collections. We feel that ten workshops far exceeded the goal. The expanded workshop schedule also met the goal of reaching as many locations as possible. The participants in the workshops represented at least 55 of Tennessee’s 95 counties.

Caring for Collections 101 consisted one full day of lectures and hands on work in three areas of improving environmental conditions for proper storage, proper housing or packaging of artifacts and archival materials for storage, and the basic elements of disaster planning.

**Deliverables of the Workshops:**  
Workshop participants received a packet of supplies in one acid free box that included acid free tissue paper, folders, mylar sleeves, cotton gloves, ph indicator pen, # 1 pencil, pva reversible adhesive, brushes, and a copy of *Rescuing Family Records: A Disaster Planning Guide* By David Carmichael.

Caring for Collections 201 consisted of one full day of lectures and hands on work of building on the first details of environment. Topics included: building custom fitted archival acid-free storage containers for uniquely sized items, cleaning the most common museum and archival artifact problems, dust, dirt, and rust; and disaster recovery and salvaging archival examples in the event of most common water damage.

**Deliverables of the Workshops:**  
Workshop participants received supplies that included one medium sheet of acid free heavy duty folder stock, archival dry cleaning sponges, appropriate lint free cleaning supplies, nitrile gloves
and appropriate brushes for metal and N-95 respirators as a reminder to take precautions for health of staff members.

Each workshop was extensively described in the quarterly Narratives provided to IMLS. So attached is a chart of statistics regarding each workshop. It should be noted that any historic site, museum or archives who were represented in the 101 workshop were first to be invited to the second workshop. However if they were unable to attend, the spaces were opened to any and all who could attend and had participated in the statewide survey. Therefore the representation of other museums and archives increased across the state.

With exception of the last workshop held late in the fall of 2010, every workshop had a waiting list for the slots limited to 30 for the first and 25 for the second. We held the size of workshop to a minimum to help each participant gain hands on works and attention with the lecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Site and date</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Additional Site Co-host</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring for Collections Part 1</td>
<td>Chattanooga, TN March 18, 2009</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>TN Association of Museums Spring Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbia, TN June 17, 2009</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Maury County Archives/ James K Polk Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adamsville, TN July 1, 2009</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sheriff Buford Pusser Historic House and Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cookeville, TN August 5, 2009</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cookeville History Museum &amp; Depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nashville, TN November 11, 2009</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Society of TN Archivists Annual Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Project for Students in Museums Studies</td>
<td>Middle Tennessee State University Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MTSU Public History Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for Collections Part 2</td>
<td>Brownsville, TN April 8th, 2010</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>The West TN Heritage Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covington, TN July 28, 2010</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Tipton County History Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maryville, TN August 10, 2010</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Blount County Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson City, TN September 29, 2010</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Rocky Mount Historic Site and Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murfreesboro, TN November 13, 2010</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Society of TN Archivists/ Rutherford County Heritage Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workshop participants were extremely generous with high grades given on the standard workshop review form. They also provided comments like “I learned so much,” ” the day was
too short and could be expanded to two days,” and “it was more fun than I expected. The form used was modified from Tennessee State Museum and AASLH templates for educational programs. Follow up site visits reflected that at several groups “went home” and started re-housing collections immediately. For example, Bristol Historical Society has now completed proper environmental housing of all their photographic collections, which includes beautiful images of the community’s historic houses and many well known citizens and visitors such as the original Carter Family, Tennessee Ernie Ford and many others. Others such as the Elmwood Cemetery Association created a disaster plan to focus concern on historic cemetery records and many others developed plans for archival materials for example, Montgomery County Archives, Heritage Alliance of Jonesborough, and others.

One final comment was “when will there be more.” This leads into the proposals for the future. They are: education, education, and education.

**Future Proposals and Recommendations:**

1. The group proposes a new series of organized workshops that will continue to build on the established program. The topics are environmental conditions, managing museum storage, disaster planning and salvage.
2. The group proposes a new series of cooperative workshops to support the AASLH “STEPS” program for museum standards and programs certification.
3. Continued support of archives and museums through a consortium of supply “depots” or even loan system of environmental monitoring equipment.