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Project Narrative

I. Activities

A. Abstract

The East Texas Research Center (ETRC) hosted a four-day workshop series May 14-17, 2012 to increase awareness and educate regional cultural heritage organizations on the importance of disaster and preservation planning. It received a Preservation Assistance Grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) for $6,000 to offset the costs incurred to contract with Donia Conn, a consultant from the Northeast Document Conservation Center (NEDCC).

There were four workshops. Workshop one examined the basics of preservation: planning and risk assessment, the nature of specific materials, agents of deterioration, preservation methods, collection storage, and collection display. In the second workshop, Conn narrowed the scope and discussed the preservation of oversize paper artifacts, scrapbooks and photographs. This workshop was the best attended; 18 people from nine different organizations were represented. Workshop three addressed such issues as emergency preparedness, fire protection, security, integrated pest management, mold, and environmental control. The final workshop included hands-on salvage demonstrations, a review of case studies, and a discussion of how to sync institutional disaster plans with state and federal disaster procedure.

The ETRC, in conjunction with the city of Nacogdoches, also hosted two free and interactive public programs at the local Durst-Taylor Historic House after workshops two and three. Ms. Conn gave advice to several members of the general public about how to preserve their family treasures. Each program ran from 6:00-8:00pm.

B. Program Changes

The grant was implemented successfully with a few minor changes to the order of events and their venue. To better conform to the consultant’s travel requirements, the public programs were moved to days two and three. The events were held at the Durst-Taylor Historical House (http://www.ci.nacogdoches.tx.us/departments/dtmuseum.php), owned by the city of Nacogdoches, instead of being hosted by the ETRC. The city agreed to provide usage of the historic home’s visitor’s center at no charge. The program director elected to have the public program at the Durst-Taylor house because of its historic nature, name recognition, central location in the city of Nacogdoches, and parking facilities, as well as the potential positive publicity.
II. Accomplishments

A. Grant Objectives

1. To increase awareness of the importance of disaster and preservation planning for cultural heritage organizations in East Texas.

Results from surveys given at the end of each workshop were overwhelmingly positive about the workshop series’ applicability to attendee’s profession, educational value, clarity of presentation, organization, and probability that the information learned would lead to further planning. Many of the participants, while aware of disaster and preservation problems, said that the workshop series gave them a new sense of dedication and urgency to make sure their organization does a better job addressing these issues going forward.

2. To encourage professional networking.

Two participants are using the professional contacts they made during the workshop series as the foundation to create an informal East Texas cultural heritage professionals organization. The goal is to meet several times a year and discuss common problems and potential solutions facing cultural heritage organizations located in the East Texas area.

3. To help the public preserve their family treasures.

Attendance at the public programs was minimal, but those that did attend received 30-40 minutes of free one-on-one time with Ms. Conn. The materials brought in by the public included a family bible, old photographs, business and personal papers c.1840-1910, and several scrapbooks. The concise and expert advice given by the consultant helped those that received it immeasurably.

4. To follow-up on the 2008 preservation survey conducted by NEDCC Assessment Program Coordinator Angelina Altobellis.

The workshop series was a good review of the practical and necessary changes recommended in 2008 and a reminder to remain vigilant and aware of the problems that can arise when archival standards are not maintained or consistently enforced.

B. Marketing/Publicity

The grant cites some 60 cultural heritage organizations within a 75-mile radius of the East Texas Research Center that could benefit from disaster and preservation planning workshops. To get even a fraction of these organizations to attend was a major task that involved the program director and members of the ETRC, R.W. Steen Library, and SFA faculty and staff.
Appendix A shows screenshots for the website and registration pages that were created especially for the workshop series. Once the website was in place, the program director and ETRC faculty and staff used a wide range of marketing media to publicize the event. Appendix B shows one of the more than 135 double-sided postcards distributed by the ETRC.

### Mailed Postcards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Audience</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage Organizations</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Officials (County &amp; District Clerks, Tax Assessor)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFA Faculty and Administration</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Persons</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Postcards were sent one month before the workshop series to cultural heritage organizations in the 25 counties generally considered to geographically constitute East Texas (see Appendix C for a map). Additional marketing included:

- Facebook and Twitter posts by ETRC and the library staff
- Featured marketing on the library webpage
- Mention in the SFA university email listserv *SFA Today*
- Two press releases – one for the workshop series and a second for the public programs
- Two emails reminding organizations to register
- KTRE news report on the evening news and website article (see Appendix F)
- The ETRC office manager e-mailed information to the Texas Association of Museums Affinity Groups one week before the workshop:
  - AAG (Art Affinity Group)
  - CMC (Collection Managers Committee)
  - HSHAG (Historic Sites and Houses Affinity Group)
  - IPAG (Independent Professionals Affinity Group)
  - MELT (Museum Emerging Leaders of Texas)
  - TAM DIVCOM (TAM Diversity Committee)
  - TAMEC (TAM Educators’ Committee)

Emails were also sent to these regional associations to add the workshop series to their listserv:

- Austin Museum Partnership (AMP)
- Central Texas Museum Association (CTMA)
- Museum Association of Waco (MAW)
- Museum Association of South Texas (MAST)
- Northeast Texas Museum Association (NTMA)
- Northwest Texas Museum Association (NWTMA)
- Southeast Texas Museum Association (SETMA)
III. Audiences

A total of 11 institutions/organizations (including SFA) and 23 people participated in some or all of the workshops. Although the number of participants was less than hoped for, the workshops succeeded in attracting a diverse audience of cultural heritage organizations. This was true at several important levels:

- **Geographically Diverse**: The director of the Battleship Texas State Historic Site came more than 150 miles from southeast Houston just to attend the Disaster Recovery workshop. With the exception of SFA faculty and students and the Battleship Texas director, every other participant (14) traveled between 33 and 93 miles to attend.

- **Experience Diverse**: Participants ranged from graduate students and a docent with little or no training, to new professionals (1-2 years out of graduate school) with limited on-the-job experience, to seasoned cultural heritage professionals. This array of experience helped create a stimulating workshop environment. The varying experience levels produced basic and more advanced questions and answers that combined to produce perspective on the discussion point at hand.

- **Mission Diverse**: Institutional/Organizational attendance at the workshop series included five archives, two historical commissions, a historical house museum, a living history museum, an art museum, and a state historic site. Such a range of cultural heritage organizations might seem counterproductive for a workshop series, but it was actually a great strength. Despite variance in mission, purpose and resources, 4 days of small, intimate day-long workshops (12-18 people) helped representatives from these organizations realize that they do have common challenges when it comes to disaster and preservation planning.

The biggest surprise during the marketing of the workshop series was the altogether lack of interest from Nacogdoches County cultural heritage organizations and professionals in the workshop series. It was only after the workshops concluded that the program director learned that the Texas Association of Museums held an “Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Recovery” workshop in Nacogdoches June 23, 2009 (http://dir.groups.yahoo.com/group/AAMG-L/message/1630). The lack of local attendance was magnified by the proportionally high interest from cultural heritage professionals in Smith County (Tyler) and Walker County (Huntsville). These observations are supported by the data compiled below in Table 1.
## Table 1: Workshop Registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Location (All in Texas)</th>
<th>Distance from Nacogdoches</th>
<th>Limit</th>
<th>Workshop Tours</th>
<th>Registration Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ETRC Faculty</td>
<td>Nacogdoches</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ETRC Faculty</td>
<td>Nacogdoches</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ETRC Faculty</td>
<td>Nacogdoches</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ETRC Faculty</td>
<td>Nacogdoches</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ETRC Staff</td>
<td>Nacogdoches</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>SFA Grad Student</td>
<td>Nacogdoches</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SFA Grad Student</td>
<td>Nacogdoches</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Diboll History Center</td>
<td>Diboll</td>
<td>33 miles (0.7 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Diboll History Center</td>
<td>Diboll</td>
<td>33 miles (0.7 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Diboll History Center</td>
<td>Diboll</td>
<td>33 miles (0.7 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.17.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cherokee County</td>
<td>Rusk</td>
<td>40 miles (0.8 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Cherokee County</td>
<td>Rusk</td>
<td>40 miles (0.8 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.12.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Heritage Village Museum</td>
<td>Woodville</td>
<td>70 miles (1.5 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.24.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Goodman-LeGrand</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>75 miles (1.5 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.23.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tyler Junior College</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>75 miles (1.5 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.23.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tyler Museum of Art</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>75 miles (1.5 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.24.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>UT-Tyler University</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>75 miles (1.5 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Walker County Historical Commission</td>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>93 miles (1.75 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Walker County Historical Commission</td>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>93 miles (1.75 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>SHSU Archives</td>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>93 miles (1.75 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.16.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>SHSU Archives</td>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>93 miles (1.75 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.15.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Van Zandt Co.</td>
<td>Van</td>
<td>100 miles (2 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.19.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kirby-Hill House</td>
<td>Kountze</td>
<td>100 miles (2 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kirby-Hill House</td>
<td>Kountze</td>
<td>100 miles (2 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kirby-Hill House</td>
<td>Kountze</td>
<td>100 miles (2 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Batttlew Historic Site</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>150 miles (3 hrs)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.10.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cancelations</th>
<th>Worked the Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 12 | 18 | 16 | 12 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 9 |
IV. Evaluation

A. Program Director’s Assessment

1. Workshop Series

   a. Strengths

   Participant Diversity – see Audience, Section III.

   Value – A workshop participant described the value of the workshop series best when they wrote after Workshop one that “This is not the first workshop like this that I’ve attended. However, this is by far the best in its specificity and practical application! Very well done.” (See Appendix H for wet-salvage photographs from Workshop 4)

   Relevancy – The relative geographical proximity of all organization present at the workshop series meant that each was susceptible to the same types of internal (pests, mold, temperature and humidity) and external (fires, floods, hurricanes, tornados) environmental threats. There was something for everyone despite the range in collecting scopes present.

   Organization – With the exception of a scheduling issue Tuesday, many of the organizational problems that went on behind the scenes did not manifest themselves to workshop participants. The workshop series would not have been so successfully without the timely and diligent assistance of ETRC faculty and staff.

   Publicity – The ETRC faculty and staff did an excellent job marketing the workshop series considering the time constraints over which they had no control (See Appendix F for the KTRE-TV Interview and Internet news article).

   b. Weaknesses

   Scheduling – The program director did not budget enough time for completion of all the administrative details from when the grant was awarded to when the workshop series began. This seriously inhibited the ETRC’s ability to adequately publicize the event. The list below shows the timeline of events leading up to the workshop series. In retrospect, the workshop series might have been much better attended and publicized if it had occurred Fall 2012 instead of Spring 2012.

   Timeline:

   Award Document Received  December 7, 2011
   Consulting Services Contract Drafted  January 2012

   The program director did not consider that before this document could be signed it had to be approved by the university’s Office of Research &
Sponsored Programs, the library director, university legal counsel, and the university president, not to mention the counterpart administration at the NEDCC.

**Consulting Services Contract Signed**  February 21, 2012  
**Workshop Website Completed**  April 4, 2012  
**Postcards Mailed**  April 17, 2012

The program director underestimated how long it would take to complete the registration website (and thus be able to put the URL on the postcard), get the postcard approved by the library director and the university Public Affairs department, and then get the postcard printed and mailed. The last postcards went out three weeks before the workshop series.

**Press Release**  May 3, 2012  
**Workshops Begin**  May 14, 2012

**Funding** – Making the workshops free seemed like a great idea on paper. The problem with any free event however, is that there is no penalty if people decide not to attend. Table 1 above shows that of the 24 non-ETRC registrants, 25% cancelled. In hindsight, the workshop series might have gotten better attendance with a $5.00 - $10.00 catering assessment per workshop for each registrant. This would have given people a small, but not insignificant financial investment in their attendance. As it was, the workshop series was not catered and the program director and ETRC director had to make last-minute food and beverage purchases.

**Publicity** – The timeline above shows that it was mid-April before word of the workshop series began to disseminate to cultural heritage organizations around East Texas. Though speculative, it is reasonable to assume that for some organizations with set travel budgets and a calendar full of upcoming events, this short notice may have precluded their attendance.

The workshop series was also victim of some bad luck. SFA’s Public Affairs Office did not publish the workshop series press release in April 2012. A second press release May 3, 2012 described the Family Treasures public program, but it was not picked up by the local newspaper (See Appendix G for the press release). The *Gilmer Mirror* ran an abbreviated version of press release May 6th on their website which garnered 315 views and 5 “Likes.” The Longview *News-Sentinel* also published the press release in their e-edition that week. Though these articles were encouraging, overall the lack of newspaper coverage from communities closer to SFA (Longview is 75 minutes; Gilmer is about 90 minutes) probably did not help attendance.
2. Program Director

a. Strengths

Effort – In spite of many mistakes, the program director worked hard to make the workshop series a success.

Adaptation – The first two days of the workshop series generated much constructive criticism of the program director from ETRC faculty and staff. These recommendations and the subsequent ensuing changes made the last two days of the workshop better.

b. Weaknesses

Leadership – A workshop series is a major undertaking and requires a team effort. The program director needs to plan the workshop, delegate responsibility, and ask for help when assistance is needed. In the weeks leading up to the workshop series, the program director did not ask for any assistance. The lack of leadership on the part of the program director contributed to a sometimes stressful and chaotic behind-the-scenes situation during the first couple of days of the workshop series. ETRC faculty assumed everything was under control, and indeed, so did the program director. This sense of being prepared changed on the morning of the first workshop when it became apparent that was not the case.

Leading up to the first workshop, the program director had not:

- Set-up the workshop space the week before. An ETRC staff member and the program director had to set-up chairs and tables an hour before the workshop.

- Reserved a PowerPoint projector for the week from the Library Systems Department for the consultant to use with her presentation. The Assistant Head of Library Systems was gracious enough to help here.

- Made photocopies of the consultant’s PowerPoint presentation slides. These were received April 27th, but forgotten about until the day of the workshop. ETRC faculty and staff members made the copies.

- Catered the event. The ETRC director ended up running to the local grocery store to buy refreshments. These were not yet in place when the workshop started.

- Prepared surveys for registrants to complete when they finished each workshop. The program director wrote these between sessions on Day 1.

- Checked on delayed supplies needed for Workshop 4. Only the persistence of the ETRC faculty and staff allayed this potential setback.
The two hours before the first workshop were disorganized and piecemeal. The program director made the error of assuming that ETRC faculty and staff would come to work early (before 8am) to help set up. Since the program director did not ask for any assistance setting up the week before, however, most of the faculty and staff did not arrive until between 8:00 and 8:15am. When they did get to work, the ETRC faculty and staff received instructions to help with the set-up when they were not expecting to have to do anything. This lack of pre-coordination was exacerbated by a lack of leadership. The program director was out in the parking lot to hand out parking passes to arriving participants from 8:00-8:45am. This was a task that should have been delegated while the program director greeted participants and the consultant as they arrived at the workshop presentation space.

The mistakes made on the first day were not limited to before the workshop began. Over the course of the workshop series, the program director made the mistake of:

- Not making workshop introductions. This was not very professional. Participants needed to know in the least who the program director was, who the consultant was, and that the workshop series was the result of a NEH grant (Workshops 1 and 2).

- Forgetting his purpose. The program director sat through first two days of the workshop, instead of running the workshop behind the scenes. This forced others to initiative and do work they should not have had to do. For example, ETRC faculty took the consultant out to lunch when the program director elected to take a working lunch; the ETRC director spent the afternoon session of Workshop 1 making photocopies for Workshops 2 and 3; and ETRC faculty and staff office organized the off-site public program without any program director guidance.

- Not having the consultant’s contact information. In what was the most obvious gaffe of the workshop series, the consultant showed up an hour late for the Workshop 2. The program director did not have her cell phone number and thus the workshop started at 9:00am instead of 8:00am.

3. Consultant

a. Strengths

**Dynamic speaking** - The consultant used her vast experience to tailor the program to the audience. While she offered practical advice and tips to attending cultural heritage organizations constrained by resource and budget constraints, the consultant did not shy from talking about the necessary expense that effectual disaster and preservation planning and action sometimes requires.
The consultant also spoke about preservation with lay people at the public programs well. Her combined usage of props (boxes, folders and photo sleeves) and basic preservation tips helped convey the range of options available to people seeking to protect their family treasures.

b. Weaknesses

Preparation – During the initial grant writing, the program director needed to know what the “wet salvage demonstrations” in Workshop 4 meant in terms of facility and financial requirements. Fast forward to mid-April, less than a month before the workshop series began, and the consultant emailed the program director with a list of supplies needed for the hands-on wet salvage demonstration. The list was extensive (see Appendix I) and required that part of Workshop 4 be shifted to a new space since the original room did not meet specifications. Though the library agreed to buy the supplies for the workshop, ideally these things would be included up-front in the NEDCC consultation quote to the next organization.

4. Workshop Surveys (See Appendix D for the full survey form)

**Workshop 1 – Preservation Basics**

Workshop Registrants: 16  
Workshop Participants: 12 (7 non-staff, 5 staff)

Institutions/Organizations Represented:  
Stephen F. Austin State University (8)  
1859 Goodman-LeGrand House & Museum (1)  
Heritage Village Museum (1)  
Cherokee County Historical Commission (2)

Survey Respondents: 8  
Respondents First Workshop of this Nature: Yes (6) No (2) No Answer (0)

Average Scores:

| a) Applicability to my profession         | (4.7/5.0) |
| b) Educational/Informative                | (5.0/5.0) |
| c) Clear and well-presented               | (4.8/5.0) |
| d) Organization                           | (4.9/5.0) |
| e) Will lead to further topic-specific planning | (5.0/5.0) |

Comments:

- “Too many references to Austin, etc.; info not relevant to workshop content”
- “Photos/examples were informative.”
- “Very informative and educational”
- “This is a very good workshop. It teaches a lot and raises many points for anyone working or looking to work with archival materials”
• “This is not the first workshop like this that I’ve attended. However, this is by far the best in its specificity and practical application! Very well done.”
• “This covers areas of preservation (building and contents) that I really can use.”
• “Good refresher of preservation”

**Workshop 2 – Preservation of Extraordinary Materials**

Workshop Registrants: 24
Workshop Participants: 18 (13 non-staff, 5 staff)

Institutions/Organizations Represented:
- Stephen F. Austin State University (8)
- Diboll History Center (2)
- Sam Houston State University (2)
- Walker County Historical Commission (2)
- University of Texas, Tyler (1)
- 1859 Goodman-LeGrand House & Museum (1)
- Heritage Village Museum (1)
- Tyler Junior College (1)

Survey Respondents: 12
Respondents First Workshop of this Nature: Yes (5) No (4) No Answer (3)

**Average Scores:**

a) Applicability to my profession (4.9/5.0)
b) Educational/Informative (4.9/5.0)
c) Clear and well-presented (4.9/5.0)
d) Organization (4.8/5.0)
e) Will lead to further topic-specific planning (4.6/5.0)

Comments:

• “The discussions on causation, deterioration, types, and conservation of old photographs, framed items, audio (old records – as well as the storage of same) have been very informative and sorely needed.”
• “Excellent presentation by Donia”
• “Enjoyed the information – I’m so new that anything helps. The chance to network is always invaluable”
• “The workshop was presented very well and it is very easy to follow and learn”
• “The content of this workshop was very interesting. The problems, and the handling of photos and film is especially interesting and useful to know”
• “Answered greatly about specific preservation and disaster planning relative to issues at my specific institution. Gave specific examples, information on further reading, and best practices”
• “Donia has an immense knowledge of the subject, which comes through in her teaching”
• “Looking forward to using the information provided in the training”
• “Love the pace! Not too slow, not too fast”
• “Very detailed, but easy to follow. Good!”
• “Very good information on the handling of materials and how to tell the difference between photos”
• “Excellent”
• “Enjoyed the program – a lot of good information”

**Workshop 3 – Disaster Planning**

Workshop Registrants: 20
Workshop Participants: 16 (11 non-staff, 5 staff)

Institutions/Organizations Represented:
- Stephen F. Austin State University (8)
- Diboll History Center (1)
- Sam Houston State University (2)
- Walker County Historical Commission (1)
- University of Texas, Tyler (1)
- Heritage Village Museum (1)
- Tyler Junior College (1)
- Tyler Museum of Art (1)

Survey Respondents: 12
Respondents First Workshop of this Nature: Yes (6) No (3) No Answer (3)

**Average Scores:**
- a) Applicability to my profession (4.7/5.0)
- b) Educational/Informative (4.8/5.0)
- c) Clear and well-presented (4.9/5.0)
- d) Organization (4.8/5.0)
- e) Will lead to further topic-specific planning (4.6/5.0)

**Comments:**
- “This is a great workshop. It builds off the first two, and the material is presented very well. All of the workshops are a valuable experience for anyone interested in collections of any kind”
- “Need breaks a little more often, but they can be shorter”
- “Very specific! Wide range of disaster planning ideas and different scenarios”
- “We have no library/archive formal disaster plan. This workshop has been a great motivator to get this done. Much of what we’ll need to consider must be done in the context of the campus disaster plan – what I’ve been exposed to here will help me communicate more effectively with the campus officials.”
- “May lead to development of a disaster plan – will speak to higher-ups”
- “Wish my presentations were this much fun”
- “Donia is wonderful and knows so much about the topics. Great!”
- “Great information on prevention of small disasters as well as major disasters”
- “Great info on what to do with water and mold”
• “Well-organized, knowledgeable, and professional presentation”

**Workshop 4 – Disaster Response and Recovery**

Workshop Registrants: 18  
Workshop Participants: 12 (9 non-staff, 3 staff)

Institutions/Organizations Represented:  
- Stephen F. Austin State University (6)  
- Diboll History Center (1)  
- Sam Houston State University (2)  
- Walker County Historical Commission (2)  
- Tyler Museum of Art (1)

Survey Respondents: 8  
Respondents First Workshop of this Nature: Yes (1)  No (1)  No Answer (6)

Average Scores:  
a) Applicability to my profession  (4.9/5.0)  
b) Educational/Informative  (4.9/5.0)  
c) Clear and well-presented  (4.9/5.0)  
d) Organization  (4.9/5.0)  
e) Will lead to further topic-specific planning  (5.0/5.0)

Comments:  
• “The workshops should be taken together to be able to get the whole picture. Each workshop is a continuation of the previous day so they build on each other. I was really surprised more students didn’t attend since we don’t have any preservation classes offered. Also, certificates for each workshop would be nice to have to show that we have attended them.”
• “The workshop was great! Being able to practice handling a disaster is great experience. All of the workshops were very informative and a great learning experience.”
• “It was very informative. Good information on to recover books and photos.”
• “Please repeat if possible – very important to reiterate on a regular basis”
• “Liked the hands-on aspect”
• “Great!”
• “This was a very good workshop. Donia is great – informative, very knowledgeable and witty.”
• “Like most people, I tend to let planning and readiness issues slide. This has motivated me to reassess, update, and investigate. Thanks!”
B. Public Programs

The goal of the workshop series’ public component was to provide the community at-large a pair of free lectures on preservation and two chances to have their family treasures examined by the NEDCC consultant. To reiterate from earlier sections, it was hoped that the location and notoriety of the Durst-Taylor Historic House would enhance program attendance, but there were mitigating several factors. Previously mentioned was the lack of newspaper coverage. Another contributing factor was the torrential downpour that coincided with the start of the first program. Despite adverse weather and publicity, those who attended were very pleased with the personal time they received with the consultant to learn about the preservation of their family materials.

Public Program #1  (See Appendix E for the full survey form)

Participants: 4
Survey Respondents: 4

Average Scores:
  a) Helpfulness (4.8/5.0)  
  b) Educational/Informative (4.8/5.0)  
  c) Clear and well-presented (4.8/5.0)  
  d) Organization (4.8/5.0)  
  e) Will lead to preservation/conservation of your object (4.8/5.0)

Comments:

- “Great information on how to store textiles and photographs”
- “Great!”
- “Gave concise instruction on how to preserve most types of personal records”

Public Program #2

Participants: 5
Survey Respondents: 3

Average Scores:
  a) Helpfulness (5.0/5.0)  
  b) Educational/Informative (5.0/5.0)  
  c) Clear and well-presented (5.0/5.0)  
  d) Organization (5.0/5.0)  
  e) Will lead to preservation/conservation of your object (5.0/5.0)

Comments:

- “Excellent personal attention – practical solutions offered for problems presented”
- “Donia is awesome”
V. Continuation of the Project

As noted above (II-A-2), two participants are using the professional contacts they made during the workshop series as the foundation to create an informal East Texas cultural heritage professionals organization. The goal is to meet several times a year and discuss common problems and potential solutions facing cultural heritage organizations.

VI. Long-Term Impact

There is some preliminary discussion amongst ETRC faculty to apply for a similar NEH Preservation Assistance Grant to host a workshop concerning digital preservation planning for East Texas cultural heritage organizations. It would use the same basic framework and build on the lessons learned from this workshop series.

VII. Grant Products


The session abstract reads: “There are a multitude of cultural heritage institutions with challenges similar to those at archives. One way for the community of archival, library, museum, and public history professionals to collectively benefit are creative applications of NEH Preservation Assistance Grants. This panel looks at these grants from inside and out with commentary on what the NEH looks for when it evaluates applications, and two case studies from recent grant recipients regarding implementation, results, and assessment.”

Joining Ainsworth on the panel will be Angelina Altobellis (NEDCC) as session chair, Elizabeth Joffrion (NEH) as the first speaker, and Chris Erickson (Brigham Young University) as the third speaker.
Appendix A: Workshop Series Website and Registration Page Screen Shots
Appendix B: Postcard

Front

Disaster & Preservation Planning Workshops

May 14-17, 2012
Hosted by the East Texas Research Center
Stephen F. Austin State University

Funded by the nation Endowment for the Humanities

Disaster and preservation planning are challenges faced by many cultural heritage institutions (like yours) in East Texas. The East Texas Research Center is proud to announce a week-long series of disaster and preservation planning workshops to address these issues. Please consider this postcard an invitation to attend. Doris Coon, an expert from the Northeast Document Conservation Center, will present on each topic. It is our hope that these workshops will be educational for participants, suggesting new approaches, answering questions, and encouraging cooperation among institutions.

What’s the best thing about these workshops? They’re FREE!
See reverse side for dates and registration information.
Hope to see you there!
Appendix C: East Texas Counties with Organizations that Received Postcards

Van Zandt  Houston
Smith        Trinity
Gregg        Angelina
Harrison     Polk
Henderson    Tyler
Anderson     Jasper
Cherokee     Newton
Rusk         Walker
Panola        San Jacinto
Nacogdoches* Hardin
Shelby       Jefferson
San Augustine Orange
Sabine

*Workshop Location

Citation:
(Accessed 30 May 2012).
Appendix D: Workshop Survey Form

Disaster and Preservation Planning Workshops
May 14-17, 2012

Survey
(Please complete one survey for each workshop attended)

Which workshop did you attend? (circle one)
#1: Preservation Planning
#2: Preservation of Extraordinary Materials
#3: Disaster Planning
#4: Disaster Recovery

Is this the first workshop of this nature that you’ve attended?

On a scale of 1 to 5 (poor-strong), please rate the workshop’s strengths and weaknesses as it pertained to your experience:
(a) Applicability to my profession: 1 2 3 4 5
(b) Educational/Informative: 1 2 3 4 5
(c) Clear and well-presented: 1 2 3 4 5
d) Organization: 1 2 3 4 5
(e) Will lead to further topic-specific planning: 1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on specifics to a) – e) above:

How did you hear about the workshop series?
Additional Comments (use back if needed):

Appendix E: Public Program Survey Form

Disaster and Preservation – Public Programs
May 14-17, 2012

Survey
(Which workshop did you attend? (circle one)

Tuesday

On a scale of 1 to 5 (poor-strong), please rate the workshop’s strengths and weaknesses as it pertained to your experience:
(a) Helpfulness: 1 2 3 4 5
(b) Educational/Informative: 1 2 3 4 5
c) Clear and well-presented: 1 2 3 4 5
d) Organization: 1 2 3 4 5
e) Will lead to preservation/conservation of your object: 1 2 3 4 5

Please elaborate on specifics to a) – e) above:

How did you hear about the workshop series?
Additional Comments (use back if needed):

Appendix F: TV Interview and Internet News Release

East Texas librarians encourage residents to properly preserve collectibles

Posted: May 14, 2012 5:39 PM CDT Updated: May 14, 2012 5:41 PM CDT

By Donna McCollum

NACOGDOCHES, TX (KTRE) -

When disaster strikes, what personal items you would grab and try to save? A lot of people answer family photos, books, bibles and letters. Object preservation is also a concern for historians, curators and librarians. The East Texas Research Center is one of many area cultural organizations. At each site, thousands of historic items are preserved.
Just like your collection at home, curators are facing potential disasters and daily challenges. "For us it's not even necessarily the disaster. It's the preservation. You've got pests, you've got the environment, so like humidity, temperature, sunlight, all these things affect the preservation of collectibles," said special collections librarian Kyle Ainsworth. An expert from the Northeast Document Conservation Center says sustainable environment is now a popular area of study. "The biggest single thing you can do is give them a stable environment," said preservation expert Donia Conn. Millions of dollars are spent on environmentally controlled vaults, but simple, less expensive measures work too. "Where ever you are comfortable, you're collection will be comfortable, so if you've got a spare closet or even a shelf in a closet," said Conn. So keep those shoe boxes of photos and letters out of the attic where heat can lead to brittle results. More best practices for display, storage and care of family collections will be shared at the Durst-Taylor Historic House tomorrow and Wednesday. Public libraries became the go to place for FEMA during category one disasters. "We learned a lot about that and learned how we as a cultural heritage community can work with FEMA and the first responders so that we do get more attention post disaster," said Conn. It's all about saving for the future. And here's your opportunity to learn the best practices for protecting family documents and valuables. Public programs are being held at the Durst-Taylor Historic House and gardens. That's at 304 North street in Nacogdoches. It's free and runs from 6 to 8 p.m. You're asked to bring an item or two from your collection for examination and discussion.

Copyright 2012 KTRE. All Rights Reserved.


East Texas librarians encourage residents to properly preserve collectibles
2:00
Appendix G: Public Affairs Press Release

East Texas Research Center to host workshop, public programs

May 3, 2012 - SFA Public Affairs
NACOGDOCHES, Texas - The East Texas Research Center at Stephen F. Austin State University will host a Disaster and Preservation Planning Workshop Series May 14-17.

The workshops were made possible through a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities and will focus on some of the disaster and preservation challenges cultural heritage institutions such as libraries, museums and archives regularly face.

Donia Conn, an expert from the Northeast Document Conservation Center, will give a presentation on basic and more advanced object preservation, disaster planning and disaster recovery. Local cultural heritage institutions with archival or museum-quality materials are encouraged to register for the free workshop series. Registration is open, so attendees may sign up for one to four sessions.

In addition to the workshop series, the ETRC, in cooperation with the City of Nacogdoches Historic Sites Department, is offering a pair of public programs on Tuesday and Wednesday nights. These focus on the preservation of important family items.

Topics will include best practices for the display, storage and care of common items in family collections, such as photographs, books, bibles and letters. Community members are encouraged to bring an item or two from their own collections for examination and discussion. The public programs will be held from 6 to 8 p.m. at the Durst-Taylor Historic House and Gardens, located at 304 North St. These programs are free to the public.

For more information and to register for the workshop series or the public programs, visit http://library.sfasu.edu/etrc/workshops, call (936) 468-4100 or email (asketrc@sfasu.edu).

http://www.sfasu.edu/6241.asp
Appendix H: Photographs from Workshop 4

Image #1 – Lecturing in the Wyatt Room

Image #2 – Wet Salvage Set-Up

Image #3 – Wet Salvage Demonstration

Image #4 – Consultant Donia Conn

Image #5 – Hands-On Experience

Image #6 – Hands-On Experience
Appendix I: NEDCC Supply List for Workshop 4

MATERIALS
Here's a rundown of materials that would be needed for the workshop. While quantities don’t have to be exact, these amounts work best for 20 people.

- **50 books**: mostly hardcover, some with coated stock, some with spiral bindings, some in 3-ring binders, aim for as wide a variety as possible
- **Magazines**: these can be anything from Cosmopolitan to New Yorker to National Geographic
- **30 folders' worth of documents, records, papers** in an old flip top document storage box
- **Videotapes**
- **Audio cassettes**
- **Reel-to-reel tapes**: If you can put your hands on any; not absolutely necessary
- **Photographs**: I can provide some
- **Negatives**: I can provide 35mm
- **Slides**: I can provide
- **Microfilm**: On reels in either paper or plastic boxes
- **Optical disks (DVDs, CDs)**

SUPPLIES
Space:
- Either outdoors or in a room or area with a concrete floor
- Easy access to water and to disposal of water
- Hose for water
- Easy access to dumpster for discarding materials

Materials:
- 8 6-foot tables capable of holding 2 containers of water each
- Tubs, buckets, bins, photographic trays for immersing materials (12 total)
- Mop and bucket (just in case)
- Trash cans – at least 2
- Absorbent paper – blotting paper and/or newsprint
- Wax paper and/or freezer paper
- Sponges for wiping up
- Paper towels (6 rolls)
- Large trash bags for disposing of materials
- Heavy plastic sheeting – for table tops
- Scissors – at least 6 pairs
- Clothespins
- Nylon clothes line
- Nitrile gloves (sizes medium and large) – as opposed to latex (allergies)
- Plastic aprons