



Report on the Survey of State Historical Records Advisory Boards November 2006

Overview of SHRAB organization and priorities

The 2006 Survey of State Historical Records Advisory Boards (SHRABs) was a follow-up to a survey conducted in 2004 prior to the introduction of an orientation program for SHRAB members. We are happy to report that the 2006 survey had a remarkable 100% response rate. Responses came from all 50 states and the District of Columbia. By comparison, the survey conducted in 2004 received 56 responses from a total of 44 states, the District of Columbia, and American Samoa.

We can now say that all 50 states and the District of Columbia have SHRABs. In 2004, SHRABs existed in 45 states, the District of Columbia, and American Samoa. Since then, Alabama, Hawaii, and Indiana have activated SHRABs (table 1). Delaware is in the process of reactivating its SHRAB having recently completed appointments. SHRABs in three states are dormant (Iowa, Mississippi, Vermont). Authorization for the West Virginia SHRAB has lapsed. The status of the American Samoan SHRAB is unclear but it appears to be inactive. There are a total of 536 individuals who have active appointments as SHRAB members, not including ex officio members.

Two-thirds of the SHRABs report that their appointments are current, with one-quarter reporting that appointments are always made on time (table 2). Another 8 SHRABs (16%) expect appointments to be made soon for those that are noncurrent. In 2 states, appointments are never made on time.

Nearly three-quarters of the SHRABs meet at least twice a year, with 10 meeting 4 or more times a year (table 3). Four meet once a year, 3 meet only when necessary, and one never meets.

Forty-five SHRABs (88%) have a written strategic plan and four more are in development (table 5). This is a distinct improvement from 2004 when only 36 SHRABs reported having strategic plans.

The three issues common to the most SHRAB strategic plans are education and training, raising public awareness, and improving access (table 6).

During the last two years, 38 SHRABs were asked to review NHPRC grant proposals (table 7). Collectively, the SHRABs reviewed a total of 45 grant proposals in 2005 and 54 proposals in 2006. Eighteen SHRABs (35%) always meet in person to discuss proposals before making recommendations to NHPRC and 21 usually do so (41%) (table 8). This is a higher proportion than in 2004 when 18 reported always meeting but just 14 reported that they usually meet to discuss proposals.

Many SHRABs are active in areas other than proposal review. A growing number are engaged in promoting Archives Week/Month activities: 22 in 2005, with 26 expecting to be involved in 2007 (table 10a). There is also growth in the number focussing on emergency preparedness, up from 10 in 2005 to 16 in 2007 (table 10c). Nearly half of the SHRABs sponsor workshops in archives or records management (table 10b). Ten managed regrant programs in 2005 and 2006, but only 7 expect to do so in 2007 (table 10a). Nineteen have been involved in local government programs in the last three years (table 10b), while 12 have compiled statewide repository directories during this time (table 10a).

Implementation of SHRAB orientation program

In 2004, CoSA distributed a manual to all of the state historical records coordinators to assist them in managing their SHRABs. The next year, CoSA introduced a PowerPoint presentation and SHRAB manual designed to help orient SHRAB members to the NHPRC grant program and the roles that SHRABs play in reviewing grants.

Nearly half of the SHRABs have distributed copies of the SHRAB manual to all of their members. Eight have given them to new members only and another 14 report that they plan to distribute the manuals. Only two do not plan to distribute the manuals.

Fewer have made use of the orientation PowerPoint to date (table 13). Eleven have presented it to the entire SHRAB, 15 plan to do so, and 11 do not plan to use the PowerPoint in any way. It appears more likely to be used as a tool to orient new members. Eleven have used it in this way and 25 plan to do so. In addition, 6 states have used it to train or inform staff about SHRAB activities and 11 plan to do so.

The most common method used to orient SHRAB members about their duties and responsibilities is informal discussions with each individual (table 14). This approach is used in 42 (82%) of the states. Thirteen states have prepared their own written manuals or guidelines.

Table 1 Status of SHRABs in the states and territories, 2004 and 2006

State/ Territory	2004 Had a SHRAB?	2006 SHRAB status	# of members
AK	Yes*	Has a SHRAB	7
AL	No	Has a SHRAB	16
AR	No*	Has a SHRAB	7
AS	Yes	Inactive?	
AZ	Yes	Has a SHRAB	14
CA	Yes	Has a SHRAB	
CO	Yes	Has a SHRAB	13
CT	Yes	Has a SHRAB	17
DC	Yes	Has a SHRAB	
DE	Yes	Not yet active	10
FL	Yes	Has a SHRAB	
GA	Yes	Has a SHRAB	12
HI	No	Has a SHRAB	7
IA	Yes	Dormant	9 plus 2 ex officio
ID	Yes	Has a SHRAB	14
IL	Yes*	Has a SHRAB	14
IN	No*	Has a SHRAB	7
KS	Yes	Has a SHRAB	10 plus 2 ex officio
KY	Yes	Has a SHRAB	
LA	Yes	Has a SHRAB	14
MA	Yes	Has a SHRAB	14
MD	Yes	Has a SHRAB	
ME	Yes	Has a SHRAB	9
MI	Yes	Has a SHRAB	16
MN	Yes	Has a SHRAB	13
MO	Yes	Has a SHRAB	13
MS	Yes	Dormant	11

State/ Territory	2004 Had a SHRAB?	2006 SHRAB status	# of members
MT	Yes	Has a SHRAB	
NC	Yes	Has a SHRAB	10
ND	Yes	Has a SHRAB	7
NE	Yes	Has a SHRAB	
NH	Yes	Has a SHRAB	8
NJ	Yes	Has a SHRAB	
NM	Yes	Has a SHRAB	8
NV	Yes	Has a SHRAB	10
NY	Yes	Has a SHRAB	11
OH	Yes*	Has a SHRAB	12
OK	Yes	Has a SHRAB	9
OR	Yes	Has a SHRAB	
PA	Yes	Has a SHRAB	11
RI	Yes	Has a SHRAB	13
SC	Yes	Has a SHRAB	11
SD	Yes	Has a SHRAB	10
TN	Yes	Has a SHRAB	11
TX	Yes	Has a SHRAB	9
UT	Yes	Has a SHRAB	9
VA	Yes	Has a SHRAB	12
VT	Yes	Dormant	7
WA	Yes	Has a SHRAB	
WI	Yes	Has a SHRAB	10
WV	No	Authorization lapsed	12, but none have active appts
WY	Yes	Has a SHRAB	11

Table 2 Are the SHRAB and coordinator appointments current?

Frequency	States	Count	Percent
Appointments are always made on time	AZ IN NC NV CA KY ND PA DC MN NH SD IL	13	25%
While all appointments are now current, we occasionally experience delays in filling seats	AR KS OK UT CO MT OR VA CT NE RI WA FL NM TN WI HI NY TX WY ID	21	41%
Not all members have current appointments, but we expect them soon	GA MD MO NJ IA ME MS OH	8	16%
Not all members have current appointments, and we do not know when they will be made	LA MA MI VT	4	8%
Appointments are never made on time	AK SC	2	4%
Other: AL: SHRAB just started quick appointments this time around DE: Appointments recently completed - meetings now being planned WV: All appointments have expired.	AL DE WV	3	6%

Table 3 How often does the SHRAB meet?

Frequency	States	Count	Percent
4 or more times a year	AR HI KY RI CA ID OH TX CO IN	10	20%
3 or 4 times a year	FL	1	2%
2 or 3 times a year	AZ MI NM SD CT MN NV TN GA MO NY UT IL MT OK VA KS NC OR WA LA ND PA WI ME NH SC WY	28	55%
Once a year	AK DC IA NJ	4	8%
Only when necessary	MA MS VT	3	6%
Only for special projects	NE	1	2%
Never	MD	1	2%
Other: AL: legislation calls for at least 2 meetings a year. DE: No recent meetings. Meetings now being planned. WV: Has not met in current or previous administrations.	AL DE WV	3	6%

Table 4 How does the SHRAB report on its activities, concerns, grant opportunities, and current priorities?

Reporting mechanism	# of SHRABs	Percent
Special reports	20	39%
Presentations at professional meetings	17	33%
Presentations, other	17	33%
New releases	15	29%
Articles in other publications	15	29%
Other	13	25%
Annual report	10	20%
Newsletters or circulars	9	18%
The SHRAB does not report	4	8%

Table 5 Does your SHRAB have a written strategic plan?

Status	States				Count	Percent		
Yes	AK	KS	NE	SC	45	88%		
	AZ	KY	NH	SD				
	CA	LA	NJ	TN				
	CO	MA	NM	TX				
	CT	ME	NV	UT				
	DC	MI	NY	VA				
	DE	MN	OH	VT				
	FL	MO	OK	WA				
	GA	MT	OR	WI				
	IA	NC	PA	WV				
	ID	ND	RI	WY				
	IL							
No, but one is being developed	AL	AR	HI	IN			4	8%
No	MD	MS					2	4%

Table 6 Issues/topics included as goals or priorities in SHRAB strategic plans

Topic or goal	# of SHRABs	Percent
Education and training in archives & records management	40	78%
Raising public awareness	39	76%
Improving access to records and collections	37	73%
Partnerships/cooperation	34	67%
Preservation	32	63%
Improving records programs	31	61%
Providing leadership within the state	30	59%
Electronic records	29	57%
Local government records	29	57%
State government records	27	53%
Regrants	23	45%
Resources (funding, personnel)	22	43%
Legislation	21	41%
Technical assistance/consulting services	21	41%
Statewide collecting strategies	16	31%
Use of primary sources in the classroom	13	25%
Publications	8	16%
Other	8	16%
Corporate/business archival programs	6	12%

Table 7 SHRAB reviews of NHPRC grant proposals in 2005 and 2006

State	Asked to review NHPRC grants in last 2 years?	Number reviewed		Other
		In 2005	In 2006	
Alabama	No	0	0	SHRAB just established in 2006
Alaska	Yes	1	0	
Arizona	Yes	0	1	
Arkansas	Yes	0	1	SHRAB just established in 2005
California	Yes	6	5	
Colorado	Yes	2	3	
Connecticut	Yes	1	2	
Delaware	No	0	0	
Dist of Columbia	No	0	0	
Florida	Yes	1	1	Plus 30 regrants in 2005
Georgia	Yes	0	2	Plus 33 regrants in 2006.
Hawaii	No	0	0	
Idaho	Yes	0	1	
Illinois	Yes	0	2	
Indiana	No	0	0	SHRAB just established in 2005
Iowa	Yes	0	1	
Kansas	Yes			
Kentucky	Yes	2	1	
Louisiana	Yes	1	0	
Maine	Yes	1	1	
Maryland	Yes	1	0	
Massachusetts	Yes	3	3	
Michigan	Yes	2	1	
Minnesota	No	0	0	
Mississippi	Yes	0	1	
Missouri	Yes	1	0	Plus Local Records Grants (68 in 2005 and 62 in 2006)
Montana	Yes	1	0	
Nebraska	Yes	0	1	
Nevada	No	0	0	
New Hampshire	No	0	0	
New Jersey	Yes	1	0	
New Mexico	No	0	0	
New York	Yes	4	6	
North Carolina	Yes	1	1	
North Dakota	No	0	0	
Ohio	Yes	3	2	
Oklahoma	Yes	1	2	
Oregon	No	0	0	

Table 7, cont. SHRAB reviews of NHPRC grant proposals in 2005 and 2006

State	Asked to review NHPRC grants in last 2 years?	Number reviewed		Other
		In 2005	In 2006	
Pennsylvania	Yes	2	6	
Rhode Island	Yes	0	1	
South Carolina	Yes	1	2	
South Dakota	Yes	0	1	
Tennessee	Yes	1	0	
Texas	Yes	5	2	
Utah	Yes	3	2	
Vermont	No	0	0	
Virginia	Yes	1	3	
Washington	Yes	2	1	
West Virginia	No	0	0	
Wisconsin	Yes	1	2	
Wyoming	Yes	1	0	
Total number reviewed		45	54	
	Yes	38		
	No	13		

Table 8 Does the SHRAB meet in person to discuss proposals before making funding recommendations to NHPRC?

Meeting practices	Count	Percent
Always	18	35%
Usually	21	41%
Seldom	1	2%
Never	4	8%
Other	6	12%

Other: AL: The plan is that they will. CT: If possible. HI: We would if we received proposal. IL: Sometimes. MO: In person or by conference call. NY: Email discussion if there is a point of contention

Table 9 Suggestions to NHPRC for improving the process used for the review of grant proposals by SHRABs

A larger window of time for SHRAB review would be useful. Scheduling can be difficult. [AR]

1. To make certain application instructions include that copies of proposals are sent to SHRABs.
2. Provide rating sheets and summaries that can be completed on time. [CA]

Have some receipt that the grant was received when submitted electronically. Our grant was properly submitted on time, yet somehow the NHPRC never received it even when copies cc:d to others were received. [ID]

Clarifying to applicants that a copy of the proposal needs to come to the State Coordinator for review. [IA]

It was suggested that any proposal presented to NHPRC be directly referred to the SHRAB. In that manner, all proposals would be reviewed by the SHRAB prior to NHPRC review. Furthermore, a few of our proposals were submitted without eligibility. [LA]

Inquire of Governor's Office and Secretary of State RE: SHRAB member appointments/reappointments. [MA]

No, I think the process works well. [MT]

It might be helpful to know advice that NHPRC has given to the grant applicant prior to the submission of the proposal to the SHRAB. [NE]

Overhaul the board member's review form and make available as an electronic document (e.g., a fillable PDF). Numerical rating system needs clarification and more specific instructions to ensure consistent responses. [NJ]

Our SHRAB has expressed its dismay with the limited credence the Commission appears to give to the grant reviews from the Board. In the past few years, nearly every grant the Board supported was not funded, and those the Board recommended not be funded. [NY]

Be sure that applicants know that they must adhere to state board requirements for state level review (including submission in draft form for some states), and share with/copy coordinators on all communications with potential applicants. [SC]

A state regrant program, such as proposed in CoSA's Partnership for the American Historical Record, would be a preferable means of distributing NHPRC funds to the organizations that need them. [TN]

With the new online grant application process, the Virginia SHRAB didn't realize that we had three applications to review until right before our fall meeting, and none of those institutions who applied realized the role of the SHRAB in reviewing the grant [VA]

Distribute e-copies of the proposals via e-mail [WA]

1. NHPRC should improve communications with SHRABs regarding which grant categories *require* SHRAB reviews and for which ones reviews are invited but not required.
2. NHPRC should post interim and final grant reports for all funded projects on its website [WI]

1. Maybe attempt to limit the documentation that is sent in with the grant application.
2. Revise the SHRAB Members Evaluation sheet. The Numerical Rating Section is difficult to use and assign the ratings. [WY]

Table 10a SHRAB activities beyond NHPRC grant reviews

	Regrants			Statewide repository directory			Archives Week/Month		
	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007
# active	10	10	7	6	8	5	22	26	26
% active	20%	20%	14%	12%	16%	10%	43%	51%	51%
AL									
AK									
AZ	X	X	X				X	X	X
AR					X			X	X
CA		X	X				X	X	X
CO							X	X	X
CT		X	X						
DC						X			X
DE									
FL	X								
GA	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
HI					X				
ID								X	X
IL									X
IN					X	X		X	X
IA									
KS									
KY							X	X	X
LA								X	X
MA	X	X					X	X	
MD									
ME	X	X	X						
MI									
MN									
MS									
MO	X			X					
MT							X	X	X
NC							X	X	X
ND							X	X	
NE									X
NH							X		
NJ							X	X	
NM	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
NV				X			X	X	X
NY	X	X	X				X	X	X
OH								X	
OK							X	X	X
OR								X	X
PA	X						X	X	X
RI		X			X				X
SC	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SD							X	X	
TN				X					
TX									
UT					X				
VT							X		
VA									X
WA							X	X	X
WV									
WI							X	X	X
WY							X	X	X

Table 10b SHRAB activities beyond NHPRC grant reviews during 2005-2006 or planned for 2007

	Archives/rec mgt workshops			Grant writing workshops			Local government programs		
	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007
# active	21	22	22	7	7	7	11	14	11
% active	41%	43%	43%	12%	16%	10%	22%	27%	22%
AL									
AK	X								
AZ				X	X	X			
AR		X	X						
CA		X	X		X				
CO	X		X						
CT								X	X
DC			X						
DE						X			
FL	X						X	X	
GA	X	X	X						
HI									
ID	X	X	X				X	X	X
IL									
IN		X	X						X
IA									
KS		X	X						
KY	X	X	X						
LA								X	
MA									
MD									
ME	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
MI		X	X				X	X	
MN									
MS									
MO	X					X	X	X	X
MT	X	X	X						X
NC	X	X	X				X	X	X
ND	X	X							
NE	X		X						
NH	X						X		
NJ				X	X	X			X
NM				X	X	X	X	X	X
NV							X	X	X
NY	X	X	X	X	X	X			
OH	X			X					
OK	X	X	X	X				X	
OR		X	X						
PA									
RI		X			X				
SC									X
SD	X	X							
TN	X	X					X	X	
TX	X	X	X				X		
UT		X							
VT	X								
VA			X						
WA									
WV									
WI			X					X	
WY	X	X	X				X	X	X

Table 10c SHRAB activities beyond NHPRC grant reviews during 2005-2006 or planned for 2007

	Emergency preparedness			Other conferences			Other outreach		
	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007	2005	2006	2007
# active	10	14	16	8	8	6	10	10	10
% active	20%	27%	31%	16%	16%	12%	20%	20%	20%
AL									X
AK									
AZ	X	X	X						
AR					X			X	
CA					X			X	
CO				X					
CT									
DC									
DE									
FL	X	X		X	X				
GA			X				X	X	X
HI									
ID	X	X	X						
IL									
IN		X	X						
IA							X		
KS		X							
KY		X	X				X	X	X
LA	X	X							
MA									
MD				X	X	X			
ME									
MI									
MN							X	X	X
MS									
MO		X							
MT			X						
NC	X	X	X						
ND									
NE									
NH	X						X		
NJ			X						
NM	X	X	X						
NV			X			X	X	X	X
NY	X	X	X	X	X	X			
OH									
OK	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
OR									
PA		X							
RI			X						
SC			X				X	X	X
SD									
TN									
TX									
UT									
VT			X						
VA				X	X	X	X	X	X
WA				X	X	X			
WV									
WI							X	X	X
WY	X	X	X	X			X	X	X

Table 11 Other outreach or public awareness activities beyond the review of NHPRC grant proposals

- AL Plan to get the word out that the SHRAB is now in place and disseminate plan.
- AZ SHRAB sponsored a survey of under-documented communities within the state of Arizona. This was done through a collaborative effort of the SHRAB, Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records and the History Department at Arizona State University. The SHRAB received the report at their October 2006 meeting. With Arizona's Centennial in 2012, the SHRAB wishes to make collecting historical records from these under-documented communities a priority for archives statewide.
- AR The Arkansas Historical Records Advisory Board sponsored Archives Week in October of this year, as well as a workshop designed specifically for workers at repositories that care for historical documents and records. A presentation at the Arkansas Historical Association's 2006 annual meeting described the AHRAB and its plans. The AHRAB also co-sponsored a special showing of the original Arkansas constitutions in the Arkansas Supreme Court building. A directory of repositories will be added to the AHRAB website by year's end.
- CA Presentation at 2006 annual meeting of California Council for the Promotion of History
- CO Workshop training in preservation and basic skills. This is aimed at the small repositories who have no, or very few trained staff.
- CT Serve as outside reviewers for grants to town clerks funded by the Historical Document Preservation Program run by the Office of the Public Records Administrator and State Archives, Connecticut State Library.
- DE Our SHRAB has received NHPRC funding to complete a new Strategic Plan in 2007.
- GA Circuit Rider Archivist program providing advice to local governments and historical repositories statewide.
- HI Conducted a need assessment survey of archival/historical repositories in the state to get feel for the major needs and issues of these organizations.
- ID We have published 2 brochures in conjunction with the Idaho State Historical Society concerning records. One is directed towards local government officials and the other is directed towards State legislators and other State elected officials.
- IL Our SHRAB also serves as the advisory board for the Illinois State Archives. By statute, it is required to meet 3 times a year. It offers advice to the Archives and, as both a SHRAB and an advisory board, publishes a newsletter.
- IA We have a state-funded grant program (not a re-grant program per se) that has received funding for the last seventeen years or so. The SHRAB recommends funding of about \$85,000 annually. In addition the SHRAB developed and has posted technical assistance brochures for use by constituent groups.
- KS We have held three workshops using the Basic Archives workshop curriculum developed and distributed by CoSA. Over 90 people from all over the state attended. We are considering holding one in SW Kansas in the spring in conjunction with our State Preservation Conference (built environment).
- KY Our SHRAB is actively engaged in Archives Week programming and promotion. In addition, it is a supporting body of an annual Archives Institute each summer and an annual Public Archives Symposium each fall.
- LA LHRAB is active in Archives Week activities, follow-up of emergency preparedness and outreach activities. Archives Week in 2006 was entitled PROTECTING LOUISIANA'S HISTORICAL RECORDS IN EMERGENCIES and was cosponsored by the LHRAB, the State Archives, and the Louisiana Archives and Manuscripts Association.

Table 11, cont. Other outreach or public awareness activities beyond the review of NHPRC grant proposals

MA	Documentary Heritage Regrant program (ends 2006).
MD	The SHRAB is not engaged in any other projects.
ME	SHRAB is represented at the Annual Maine Archives and Museums conference, sometimes with co-located Boards meetings, sometimes as panelists.
MN	Collaboration with History Day programs and History Day teachers; working with Indian archives; facilitating the development of digital content with various partners
MT	We are currently rewriting our strategic plan; to be completed in 2007. This will be in addition to our normal sponsoring/presenting of two workshops per year.
NE	Completed Strategic Plan in 2006.
NV	Promoting National History Day Teacher Workshops on using primary sources in classroom. making presentations at meetings of local government officials and museum and library association meetings.
NH	Supporting the Vital Records Improvement Program in localities throughout the state.
NJ	Legislation is pending that will formalize SHRAB's advisory role in developing and revising the annual goals and priorities of the Public Archives and Records Infrastructure Support (PARIS) Grants Program, which funds New Jersey's local government records programs.
NM	Re-grant and scholarship program provides fundings for preservation of historical records. Scholarship funds help support training in archival and records management.
NY	Conference involvement includes New York Archives Conference annual meeting.
ND	Emergency preparedness is a high-profiled government activity, so member institutions are actively involved, but not as a SHRAB.
OK	The Oklahoma Historical Records Advisory Board (OHRAB) will sponsor the pre-conference programs/workshops at the upcoming 'Tribal Conference for Libraries, Archives and Museums' to be held in Oklahoma City on October 22-25, 2007.
SC	Awards
TX	Texas SHRAB applied for and received a grant of \$20,000 from a state foundation in 2005 to allow the board to contract with Amigos Library Services to present a total of 16 basic preservation workshops-- videoconferenced and face-to-face--on 3 different topics in various regions of the state during 2006 and 2007.
VA	The SHRAB deputy serves as editor of NAGARA Clearinghouse. The deputy and the coordinator also participate in programs at the Library of Virginia and professional conferences, and contribute articles to state and national publications.
WA	Regional historical society meetings Regional archivist meetings
WI	Other outreach - Governor's Archives Awards
WY	Assisted with the Society of Rocky Mountain Archivists (SRMA) Conference. Always looking for opportunities and participating in conferences or vendor shows, like the Wyoming Association of Municipalities (WAM) conferences.

Orientation

Table 12 Have you distributed copies of the SHRAB Manual prepared by CoSA to members of your Board?

Distributed?	States	Count	Percent
Yes, to all members	AL IL ND SD CA IN NH TN CT KS NM TX FL LA NY UT HI ME OH VA ID MO OR WI	24	47%
Yes, to new members only	CO GA MD PA DC KY NC RI	8	16%
No, but we plan to do so	AK MA NJ SC AZ MS NV WA DE MT OK WY IA NE	14	27%
No and we will not be doing so	MN VT	2	4%
Other: AR: Distributed portions to all members MI: Keep expecting new appointments and have held for that time WV: Inactive board.	AR MI WC	3	6%

Table 13 How have you used the SHRAB Orientation PowerPoint presentation prepared by CoSA?

Use	States				Count	Percent
Presentation to the entire SHRAB						
Have done so	AL AR ID	IN MO NM	OR PA TN	UT VA	11	22%
Plan to do so	AZ DE GA IA	KY MA MI MS	MT NJ NV OK	SC WA WY	15	29%
Do not expect to use it in this way	CT IL KS	MD ME MN	ND NE NH	RI WI	11	22%
To orient new SHRAB members						
Have done so	AL CO DC	ID IN NM	NY PA TN	TX VA	11	22%
Plan to do so	AR AZ CA DE FL GA IA	KS KY MA MD MI MS	MT NC NE NJ NV OK	SC SD TX WA WI WY	25	49%
Do not expect to use it in this way	CT IL	ME MN	ND NH	RI	7	14%
To train or inform staff about SHRAB activities						
Have done so	AL AR	DC ID	NM VA		6	12%
Plan to do so	AZ CA DE	IA KY MS	MT NJ NV	OK WY	11	22%
Do not expect to use it in this way	CT GA IL IN	MD ME MI MN	ND NE NH PA	WA WI	14	27%
Other TX: Presented it to the Public Information Officer for the Texas State Library and Archives Commission to orient her as to the work of the SHRAB. VA: The PowerPoint is available to the public on the Library of Virginia's Web site (on the SHRAB page). The deputy used it in a presentation on the board for the Archives Research Services staff, and we've used it to explain the role of the board to grant applicants.	TX	VA			2	4%

Table 14 What other methods do you use to instruct individual SHRAB members about their duties and responsibilities?

Method	States				Count	Percent
Written manual or guidelines prepared by state archives	AK CO ID MD	ME NV NY	OK PA RI	TN UT VT	13	25%
Informal discussions with each individual member	AK AL AR AZ CA CO CT DC DE FL GA	HI IA IL KS KY MA ME MN MO MS MT	NC ND NE NH NJ NV NY OH OK OR	PA RI SD TN TX UT VA VT WA WI	42	82%
No instruction provided	IN				1	2%
Other AZ: Still using the old SHRAB manual, but will be distributing the new at the next SHRAB meeting CT: Description at meetings LA: We have had the same membership since 1998 MD: Documents at NHPRC website MN: Documentation on strategic plan and priorities; review of ongoing projects NJ: Also, formal presentations to board every other year NM: Training at regular meetings SC: Discussions at meetings; background reports and e-mail communication WY: Provide minutes, publications produced by SHRAB, By-laws, Strategic Plan	AZ CT LA	MD MN	NJ NM	SC WY	9	18%

Table 15 Do you have suggestions on how CoSA can improve the SHRAB Manual or and/or Orientation PowerPoint?

- HI Great manual
- LA Design the program as The Basics of Archives was designed for self-instruction/orientation. It should be appropriate for basics and not too detailed or cumbersome.
- MA Send a copy to appointing authorities and follow up with e-mail. Make sure someone reads it other than the Historical Coordinator.
- NJ It would be interesting and useful if CoSA, supported by NHPRC, could develop and present a series of training workshops and discussion forums for SHRABs annually, held in conjunction with regional archives conferences (MAC, MARAC, SARC, etc.), SAA or NAGARA. Many on New Jersey's SHRAB would benefit from cross-pollination with leading Coordinators and SHRAB members from other states. Support for travel, lodging, per-diem and registration would be necessary to entice non-archivists on the board to attend (those who would not normally attend a regional archivists' meeting). Perhaps the costs could be split between a grant to CoSA and the states.
- WY Making sure that it is current with all information and resources.

Table 16 Other comments or information about SHRABs

- AZ Our SHRAB has been working diligently on implementing the objectives in our Action Plan.
- AR Our AHRAB re-activated itself in 2005, so our activities are just getting underway. We hope to increase the importance of the board as our plans continue to unfold.
- CO We are fortunate to have most members directly engaged in the value(s) of the historical record.
- LA Thank you for allowing input. Look forward to continued input.
- MA CoSA is doing a good job. Keep it up!
- NE It seems to me that if we had regrant money we would be able to recruit a more engaged and interested SHRAB. Without having funds to distribute, we are limited in the impact that we have.
- NY Our SHRAB sees its role as advocating for the historical record in New York. It currently includes members from the FDR Presidential Library and the NARA Northeast Branch which promotes better collaboration. We also try to include individuals from related professions (museums, libraries, historians, genealogists) to represent groups with whom we can collaborate and whom we serve. A board of entirely archivists may limit the options and potential directions.
- OR We are in the process of 'revitalizing' our SHRAB. Our first main project will be to present a subset of the 'Basics of Archives' workshop at several sessions around the state. Board members will help give the workshops. I am hopeful that this activity will help build a closer working relationship between our members.
- VT The Vermont SHRAB has been inactive for the past two years due to the workload of the various members, primarily of the coordinator and assistant coordinator. A partnership with the Vermont Museum and Gallery Alliance is set for 2007 for the presentation of at least five disaster preparedness workshops. We hope to use this to re-activate the SHRAB in 2007.
- VA We have a SHRAB pamphlet available online and in the reading rooms (we keep it updated with new board members and successful grants): <http://www.lva.lib.va.us/whoware/boards/SHRABbrochure.pdf>
We also submit SHRAB news to our Library newsletter, to our MARAC caucus representative, and to Clearinghouse. We're hoping in the next year to combine a SHRAB meeting and a Basics of Archives workshop. The deputy will be presenting a mini Basics of Archives class at the National Genealogical Society Librarians Preconference in 2007.
- WI Our SHRAB has reached the level of activity that can be sustained with current resources. Though much more needs to be done for historical records in Wisconsin, a higher level of activity is not realistic without more resources. Good ideas from CoSA and other organizations are always welcome but only resources can make them happen.

Table17 Relationship of respondents to the SHRABs in their states

Position	Count	Percent
Coordinator	36	71%
Deputy Coordinator	11	22%
SHRAB Staff Support	1	2%
Other (state archivist, asst state archivist, SHRAB liaison)	3	6%

Table 18 The following individuals filed reports for their states in 2006:

Alabama	Tracey Berezansky	Montana	Jodie Foley
Alaska	Ken Nail Jr.	Nebraska	Andrea Faling
Arizona	Melanie Sturgeon	Nevada	Jeffrey M. Kintop
Arkansas	Wendy Richter	New Hampshire	Frank Mevers
California	Nancy Zimmelman	New Jersey	Karl J. Niederer
Colorado	Terry Ketelsen	New Mexico	Sandra Jaramillo
Connecticut	Mark H. Jones	New York	Kathleen Roe
Delaware	C. Russell McCabe	North Carolina	Jesse R. Lankford, Jr.
District of Columbia	Clarence Davis	North Dakota	Gerald Newborg
Florida	Jim Berberich	Ohio	Jelain Chubb
Georgia	David Carmicheal	Oklahoma	Gary Harrington
Hawaii	Susan Shaner	Oregon	Daniel Cantrall
Idaho	Steve Walker	Pennsylvania	David Shoff
Illinois	Elaine Shemoney Evans	Rhode Island	Gwenn Stearn
Indiana	Jim Corridan	South Carolina	Roy H. Tryon
Iowa	Gordon Hendrickson	South Dakota	Chelle Somsen
Kansas	Pat Michaelis	Tennessee	Wayne Moore
Kentucky	Richard Belding	Texas	Chris LaPlante
Louisiana	Florent Hardy, Jr.	Utah	Patricia Smith-Mansfield
Maine	James Henderson	Vermont	Gregory Sanford
Maryland	Robert Schoeberlein	Virginia	Jennifer Davis McDaid
Massachusetts	John Warner	Washington	Jerry Handfield
Michigan	Sandra Clark	West Virginia	Fredrick H. Armstrong
Minnesota	Robert Horton	Wisconsin	Peter Gottlieb
Mississippi	Julia Marks Young	Wyoming	Tony Adams, CRM
Missouri	Shelly Croteau		