The State of State Records

2015 edition

A Statistical Report on State Archives and Records Management Programs in the United States

Based on FY2014 survey

PART 1: Overview and Commentary, plus Survey Forms

September 2015

![CoSA - Council of State Archivists logo]

RECENT REPORTS AND PUBLICATIONS FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE ARCHIVISTS

These and other publications may be found at the CoSA website:

The Importance of State Archives. April 2013. 8pp.

State Historical Records Advisory Boards (SHRABs): A Statistical Report. March 2013. 30pp.

State Electronic Records Initiative (SERI) -Phase I Report. June 2012. 66pp.

Local Government Archives Task Force products. 2010.

- "Valuing and Protecting Local Government Records (case statement, 8 pp.)

- "Doing your part for the records that are Closest to Home and Closest to You" (call to action, 2 pp.).

Reports and tables from all surveys conducted by the Council of State Archivists, 1993-2012, are available on the CoSA website.

Council of State Archivists
PO Box 2508
Albany NY 12220-0508

Voice: 518-473-9098
Fax   518-473-7058
Email: info@statearchivists.org

September 2015

Table of Contents

Foreword

Documenting Government | Promoting History | Securing Rights. We are pleased to present the 2015 edition of the State of State Records, a recurring research project of the Council of State Archivists (CoSA) that is part of a series of extensive surveys on the state of the state archives community stretching back to the 1990s. At the state level, government is empowered by the electorate to protect life, property, and the rights of citizens. The records of government, therefore, demonstrate the effectiveness of our democratic republic. Such essential records must be securely preserved and accessible to the people in perpetuity. But this unglamorous function of government too often suffers from inadequate attention and financial support. This report confirms the collective commitment of state archives and records programs nationally to the important work of preserving the records of state government, ensuring that they are always available when needed by government and the people.

State Archives and records managers are committed to information access and public service. Last year, staff of state and territorial archives responded to more than one million requests for information. Users of government records come from government agencies, elected and appointed officials, from the business and nonprofit sectors, and the general public. Today, the majority of state and territorial archives also provide access via online catalogs, and to born-digital records, thus facilitating access to people around the globe. Increasingly, state archives are developing materials for K-12 classrooms and onsite use in the form of teaching packets, tours, publications and online exhibits.

The volume of electronic records continues to expand exponentially. In a world where more and more records are created electronically – and older formats are digitized –the holdings of state and territorial archives are increasingly found on servers instead of in file drawers. In less than a decade, electronic records holdings have grown by 734%! Respondents to this survey now have 635 terabytes of permanent records in their possession. Despite this massive growth in the volume of material, the staffing for electronic records management remains relatively small, representing a little more than six percent of the total full-time workforce of state archives programs. CoSA's State Electronic Records Initiative (SERI) has made a positive difference in helping a number of state and territorial archives address management and preservation needs of electronic records.

Daunting challenges remain. Ask almost any state and territorial archivist today what their number one challenge is and they'll tell you it is chronic funding reductions and the resultant loss of staffing. Funding for all archives and records management programs is well below one-tenth of one percent of the total expenditures by all state governments across the nation and the result is less financial and human resources devoted to documenting government, promoting history and securing citizen rights. Access, preservation, strategic and emergency planning are all vulnerable to cutbacks, as is the ability for state and territorial archives to remain proactive in times of greater public scrutiny regarding government transparency and accountability.

Matthew Blessing   Anne W. Ackerson
President   Executive Director

Council of State Archivists
September 2015

Executive Summary

The statistics presented in this report are drawn primarily from the 2014-2015 Council of State Archivists survey of state archives and records management programs. The survey provided an opportunity to build on several earlier statistical reports compiled by CoSA (including those executed under its previous name, the Council of State Historical Records Coordinators). Surveys in 1992 and 1994 were conducted in collaboration with the National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators (NAGARA). The report also draws comparisons with earlier CoSA surveys in 2012, 2010, 2008, 2006, and 2004, with data collected and analyzed in 1992 and 1994 by CoSA and NAGARA, and with a 1986 survey conducted by Howard Lowell for NAGARA.

While most states and territories have joint archives and records management programs administered within the same government agency, some programs are split and, therefore, report survey data to CoSA separately. The FY2014 survey results include data from 54 programs out of a possible total of 68 archives and/or records management programs in the states, territories, and the District of Columbia(Table A). This is a decrease of responses from 2012 where 63 of 68 programs responded. The impact of this decrease in responses will manifest itself in the trends discussed in this report by larger percentages of change than if the response rate was the same.

Table A. Response rate

KEY
ARM = Joint Archives & Records Management
 A = Archives only
RM = Records Management only

REPORTING

Combined State and Territorial Archives and Records Management Programs
(39 out of 44)

States			Territories
AL – ARM	KS – ARM	NC – ARM	
AK – ARM	KY – ARM	OK – ARM	AS – ARM
AZ – ARM	MA – ARM	OR – ARM	GU – ARM
CO – ARM	ME – ARM	PA – ARM	MP – ARM
CT – ARM	MO – ARM	RI – ARM	(N Marianas)
FL – ARM	MS – ARM	SC – ARM	VI – ARM
GA – ARM	NE – ARM	UT – ARM	
HI – ARM	NH – ARM	VT – ARM	
IA – ARM	NJ – ARM	VA – ARM	
ID – ARM	NM – ARM	WA – ARM	
IL – ARM	NV – ARM	WY – ARM	
IN – ARM	NY – ARM		

Archives only programs (12 out of 13)

CA – A	MT – A	TN – A
MD – A	ND – A	TX – A
MI – A	OH – A	WI – A
MN – A	SD – A	WV – A

Records Management only programs (3 out of 11)

CA – RM	MT – RM	TX – RM

NOT REPORTING

			DC/Territories
AR – A	MD – RM	SD – RM	
DE – ARM	ND – RM	TN – RM	
LA – ARM	OH – RM	WI – RM	DC – ARM
MI – A/RM		WV – RM	PR – ARM

The report presents findings in seven sections:

1. Resources and administration, which includes finances, staffing, and placement within state government
2. Extent of the record, which covers holdings, electronic records, and the role of archives in documenting state government
3. Access to and use of the record
4. Authority and resources
5. Services for Local Government Records
6. Emergency Preparedness
7. Initiatives and Priorities

Overall, the trends for all sections have been down. This could either be a result of the decrease in responses to the survey or a result of continuing decline in state archives budgets. Budgets for state archives have decreased 4.5% but overall staffing has decreased 18%. Holding are looking a bit better with an increase in electronic records collections and a decrease in 13% non-electronic records, showing states getting a better handle on their collections. An increase in availability of collections online has led to a decrease in the number of person-to-person requests in state archives. Authority and resources for state archives has dropped slightly as have services for local government records. Almost all state archives have or are writing a disaster plan.

As disheartening as these trends may be, most of the states polled indicated that budgets and/or staffing appear to be stabilizing. This stabilization will allow states to move forward with their planned initiatives, many of which include major capital projects, a move in a positive direction.

Context

The History, Functions, and Significance of State Archives and Records Management Programs

While many state constitutions and early statutes established requirements to make and keep records of government, the first state archives – those agencies whose primary charge is to preserve and protect state government records – were not established until the first decade of the twentieth century. While the states had been accumulating records since colonial and territorial times, often in great volume, the lack of a formally designated agency to care for these records had resulted in great disparities from state to state in their physical condition, accessibility, and prospects for continued survival.

Today all 50 states, the District of Columbia and most of the territories have formal archival programs and all but two have formal records management programs. Good records management programs ensure that records are maintained in efficient and economical ways while they are still in active use. Tools like records retention and disposition schedules identify the small but critical body of records that are essential to current government operations and those that warrant permanent retention in the state archives, estimated to range between 2 and 5 percent of all records created. Records managers also ensure that the other 95 to 98 percent are retained only so long as they are needed and then disposed of according to properly enforced records disposition laws and regulations.

While wide variations among the states remain in terms of resources – financial, human, and administrative – substantial agreement now exists on the principles and policies essential to a sound program for state government records management and the care of archival records.

Evolution of State Archives and Records Management Programs

The first state archives were created at the turn of the twentieth century, largely in response to an alarming report by the American Historical Association (AHA) on primary source documentation in the United States. It detailed the sometimes "total neglect" of government records in the then 46 states and spurred 23 states to create central repositories for their archives by 1910.[1] Another wave of new state archives occurred during the middle third of the century prompted by two factors: the establishment of the National Archives in 1934 and the paper explosion that all governments experienced during World War II. Seven states created official archival repositories between 1935 and 1950, and fourteen more were established in the next two decades. This period also saw the rise of records management at both

---

[1] Ernst Posner, *American State Archives* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964): 19.

Table B. Years in which state archives were established and state records management initiated.

	State archives established	State records management initiated
Alabama	1901	1955
Alaska	1970	1957, active after 1968
Arizona	1937	1974
Arkansas	1905, implemented 1911	1973 (authorized), limited operation 1976-87, suspended but now being reactivated
California	1850	1949, combined 2014
Colorado	1951	1955
Connecticut	1909	1911
Delaware	1905	1977
Dist of Columbia	1985	1985
Florida	1967	1967
Georgia	1918	1971
Hawaii	1905	1957-58
Idaho	1947, 1st full-time archivist 1990	
Illinois	1922	1957
Indiana	1913	1979
Iowa	1906, state archivist reestablished 1978	1974, combined with state archives in 1998
Kansas	1905	1950s (authorized), funded in 1992
Kentucky	1958	1958
Louisiana	1956	1956 (authorized), implemented 1966
Maine	1965	1965
Maryland	1935	1953
Massachusetts	1896	1976
Michigan	1913	1952, combined with State Archives in 2002
Minnesota	1947	1947
Mississippi	1902	1981
Missouri	1965	1965
Montana	1969	1977
Nebraska	1963	1969
Nevada	1965	1967
New Hampshire	1963, state archivist established 1979	1963
New Jersey	1945	1953
New Mexico	1959	
New York	1971 (authorized), opened 1978	1950, combined with state archives 1987
North Carolina	1903	1913, State records center established 1948
North Dakota	1977	1961
Ohio	1927	1985
Oklahoma	1939 & 1947 (authorized), staffed 1968	1961 (authorized), staffed 1968
Oregon	1945	
Pennsylvania	1903	1956
Rhode Island	1930, in legislation in 1989	1981
South Carolina	1905, reorganized 1954	1966, authorized by law in 1973
South Dakota	1975	1967
Tennessee	1907	1957, revised 1978; combined 2014
Texas	1876	1947
Utah	1951	1970
Vermont	1778, stronger authority with 1990 law	1937
Virginia	1902	1942 (authorized), established 1950
Washington	1909 (authorized), fully functional 1957	1957
West Virginia	1905	1961
Wisconsin	1907	1947, moved to Dept of Administration in 1959
Wyoming	1951	1959

the federal and state levels. At least 35 states made some move toward instituting records management between 1945 and 1965 (Table B).

The organizational structures that the states chose as they implemented these programs were as different as the states themselves. A few state archives were established as independent agencies, other were assigned to state libraries, historical societies, secretaries of state, or other government agencies. In some states, the archives and records management functions were assigned to the same agency, in others they were split. In addition, like all state officials, state archivists had to deal with the realities of operating in a political system. Every state archivist then and now has to wear, "in addition to an archivist's garb, the cloak of a diplomat, a politician, and, most of all, a missionary; for only through building personal and official relationships with members of the executive and legislative branches could he or she win the respect and funds necessary for the development of an adequate program."[2]

Legislation establishing a state archives or records management program did not guarantee that it would actually become a functioning part of state government. In some states, many years elapsed between the creation of a state archives in law and the provision of adequate appropriations, staff, and facilities. This gap between legal responsibility and resources to adequately carry out that responsibility persists to this day in many state archives and records management programs. Tables 4.1 through 4.4b in PART 2: Tables detail the extent to which the state ARM programs have the authority and resources to oversee records practices and programs in each state's executive, legislative, and judicial branches as well as for local government agencies.

The last of the state archives were created during the 1970s and 1980s. A number of these can trace their establishment to persistent efforts by archives and records professionals who leveraged funds provided by the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC), the funding arm of the National Archives, to assess conditions and provide strategic plans for implementation of effective programs. Several other existing but weak state archival programs also succeeded in using this NHPRC assessment and planning process to gain support from their legislators and agency heads to strengthen archives and records programs in their states.

It is possible to see real progress in state archives and records programs by comparing the conditions Ernst Posner described in his landmark study *American State Archives* with those of today. In 1962–1963, Posner's book "told an uncomplimentary story of archival lethargy or neglect in about three quarters of the states of the Union."[3] At that time, twelve states had no state archivists, and nine of those had no program at all for the management of permanent government records. Change happened slowly at first, but some movement in the right direction began to occur in the decade immediately after Posner's report

---

[2] H. G. Jones, "The Pink Elephant Revisited," *American Archivist* (Fall 1980): 481.

[3] Jones, 476.

was published. Between 1963 and 1973, eight states established archival agencies for the first time and thirteen created records management programs. State archival programs in Rhode Island and Idaho were not firmly established until 1989 and 1990, respectively. By 1993, there was a functioning state archival program in every state in the union.[4]

Major changes in the ways state archives worked, especially on collaborative initiatives, also began to occur in the mid-1970s. A significant number of long-term state archivists retired during this time, resulting in a generational turnover in the leadership of the state archives and records management programs. In retrospect, 1974 was an especially key year because it saw both the creation of a new professional association, the National Association of State Archives and Records Administrators (NASARA), and the establishment of the Records Program within the National Historical Publications Commission, which then became the National Historical Publications *and Records* Commission (NHPRC). Both of these have been critical to the advancement of sound practices and innovative programs for state government records.[5]

NASARA was founded by state archivists, but became NAGARA in 1984 when the organization expanded its membership and mission to include local and federal interests and "Government" replaced "State" in the organization's name. Over the years, NAGARA has provided a focal point for collaborative activity across all three levels of government, promulgating best practices and providing important resources through its publications and conferences. Since the outset of the NHPRC Records Program in 1974, the state archivists have also functioned as state historical records coordinators, chairing state boards that evaluate applications to the commission from within their states (described in more detail below). In this capacity, the state archivists came together as the Council of State Historical Records Coordinators (COSHRC) in the 1980s; in 2005 the organization changed its name to the Council of State Archivists (CoSA) to encompass all aspects of the work of state archivists. The FY1994 survey of state archives and records programs, cited often in this report, was a collaborative project between COSHRC (now CoSA) and NAGARA and relied heavily on experience that NAGARA had gained in collecting data and establishing program measures.

As noted earlier, NHPRC's Records Program has had a substantial impact on the development of state archives and records programs, furnishing the resources and incentives to make real change possible. As the NHPRC Records Program developed, it focused ever greater attention on and vested significant responsibility with the fifty state archivists. In order to participate fully in the grant program, NHPRC required each state to establish a State Historical Records Advisory Board (SHRAB), appointed by the governor and headed by the state archivist acting as state coordinator. All but two of the 50 states now

---

[4] Council of State Historical Records Coordinators, "Recognizing Leadership and Partnership," April 1993: 5.

[5] Notably, establishment of both the Idaho and Rhode Island state archival programs cited above was spurred by recommendations from NHPRC-funded assessments.

have authorized a SHRAB, although some are more active than others and levels of activity have waxed and waned over the years.[6] Grant proposals from both public and private repositories are reviewed by their respective state boards and, in turn, the SHRABs are expected to foster archival activity within their states. The FY2012 CoSA Survey collected data about current SHRAB activities and priorities, which was presented in a separate report available at http://www.statearchivists.org/SHRABs. No separate SHRAB report was written in 2014.

The first significant body of work generated by NHPRC through the State Historical Records Advisory Boards was the Statewide Historical Records Assessment and Planning Projects. The first round of grants for these projects was made in 1981 when the Reagan administration's downsizing initiatives threatened NHPRC with extinction. The commission "wanted to leave a legacy of assessment reports that the states themselves could use as central planning and action documents."[7] Fortunately, NHPRC survived, but the state assessments proved to be a wise investment nonetheless. By the mid-1990s, all fifty states had completed at least one such project; several of the earliest had actually gone on to complete reassessments, in order to monitor either progress or strategic planning projects to carry progress forward.

To an extent even greater than Posner's *American State Archives*, these reports often became catalysts for change. Perhaps it was because the process itself—the surveys, analyses, and strategic planning— was ultimately as important as, or more important than, the written documents themselves. By the time each project ended, the report was not just one person's opinion but a collaborative effort in which the SHRABs' constituents also had a stake. In completing the assessments, archivists from public and private repositories came together over many months with genealogists, attorneys, local government officials, librarians, and educators to identify needs and propose solutions. The process itself helped build networks and alliances and reinforced the leadership status of the state archivist/coordinator. With leadership from the state archivist in his or her role as state historical records coordinator, many of these alliances have been maintained and have prospered in the years since the assessment projects were conducted.

One of the areas that the NHPRC specifically asked each state to evaluate was state government records. There are numerous examples of concrete, positive actions taken as a result of recommendations made in the assessment reports. At least two states appointed their first professional state archivists as a result of NHPRC-sponsored studies (Rhode Island and Idaho). Several reports made

---

[6] Alabama, Arkansas, Hawaii, and Indiana activated their SHRABs in the mid-2000s; Virgin Islands in 2014. The authority and appointments for West Virginia's and Delaware's SHRABs have lapsed are no longer active, although Delaware has an active Delaware Heritage Commission.

[7] Larry Hackman, "A Perspective on American Archives," *Public Historian* 8:3 (Summer 1986): 20. Hackman notes that the first 20 assessment reports were reviewed in a summary for the 1983 meeting of State Historical Records Coordinators, published as Lisa B. Weber, ed., *Documenting America: Assessing the Condition of Historical Records in the States* (Atlanta: NAGARA, 1983).

successful arguments for new state archives buildings (New Mexico, South Carolina, and Delaware). In Pennsylvania, the records management function was transferred to the state archives. Many have since developed training and assistance programs for local governments and for private archival repositories.

Recent areas of focus

Since CoSA issued its last comprehensive survey report in 2012, the state and territorial archives have continued their commitment to collective action and collaboration through several CoSA-led initiatives. The following topics have received special attention.

Electronic records. In July 2011, the Council of State Archivists launched its State Electronic Records Initiative (SERI) focused on improving efforts to manage, preserve, and provide access to state government electronic records nationwide. Like the Emergency Preparedness Initiative, SERI began with an intensive data-gathering effort designed to evaluate the status and current needs related to the management and preservation of electronic records in state and territorial governments nationwide. Each state archives and records management program completed a survey about their existing electronic records programs then participated in extended follow-up telephone interviews. The data collected allowed CoSA to develop a composite nationwide profile of state archives' efforts to create, fund, and maintain state electronic records programs included in the SERI Phase I report issued in early 2012.

Self-assessments completed by every state and territory in May-June 2012 helped them determine the current status of their electronic records programs and identify where they should focus their attention to continue to move forward. The self-assessment tool is based on the Digital Preservation Capability Maturity Model (DPCMM) developed by Charles Dollar and Lori Ashley and will remain available to the state archives and records program so they can monitor their progress toward more comprehensive electronic records programs over the next several years.

CoSA's Strategic Training and Education Program (STEP) project began on October 1, 2012, funded by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). The three-year project provided state archives staff with access to training immediately through scholarships, delivered three week-long institutes during 2013-2014, and developed a plan to meet long-term training needs for state archives and records management staff. The final meeting of the SERI project was held in July 2015 at the joint CoSA/NAGARA annual meeting with 25 states and all 5 territories in attendance. The complementary Program for Electronic Records Training, Tools, and Standards (PERTTS) project began January 1, 2013, and ran for two years with funding from the National Historical Publications and Records Commission. This project focused on two areas: (a) providing access to in-depth information about standards, best practices, and tools for the management and preservation of electronic records, and (b) delivering education and training to ensure that these standards, best practices, and tools are widely and effectively implemented.

Data collected during the FY2014 survey related to state and territorial electronic records programs are discussed in Section 2 of this report and in PART 2: Tables 2.3 – 2.6. It is important to note, however, that CoSA's ongoing State Electronic Records Initiative, outlined above, is the focus of considerable activity and will be tracking progress in implementing effective electronic records programs nationwide. Those interested in the latest information on this topic should follow SERI's work at http://www.statearchivists.org/seri/

Digital access. In the mid-2000s, a growing number of nonprofit and for-profit entities began actively pursuing contracts with state and local archives to allow them to digitize public records and make these records available online. As state archivists began comparing the terms being offered to them, they realized that the contracts varied widely and were not always in the best interests of their own repositories or the residents of the states who they served. In response, CoSA developed a ***Statement on Digital Access Partnerships*** to provide guidance to government archivists who are negotiating these contracts to ensure that their provisions reflect the long-term best interests of the records and their users. Responses to the 2014 CoSA ARM Survey indicate that access to holdings in some 24 state and one territorial archives is provided via vendor websites such as Ancestry and FamilySearch (Table 3.4a), 23 state and one territorial archives provide descriptive access through OCLC, and nine state and one territorial archives provide descriptive access through statewide or regional networks.

Working with stakeholders. In FY2015, CoSA embarked on a one-year project to expand the work of the SERI project. With the help of an IMLS National Leadership Grant for Libraries Planning Grant, the Archives Collaborating and Cooperating with External Strategic Stakeholders (ACCESS) planning project's goal is to expand the work of CoSA's successful State Electronic Records Initiative (SERI) by engaging a diverse group of national partners, stakeholders, and other organizations to work collaboratively on increasing access to digital government records and information. A meeting of stakeholders in April 2015 helped to engage related groups in a discussion of the future of the SERI project. More than 80 allied organizations have been identified as possible stakeholders in the arena of electronic records management and digital preservation. The final result of the planning process, completed in the fall of 2015, has been the development of a business case statement and strategic plan to sustain collaboration to increase access to digital government records and information.

Trends

1. Resources and administration

Placement. As states established their archives and records management programs, the organizational structures they chose varied widely. Only a few created wholly new agencies like the departments of archives and history in Alabama and Mississippi. Most assigned the duties to existing departments. In the earlier years, the most common placements were state libraries or state historical societies, but today many departments of administration, management, and general services also perform records-related functions (Table C, pp. 11-12).

Secretaries of state have been the traditional recordkeepers in many states and continue to serve that function as homes to 18 state archives and 17 records management programs (notably all but 3 of those 17 are joint programs, with archives and records management functions operating together). Historical societies are the next most common parents to state archives (11 in all), while departments of administration come in second for records management (6). State library agencies are third in both categories (8 joint placements and 1 state archives). In 2006, 6 states have independent state archival agencies, 5 of which also administer the records management program.

State archives and records management programs operate within a variety of administrative settings. Table C, below, shows all the levels of authority between the head of the state archives and/or records management program and the governor (or legislature in Tennessee). The immediate parent agency for each program is indicated with bold face type. In some cases the parent agency is, in turn, part of a larger agency. Those are indicated with regular type. Totals for the number of programs, which are part of each type of parent agency, are given at the bottom of the columns.

A dramatic shift in placement occurred in 2012 when the Georgia Archives was transferred from the Office of the Secretary of State to the University System of Georgia. This makes Georgia the only state archives administered by a state university system and only one of two to operate outside of the state executive branch.

Archives and records management programs in the territories may be characterized as unsettled. The U.S. Virgin Islands formally appointed an archivist in 2012. The archival function for Puerto Rico is assigned to the Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña but is stretched for resources. Guam has individuals who are interested in implementing archives and records management, but there is no authorization for a specific program focused on these functions. American Samoa has had an archivist for many years, but the administration has shifted to the Attorney General and resources are strained. An archivist was appointed in the Northern Marianas in 2012.

Table C. Placement of Archives and Records Management Programs in the States and District of Columbia.

KEY: A/RM = Jointly administered programs   A = Archives only   RM = Records Management only

State	Joint/ Separate	Inde- pendent	Secretary of State	Cultural Resources/ Affairs	Education	Admini- stration/ Finance	General Services	Info Tech/ Info Mgt	State Library	State Historical Society	Other
Alabama	J	**A/RM**									
Alaska	J		A/RM		A/RM				A/RM		
Arizona	J	A/RM							A/RM		
Arkansas	A only	**A**									
California	J		**A/RM**								
Colorado	J					**A/RM**					
Connecticut	J								A/RM		
Delaware	J		**A/RM**								
Dist of Columbia	J		**A/RM**								
Florida	J		A/RM						A/RM		
Georgia	J										**A/RM**-University
Hawaii	J						A/RM				
Idaho	S					RM				A	
Illinois	J		**A/RM**								
Indiana	J	**A/RM**									
Iowa	J			A/RM						A/RM	
Kansas	J									A/RM	
Kentucky	J				A/RM				A/RM		
Louisiana	J		**A/RM**								
Maine	J		**A/RM**								
Maryland	S	**A**					RM				
Massachusetts	J		**A/RM**								
Michigan	S			**A**		RM					
Minnesota	A only									**A**	
Mississippi	J	**A/RM**									
Missouri	J		**A/RM**								
Montana	S		RM							A	
Nebraska	S		RM							A	
Nevada	J			**A/RM**							
New Hampshire	J		**A/RM**								
New Jersey	S		**A**				RM				
New Mexico	J	**A/RM**									
New York	J				A/RM						
North Carolina	J			**A/RM**							
North Dakota	S							RM		A	
Ohio	S						RM			A	
Oklahoma	J								A/RM		
Oregon	J		**A/RM**								
Pennsylvania	S					RM				A	

Table C, continued. Placement of Archives and Records Management Programs in the States and District of Columbia.

KEY: A/RM = Jointly administered programs   A = Archives only   RM = Records Management only

State	Joint/ Separate	Inde-pendent	Secretary of State	Cultural Resources/ Affairs	Education	Admini-stration/ Finance	General Services	Info Tech/ Info Mgt	State Library	State Historical Society	Other
Oregon	J		A/RM								
Pennsylvania	S					RM				A	
Rhode Island	J		A/RM								
South Carolina	J	A/RM									
South Dakota	S					RM				A	A - Tourism
Tennessee	J		A/RM						A		A-Legis Branch
Texas	J								A/RM		
Utah	J					A/RM					
Vermont	J		A/RM								
Virginia	J								A/RM		
Washington	J		A/RM								
West Virginia	S			A		RM					
Wisconsin	S					RM		RM		A	
Wyoming	J			A/RM							
Total in each category	J=37 S=12 A only=2	A/RM=5 A=2	A/RM=17 A=1 RM=2	A/RM=4 A=2	A/RM=3	ARM=2 RM=6	A/RM=1 RM=5	RM=2	A/RM=8 A=1	A/RM=2 A=10	A=2

Joint vs. split programs. Regardless of the specific parent agencies to which each function is assigned, most records professionals agree that both archives and records management are likely to function better when they have close links to each other within state government.

Currently, the two functions are assigned to the same agency in 37 states and the District of Columbia (Table C). In 12 states, archives and records management are administratively split. Two states—Arkansas and Minnesota—do not have a formal records management program for state or local government records.

For the last several decades the overall trend has been toward merging the two. In the mid-1960s, there were only 24 joint programs and 16 split ones. Since the mid-1980s, previously separated archives and records management programs have been consolidated in New York, Rhode Island, Kansas, Iowa, and Vermont. Most recently, consolidation came to California and Tennessee.

The strength of the ties between archives and records management has become increasingly important as these programs more actively reach out to the chief information officers and information technology departments in order to develop cohesive policies for electronic records. The more fragmentary the authority over electronic records and information is, the more difficult it will be to develop sound programs for their long-term administration. A combined approach helps increase the likelihood that provisions for retention and disposition are built in when new electronic information systems are planned. It also

increases the prospects that electronic records are disposed of when no longer needed and have reached their minimum retention periods on approved schedules; those with archival value are identified; and appropriate provisions are made for their preservation.

Financial and staffing resources. Without exception, the budgetary allocations for state archives and records programs represent a minuscule part of total state expenditures. The 2014 CoSA survey found that expenditures on archives and records programs were well below one-tenth of 1 percent of total expenditures by all state governments across the nation. At the highest, expenditures on archives as a percentage of state expenses was 0.034% (VT). The total spent by all states on archives and records management has dropped from $112 million in 2012 to $107 million in 2014, a reduction of 4.5% (Table 1.4). In 2012, 21 states allocated less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent specifically to records. That number has now risen to at least 22 states (Table 1.2).

Staff salaries comprise a large portion of state archives budgets and continued state budget issues have forced reductions in archives and records management staffing, discussed below under "Staffing." On average, 68% of state archives budgets go toward personnel while only 29% goes toward operations (Table 1.3)

Storage space both for physical collections and growing digital collections is a continuing strain on budgets. These expenses will only increase with the annual additions to holdings and overall economic inflation. When budgets have to be cut, storage costs are relatively fixed while staff layoffs can yield more substantial, if undesirable, reductions.

Staffing. In FY 2014, the total number of full-time equivalents (FTEs) employed in state archives and records management programs nationwide was 1,099, down from 1,412 in 2012, an overall reduction of reduction of 18%. This is a direct result of the continued budget cuts described above. It appears that one-quarter of all records management positions were lost and more than one-fifth of all archival positions (Table D).

Reductions in force often result in the loss of both enthusiastic and promising new professionals as well as talented, experienced staff members. Important initiatives and services lapse; irreplaceable archival records are lost; research, both present and future, is undermined. Staff

Table D. Number of FTEs assigned to specific functions, all states (based on data in Tables 1.5 ,& 1.6, & 5.3 and on 2006 Local Government Survey).

Function	# of FTEs in FY2006	# of FTEs in FY2012	# of FTEs in FY2014	% change from 2012
Total, all FTEs	1,727	1,412	1,190	-18%
Archives	899	708	553	-22%
Records management	500	373	355	-5%
Other	331	330	282	-15%

The following are also included in the above totals.

Electronic records	85	103	78	-25%
Preservation	133	97	98	0%

decreases in records management programs have been even more dramatic than for archives. Weak records management undercuts even a strong archival program. Remaining staff are at risk of being both discouraged and overworked.

It is disheartening to note that the number of electronic records FTEs has decreased to a level below that in 2006. The only sector to not decrease in staffing between 2012 and 2014 is preservation, which remained stable (Table D).

Two figures provide some context to understanding the workload demands on state archives and records management staff and their growing impact. Staffing in archives compared to the overall state employees (Table 1.8) shows how many state employees are served by each state archive member. The average number of state employees served was 5,284 in 2014 (up from 4,282 in FY2012) showing the growing disparity between all state staff and archives staff. In that same time period, state staffing has increased from 3,279,080 in 2012 to 5,262,027 in 2014, a 60% increase compared to a 22% decrease in archives staffing. Similarly taking into consideration the number of archive staff, the comparison of the average volume of linear/cubic feet to the number of ARM FTEs was 6,834 in 2014, compared to 6,993 in FY2012. This decrease reflects not only a decrease in staffing but also a decrease in the overall linear/cubic feet of materials archives are holding, see Table 2.2 as well as Section 2 of this report. The volume of electronic records is growing rapidly in state archives. These records are difficult to accommodate in the kind of calculation done for non-electronic records because volume is only one small measure of their complexity. For a more personal narrative regarding staffing changes in ARM programs, see Table 1.7.

Extra revenue sources. Archives and records management programs have actively sought ways to increase revenue outside of regular appropriations from the state legislatures (Table 1.1). Many of the state ARM programs receive income from some combination of fees, revolving funds, and trust funds that provide substantial support for staff and programs.

Like many other sectors of government, state archives and records programs have had to become more entrepreneurial in their outlook. Resources can grow, but these programs will constantly be looking for new methods of generating revenue. The most desirable approaches will be those that generate substantial income without unduly restricting access by imposing prohibitive fees for reproductions or other use-related activities.

Extra revenue sources states utilize include: 30 states charge fees; 13 states have revolving or trust funds that they draw from; 29 states are working on grants in 2014, and 14 states have other forms of income (Table 5.4b).

Legal authority and resources for carrying out records-related responsibilities. Archives and records management programs cannot perform well without the full legal authority to act. Section 4 of this report examines the current status of this authority in some detail.

2. Extent of the record

This section addresses the quantity of records held by state archives as well as their physical characteristics and the subject matter they cover.

State Archives holdings. The combined holdings for all state archives in 2014 totaled approximately 2.8 million cubic feet, down 13% from 2012 (Tables 2.1, 2.2). This shift to a decrease in volume of paper, film, photographs, maps, and other materials that can be measured in feet offsets the 16% growth in holdings of electronic records that take up relatively little physical space but can be the equivalent of many hundreds or thousands of feet of paper in a very small drive. Although there has been a decrease in growth of paper and other records, this by no means will mean a decrease in costs as the cost of electronic records will continue to increase.

In addition to state government records, many state archives hold records from local governments and from nongovernmental organizations, institutions, and individuals. State archives in Washington and Wyoming each hold more records from local governments than they do from state agencies. In other states, holdings of "private" papers comprise a substantial volume of the total holdings, especially in the state historical societies serving Nebraska and Wisconsin. Just seven state archives report holding no local government records while 15 state archives report holding no nongovernment records (Table 2.1).

While most state archives non-electronic holdings have continued to grow, 9 states are decreasing in volume (Table 2.2). The decreases in records potentially result in weeding out unneeded duplicates or segregating permanent from nonpermanent records and shows states getting better control over the management of their collections.

Electronic records in state archives. Thirty-three state archives and 4 territorial archives report that they have accessioned electronic records (Tables 2.3, 2.4). Only 8 state archives reported in FY2014 that they did not hold any electronic records. Collectively, the state archives have accessioned about 447 terabytes of electronic records and hold another 244 terabytes that have not yet been accessioned. This represents an increase of approximately 65% in each category.

Holdings of electronic records have accelerated rapidly in the last nine years growing 734% in that time. Earlier CoSA survey reports expressed concern about the slow rates at which state archives were acquiring these types of records but looking at it in the aggregate, growth has been considerable. CoSA's State Electronic Records Initiative has provided the much-needed training and support necessary to implement sound electronic records programs in state archives and records management agencies

during this time of growth. Unfortunately, archive budgets have not managed to keep up as shown in Section 7.

The number of FTEs being devoted to electronic records in state archives and records management programs is still relatively small. Nationwide, there are about 77 FTEs in all state archives and six FTEs in territories addressing these records. However, seven states and one territory report no FTEs for electronic records at all (Table 1.6).

State records center holdings. Holdings of records in state records centers are also substantial totaling 5.1 million cubic/linear feet among the 36 states that provided a report (Table 2.7a). In addition, the territories reported records center holdings of 9,032 feet.

Table 2.7b presents a comparison of record center holdings for FY2006, FY2010, FY2012, and FY2014. The total holdings dropped about 28% between 2012 (about 7 million feet) and 2014 (about 5.1 million feet). There is an interesting trend among the sources of the records over these eight years as well. State records centers have greatly reduced the volume of local government records stored in their facilities (from 85,160 feet in 2006 to 26,450 feet in 2014) and have eliminated all holdings from non-government entities.

3. Access to and use of the record

Impact of an online presence. Almost universal access to the Internet has increased the number of users of state archives as well as the ways records are located and used. People who might not be able to travel to the state archives' facilities can access them through the electronic portals. Most state archives are working hard to make their holdings accessible via the Web. At least 31 now provide access to at least half of their holdings on their own websites and 8 of those provide access to 100% of their holdings (Table 3.3).

Forty state archives have created virtual exhibits or memory projects that focus on especially significant documents, collections, or topics. Access for holdings of 24 states and one territorial archives is provided via vendor websites like Ancestry and FamilySearch. Many also place emphasis on facilitating use of documents in the classroom: 19 states and one territorial archives and provide teaching resources, including curricular packets, along with digital images of original documents. A range of other online access options are also employed: 21 state archives provide transcripts of documents/records; 23 state and one territorial archives are delivering access to records via social media (Tables 3.4a, 3.4b).

Thirty-seven programs reported that they are using one or more types of social media (Table E) and their reasons for doing so extend well beyond providing access to records.

Impact of the Internet. Table E. Use of social media.

Types used by ARM programs. Based on data in Table 3.5a.

Type of social media	# of state ARM programs using them (as of 6-30-2012)
Any type	35
Facebook	31
Blogs	18
Twitter	22
YouTube	21
Flikr	16

Purposes for using social media.
Based on data in Table 3.5b

Purpose	# of state ARM programs
Reference interactions	13
Promoting collections, events	39
Online exhibits	23
Other	9

When asked why they were NOT using social media, responses included insufficient staff time and expertise, uncertainty about how social media would improve their business model, information delivery focuses on website, and legal issues re: housing public records on social media sites.

Number of state archives users. The number of users of state archives making direct, person-to-person contacts with staff has remained relatively steady over the last two decades (Table F), not because the demand to use state records has been flat but because so much information in and about records is now available on state archives websites and through other Internet sources. To accommodate those users who still wish to access records in person, state archives provide open hours for research rooms. On average, state archives were open to the public 36 hours per week in 2014, a slight decrease from 2012 when archives were open 37.4 hours on average (Table 3.2). Twenty-two states have regular Saturday

hours, 6 have hours one Saturday a month, and one state has Sunday hours. Two state archives are currently closed to public research during construction.

In FY2006, we noted that in all but 10 states, more reference requests were received via electronic mail than by surface mail. Requests continued to increase until the slight drop of 15% in 2014. The most remarkable change in person-to-person contacts is the 57% decline in in-person visits between 1994 and 2014. The number of visits began to decline as soon as collections were put online. The decline in the number of telephone calls has remained virtually the same since 2012, perhaps because there are still a significant number of requests that come by phone from other state agencies whose questions are not as easily answered via the ARM website.

Table F. Comparison of "person-to-person" reference contacts in states that provided figures for all three years

Contact type	FY1994	FY2006	FY2012	FY2014
Surface mail	169,825	155,710	67,121	81,218
Electronic mail	Not counted	150,785	153,934	120,666
In person	300,336	285,404	172,095	129,573
Telephone	172,327	245,529	134,137	134,228
Other			676,574	577,248
Total	642,488	837,428	1,203,861	1,042,893

*No distinction made between surface and email in 2012

4. Authority and Resources for Carrying Out Records-related Responsibilities

During its 1994 survey, CoSA asked states to indicate whether they had formal definitions of what constitutes a record. All 48 states responding to that survey said they did. Forty-six were based in statutes, while those of Oregon and Tennessee were contained in regulations. This was an improvement from the mid-1980s when only 24 had detailed and explicit definitions, 16 had detailed but ambiguous definitions, 8 had only oblique or summary coverage, and 2 had no definitions at all.[8]

Many state laws are modeled after the 1943 Federal Records Act which added the phrase "regardless of physical form or characteristics" in an attempt to cover all possible forms and conditions under which information could be stored. In a 1992 study, Dennis Neilander found this same catchall phrase in 25 state laws defining public records.[9] In the last 20 years, many states have strengthened their statutory or regulatory definitions of a record to specifically cover electronic records.

The existence of a solid foundation of records-related laws and regulation in most states is confirmed by reports from the state archives and records programs that they have relatively strong legal authority in many key areas. CoSA has asked state archives and records management programs to

---

[8] George Bain, "State Archival Law: A Content Analysis," *American Archivist* 46 (Spring 1983): 164–167.

[9] Dennis Neilander, "Presentation to the Legislative Commission's Subcommittee to Study the Laws Governing Public Records and Books: Comparisons of State Public Records Laws," [Nevada] Legislative Counsel Bureau, January 10, 1992.

report on the extent of their authority and the availability of sufficient resources to fulfill that authority three times. In 2006, the "Assessment of Emergency Preparedness in State Archives and Records Management Programs" included an extensive set of questions about the ARM programs' authority and resources over agency records in each of the three branches of state government (executive, legislative, judicial) and for local government agencies.[10] The FY2010 and FY2012 ARM surveys repeated many of the same questions.

Table 4.1 provides a comparative summary of the responses for 2006, 2012, and 2014. These are, of course, subjective responses and in many cases were provided by different people in the three years, so the decrease in both authority and resources from 2006 to 2014 may more reflect the individual's view of the relative status in each area, not hard quantifiable data. Nonetheless, respondents in all years indicated that, across the board, the authority to execute and/or oversee records-related functions and services is far greater than the resources (funding and personnel) available to follow through on that authority. In addition, they indicated that the ARM program has far more authority over the state executive branch than it does over records in the legislative and judicial branches.

5. Local Government Records

The questions posed in this section of the FY2014 ARM Survey were based on those originally asked in a survey conducted by CoSA's Local Government Archives Task Force in March 2006.[11]

The loss of FTEs in state archives and records management programs discussed in Section 1 and enumerated in Table D has had an impact on the number of state archives reporting that they actively serve as a repository for local government records, decreasing from 25 in 2012 to 21 in 2014. "Active" programs for the security storage of local government microfilm have increased, however, from 23 to 26 programs, perhaps showing an improved knowledge of the fragility of the digital and the stability of the film.

The services most frequently provided to local governments by state archives are training, onsite consultations, and preparing, writing, and approving schedules. Thirty state archives actively provide training to local government officials and employees (down from 36 in 2012). The number of state archives writing and approving schedules has also decreased. Twenty-five state archives write schedules (down from 34 in 2012) and 31 approve schedules (down from 42) (Tables 5.2a-5.2c).

More than three decades ago, states began implementing programs that designated a portion of filing fees to be used for the support of records-related services. In some states, these fee-based

---

[10] The results of the 2006 emergency preparedness assessment were included in the full version of *Safeguarding a Nation's Identity,* published by CoSA in 2007. http://www.statearchivists.org/prepare/epireport_all.pdf

[11] http://www.statearchivists.org/lga/documents/LGRsurveyReport.pdf

revenues have meant significant increases in the state archives budget for staffing, training, and improvements to storage facilities. Fees have become a large portion of many archives budgets; seven states earn over $1,000,000 in fees and another five make more than $500,000.

6. Emergency Preparedness

CoSA has monitored emergency preparedness in state archives and records programs for many years, but became especially concerned after the widespread destruction of government records by Hurricane Katrina in August 2005 and equally important in 2015, its 10th anniversary.

In responses to its FY2004 survey, CoSA found that written disaster plans were the norm among the state archives and records programs: 46 out of 60 reporting programs said they had such a written plan in place. About one-third of those plans were out of date, however. Seven programs in 2004 had no disaster plan, although four of those said they were in development.

CoSA asked each state and territorial archives to complete emergency preparedness assessments in 2006 to establish a baseline as part of its Emergency Preparedness Initiative (EPI) and in 2008 at the beginning of the FEMA-funded Intergovernmental Preparedness and Emergency Response (IPER) Project. The FY2014 ARM Survey repeated many of the questions included in the 2006, 2008, and 2012 assessments as a way to measure change over the course of the ten years CoSA focused so closely on preparedness and response.

In 2014, 43 (88%) of the state and territorial archives reported having an emergency preparedness plan in place, five more (10%) have a plan in development, two (2%) had no plan. In comparison, in 2006, only 14 (25%) archives reported having plans in place. Although it appears to be an improvement, of the 43 states with plans in place, only 31 (74%) are current and even fewer (24 states or 57%) update their plans annually. Another area for improvement is the ARM staff and volunteer participation in emergency response drills; only 12 (20%) states participate annually. Although low, these numbers are still well above the 2006 numbers and the neglect is more likely one of time and budget than desire.

7. Issues and Priorities

The 2014 ARM survey asked respondents to identify "the three most important issues or concerns facing your agency in the next two to three years." Fifty-one states responded with their top three issues, the compilation of which is shown in Table H.

In both 2006 and 2012, the challenges of electronic records topped the list of concerns and priorities for state archivists and records managers, but in 2014 we see that challenge topped by the continued weight of budget woes. Electronic records have been a concern for as long as CoSA has been surveying state ARM programs, but the State Electronic Records Initiative (SERI) may be helping state archives feel more comfortable with the issue and changing the focus from electronic records to the funding for staff and repositories.

Table H. Top issues and priorities cited by state archives and records management programs in 2014. Summarizing data in Table 7.1.

Issue area	FY2014 (n=51)	
	# of programs	**% of programs**
Funding/Staffing	43	84%
Electronic records, digital preservation	41	80%
Facilities	16	31%
Training	15	29%
Records initiatives	10	20%