

**CAUCUS ARCHIVAL PROJECTS EVALUATION SERVICE (CAPES):
Assessment of the Program's Effectiveness**

Executive Summary

Major Findings:

- CAPES is, overall, very successful and effective.
- There is still a compelling need for the program.

Major Recommendations:

- The CAPES program should be continued.
- More structured follow-up would improve the program's effectiveness.
- Steps should be taken to insure that consultants' reports conform to a consistent high standard and meet the needs of the applicants.
- More analysis is needed to determine the effectiveness of current outreach efforts.

Mimi Bowling
Consulting Archivist
January 31, 2008

Introduction

History of this assessment. This evaluation of the effectiveness of the CAPES program was initiated in the summer of 2007 by the CAPES Advisory Committee, consisting at the time of Gary Saretzky (committee chair), Carla Zimmerman, Fred Pachman, Lisa Mangiafico, Elizabeth Shepherd, and (ex officio) Daniel Linke, Chair of the New Jersey Caucus of MARAC, which manages the program, and Sara Cureton of the New Jersey Historical Commission, which funds it. Dan Linke contacted the author and an agreement on terms was reached on July 26, 2007. The initial deadline of December 31, 2007 was extended, at the request of the author, to January 31, 2008.

The CAPES program has been evaluated in the past, both formally and informally. The only previous formal, large-scale evaluation took place in 1992, three years after the launch of the program, when archivists David W. Carmicheal, Charlotte B. Brown, and Robert C. Morris were engaged to study the program's effectiveness. Their assessment was strongly positive, though they suggested some areas for improvement. As will be seen in this report, some of those points remain concerns to this day.

Another review, internal, less formal, and narrower in scope, was undertaken ten years later, in 2002, by Caucus Chair Alan Delozier and CAPES Coordinator Dan Jones. This undertaking canvassed only CAPES consultants, and attempted to gauge the consultants' opinions of the "template" approach to survey forms and several other issues relating to the program.

As described by Dan Linke, there were several motivating factors behind the decision to commission a new evaluation. New guidelines were enacted in October 2006, although for the most part they were not radically different from the previous ones. There was a belief by some that the program was running out of steam and running out of repositories to survey. The financial outlook for cultural resource programming in the State of New Jersey was (and remains) troubled: there is no hope of an increased budget for the New Jersey Historical Commission in the near future, and in fact there is the likelihood of a decrease. This spells increased competition for limited Commission funds, and the necessity in recent years for the Caucus to submit formal grant proposals to the Commission. Proposals have always been funded, but usually at half or less of the requested amount. Prior to 2004, CAPES was not required to submit formal proposals at all. However, since that first proposal was required, the Commission has managed to allot unsolicited supplements to CAPES in 2005 and 2006, totaling nearly \$20,000.

Charge. The charge presented to the consulting archivist was to address the following questions and tasks (text is unaltered but some changes have been made to spacing and punctuation for the sake of clarity):

How effective have the consultant reports and follow-up visits from the last five years (2001-2006) been?

Did the recipients follow up on the recommendations of the report, and if they did not, why not? Was it something the CAPES program could have helped with? A follow-up phone call? More specific info?

Evaluate how effectively the consultants and administration have worked (with an eye toward improvements).

Contact a sample (no less than 15) of the sites to assess the evaluations' impact (phone or visit). [None from the last twelve months.]

What was helpful?

What was missing?

Other services that CAPES could provide?

What else could CAPES do?

Written report in 4 months with a follow-up meeting with the CAPES advisory board at a time mutually convenient to all parties.

The consulting archivist who is the author of this report was a CAPES consultant during the program's first three years. Because of scheduling conflicts, she declined assignments after 1991 and at her own request was removed from the roster of consultants. She has had no involvement with the program for over sixteen years.

Some recommendations, unattributed in this report, originated with interviewees. Thanks to the many individuals who contributed their thoughtful suggestions.

Methodology

The methodology employed in this evaluation consisted of four activities:

- A review of the pertinent records of CAPES administration: guidelines, coordinators' reports (2000-2006), past evaluations and surveys.
- A review of a selection of recent (2001-2006) consultants' reports.
- Interviews with selected repositories that received CAPES consultant visits between 2000-2006.
- Interviews with selected others: coordinators, advisory committee members, New Jersey Historical Commission personnel.

The parameters of this project mandated a selective rather than comprehensive approach to research, report reviews, repository contacts and other interviews.

Site Interviews

The charge to the consultant undertaking this evaluation was to contact not fewer than fifteen sites, whose reports must not have been completed in the past twelve months. Elsewhere, the charge made clear that the evaluation should concentrate on the years 2001-2006. In selecting the sites to be interviewed, the author attempted to achieve a balance of a) types of repositories, b) geographical areas within the state, c) different years and d) different consultants. In order to facilitate the author's discussion with repository interviewees, an additional criterion for selection was that the site's report had to either (preferably) follow the template requirement of listing all recommendations in priority order near the end of the text (even though this requirement is reportedly no longer enforced); or at least state the consultant's recommendations clearly in one section of the report. This eliminated some sites and consultants from consideration.

The fifteen sites contacted are listed in Appendix A. Responsiveness was uneven, and in one instance, completely absent. The breakdown of responses is as follows:

- Full response (interviewed by phone or email) = 12;
- Partial response (responder reported that staff at the time of the visit had left and s/he didn't think there had been any follow-up on the CAPES consultant's recommendations; s/he would try to respond by email or would ask someone else to respond, but no further response was received) = 2;
- Failure to respond at all to multiple attempts to contact by phone and email = 1.

It is unlikely that full responses from the three delinquent sites would have made a significant difference in this evaluation. Their lack of response can be presumed to answer at least some of the stock questions, as well as the unspoken one: whether anyone at that organization still cares about or for its archival holdings.

Summary of responses. In reviewing the following section, readers should bear in mind that this is not a statistical study. Answers are summarized for the twelve sites that responded.

1. *Information about CAPES.* Respondents reported that they learned about the program in a variety of ways. These included presentations at Monmouth County Library History and Archives Day, New Jersey Library Association events, word of mouth (several mentioned Rutgers University Special Collections), and announcements in unspecified or unremembered publications. One had no idea how he heard about CAPES.

2. *Follow-up by sites.* Respondents were asked whether their organizations had followed up on none, some, most or all of the consultant's recommendations. Eleven reported "some;" none reported "all" or "most;" only one reported "none." Respondents reported a wide range of follow-up activities, including rehousing of collections, development of policies and procedures, arrangement and description

projects, digitization of some holdings, and improvements in security and disaster prevention.

3. *Lack of follow-up by sites.* When asked if some further action by CAPES could have made a difference in addressing the recommendations that had not been acted upon, the answer was unanimously “no.” In most cases the reason for lack of progress was budgetary. Interestingly, one respondent said:

“In fact, CAPES *did* help, indirectly. The reason for the delay of many of the projects is that major library construction took priority, and that construction is now in the works.”

Some respondents sadly reported backsliding instead of progress. They cited such developments as loss of space due to decisions by the parent administration or major organizational changes, or damage to collections from Hurricane Floyd. In no instance, however, did they believe that CAPES involvement could have reversed the situation.

One instance of backsliding was revealed inadvertently. One respondent happily announced that his organization had found a nice, new location for the archives – next to the furnace. (The author did her best to talk him out of it.)

4. *Helpfulness of consultant’s visit and report.* Response to this question was overwhelmingly positive. Three answered yes in emphatic terms, using words like “incredibly” and “a privilege.” Seven answered yes; one answered that it was of limited help; one couldn’t say. When asked in what way the process had been helpful, one respondent said:

[It was] “a lifesaver to have a professional archivist’s pronouncements to help convince administration of what the archives needs.” The same individual reported that she “gave the recommendations to the architect for the renovation, and the architect actually heeded the recommendations!”

Others stated that the evaluation had in some way helped raise the archives’ visibility within the parent institution, or that the recommendations, being specific and prioritized, helped the organization approach the management of its archival collections in a sensible and orderly manner.

One respondent reported that following the consultant’s report, the entire archival collection was moved to a repository with greater resources to take appropriate care of it. Yet even though the respondent’s organization had relinquished custody, he regarded the CAPES consultancy as extremely positive and helpful. He remarked that the state’s interest (as manifested in the support of the New Jersey Historical Commission for a CAPES evaluation) had helped build support and interest in the archives among his own constituency.

A number of respondents talked about how comforting and reassuring it was simply to talk with someone who knew about archives. And one said, “Getting going in ANY direction was helpful!”

One organization responded somewhat negatively to this question. They reported that some of the consultant’s recommendations were helpful, but that they were unhappy with the consultant’s response to their primary concern and felt that the consultant lacked the necessary expertise to address that aspect of archival management. This does not appear to be representative of any widespread problem.

5. *Achievements.* Several successes were reported that could be traced to the CAPES evaluation. These included (most spectacularly) a major building renovation. Another respondent reported that she had subsequently attended the Modern Archives Institute (and got so much out of it that she wanted to go back and do it again) and had acquired all of the manuals published by the Society of American Archivists.

6. *CAPES deficiencies or services that were wanted.* A theme that clearly emerged from these interviews was the desire of many of the repositories for some form of structured follow-up. Some felt they needed an occasional prod or positive reinforcement; others had questions or problems that arose as they attempted to implement the consultant’s recommendations, but they were reluctant to contact the consultant.

One forward-thinking respondent, concerned with recording the story of her present-day community, suggested that CAPES should expand its program to include assistance with documentation strategy (although, not being an archivist, she did not use that term). She questioned whether CAPES could help sites develop oral history programs and other kinds of documentation projects.

One respondent suggested that he would have liked a consultant with appropriate expertise to help with humidification and flattening of documents, saying he felt too intimidated to try to build and use a “Horton humidifier” himself. [Author’s comment: The respondent is wiser than he knows, to be cautious about attempting treatment methods without sufficient training.]

Most of those who said that they did not know or could not respond to this question often added that they didn’t know enough about what other services CAPES offered, or might be expected to offer, to answer in any meaningful way.

7. *Subsequent grant applications.* Five respondents reported that they had subsequently applied for grants from the New Jersey Historical Commission or other sources. Of those, two were successful: one received funds from NJHC for a description project, the other received funds from a private donor for a digitization project. Of the three whose applications were unsuccessful, one site

reported that its application was denied because of the (then) shaky funding of the parent institution. Another claimed not to know why it was denied, but surmised that it was either that its collections were not sufficiently strong in New Jersey history or that it lacked grant-writing expertise. This respondent asked if grant-writing training or assistance was something that CAPES could offer. The third believed that the lack of popular support for the parent organization in general was the primary reason that its grant application was denied.

One respondent didn't know whether his organization had submitted any follow-up grant applications or not.

Other Findings

The Good:

The View from the New Jersey Historical Commission. Current and past officials of the New Jersey Historical Commission are emphatic about the importance and effectiveness of CAPES, describing it in terms such as “splendid” and “essential.” They stress that a CAPES evaluation is a mandatory prerequisite for any institution (except for those institutions that clearly have archival expertise on staff – as most small historical societies, public libraries, churches and small colleges do not) that is submitting a grant application to NJHC for larger project or programmatic support involving archives or primary sources. Staff of the NJHC regard CAPES as a model program, and indeed it is unique within MARAC and New Jersey. They wish there were a comparable program for museum collections and historic structures.

Successes. A number of success stories were reported during the course of this study, either in interviews or in messages forwarded to the author. Sites where CAPES evaluations have contributed to the development of successful programs include:

- The First Presbyterian Church in Elizabeth, which in 2007 advertized a position for a free-lance archivist to work with their collections.
- The Jersey City Public Library, which is constructing new facilities for its archival and historical collections.
- Bruce Springsteen Collection at the Asbury Park Public Library, which energetically followed up on all of the consultant's recommendations, including holding workshops, rehousing the holdings in archival enclosures, and reformatting the collection.
- The Plainfield Public Library, which now has one of the most renowned local history collections in the state.
- The Helene Fuld School of Nursing, which received a large grant from the Fuld Foundation for a new archives building.

Others that were mentioned in less detail included:

- The Monmouth County Historical Association
- The Ann May School of Nursing
- The Fort Lee Historical Society

The Consultant Pool. Attempts to recruit new consultants in recent years have been successful, and there is now a pool of 15 consultants. The recent institution of “mentoring” new consultants, having them shadow a more experienced consultant, was regarded positively by those who commented on it.

The Less Good:

1. Maintaining consistently high quality of the consultants’ reports can be a challenge, given that consultants are self-nominated and possess a wide range of skills. The current guidelines specify the number of years of experience or training one must have in order to be a consultant, but these qualifications do not guarantee that the consultant will produce a report that is insightful, informative, helpful, well-organized and well-written. This is a sensitive issue, because CAPES relies on members who, while paid for their services, nevertheless must volunteer for the duty. Coordinators have sometimes tried to address this problem by assigning no (or very few) new sites to sub-par consultants, but this generally results in hurt feelings. Further, there is no unanimity of opinion regarding which reports are substandard.

2. Related to this is the problem of setting and enforcing standards for the content and format of the reports. In the early 2000s, a template was created that would impose a consistent format (if not consistent quality) in the reports. The template was designed to make reports easy to fathom by inexperienced repository staff (often volunteers, seldom with any archival background) and to insure that important information is always covered. Template criteria such as a list of recommendations in priority order are helpful to repositories. Most consultants generally liked the template and many continue to use it, but others refused to. Use of the template is not enforced at this time.

4. Several individuals interviewed noted that in years past there were coordinator-related problems such as poor communication, lack of feedback and follow-through, shoddy bookkeeping and financial management, and long delays in the various stages of an assignment, including making the assignment, distributing the report, and paying the consultant. All these interviewees hastened to affirm that these problems are in the past; the current and previous coordinators both get high marks for their efficient and effective management.

5. CAPES’ effectiveness is sometimes compromised by internal disharmony. One manifestation of this is that several individuals asserted that from time to time assignments have been distributed inequitably. This allegation was not exhaustively

researched by the author, but a review of the report files and coordinators' reports suggest that this allegation may prove to be more impressionistic than factually supportable. Nevertheless, it suggests some lingering discontent. In an organization that relies on the voluntary efforts of its members and seeks to be democratic and fair, this may to some extent always be an insoluble dilemma. Since the respect and approbation of one person for another cannot be legislated, sound procedures consistently followed (such as, for example, term limits on coordinators and the requirement that no consultant be assigned more than four sites per year, both specified in the current guidelines) are the best insurance against favoritism and overbearing, autocratic or unenlightened leadership.

6. Not infrequently, the repository is a problem. Some aren't ready for a CAPES evaluation. Others, despite having sought CAPES assistance, seem to take pride in their maverick nature and cling tenaciously to their amateurism. Still others have apparently insurmountable management difficulties. As one interviewee said, "We can't referee applicants' internal governance problems."

Other Issues, Questions and Possibilities:

Outreach. Questions related to outreach were raised often in the interviews. At the start of this project, it was reported to the author that 1) there were approximately 500 eligible institutions in the state, 2) CAPES had surveyed around 330 of them as of 2006, and 3) applications were dwindling. However, the first and third of those assertions have been challenged by others. No one, it turns out, could say where the 500 number came from. Organizational membership in the League of Historical Societies of New Jersey currently stands at around 260; more than two-thirds of those organizations have had CAPES evaluations. (Interestingly, during the summer of 2007 the Coordinator sent a mailing to the 82 historical societies in the League who had not yet had CAPES evaluations, to inform them of the program and solicit their interest. As of October 2007 she had received not a single response.) But eligibility for CAPES services is not limited to historical societies: public library local history collections, college libraries, religious institutions and other cultural institutions may apply, provided their collections are accessible for research. Therefore, many interviewees (including Historical Commission personnel) believe that there are many more than 500 eligible institutions. Impressions differ as to whether applications are dwindling or not. Some interviewees assert that they are, but Sara Cureton at NJHC says "they continue to roll in – two more just today." The latest coordinator's report, covering the last quarter of 2007, indicates that fifteen reports have been completed or are pending. This level of activity is on a par with the fiscal years 2004-2005 (fifteen reports completed) and 2005-2006 (sixteen reports completed).

The question is whether the current level and types of outreach are sufficient or too little, well- or poorly-targeted. The obverse of this is the question of whether there is (or could be in the future) too much outreach: if funds are limited, it would be unfortunate to raise expectations among potential applicants that then cannot be met.

Outreach issues are addressed further under "Recommendations," below.

Report Database. It was discovered in recent years that information regarding which institutions had been surveyed, when and by whom, was incomplete in both the CAPES files and at the New Jersey Historical Commission. Between the summers of 2005 and 2006 an Access database was designed to capture comprehensive information about the surveys, both retrospectively and going forward. So far, only a few fields (sequence number, name of repository, year completed) have been filled in. The table contains twenty-three fields, so completing it retrospectively for all fields would be very time-consuming. The question of whether this database should be completed, to what extent, by whom, and where it should fit among the program's priorities, are the subject of ongoing debate within the CAPES Advisory Committee. For purposes of this evaluation, the Access table was converted to an Excel file and unused fields (columns) were hidden for ease of use; it proved a very helpful tool throughout the project.

Expansion of the Scope of the CAPES Program: Disaster Response. Following recent disasters such as the 2007 flood at the David Sarnoff Library, some interviewees vigorously support the idea that CAPES should expand its services to include some level of disaster response. This could mean the deployment of a single consultant to provide advice, or a team of consultants to assist with the physical work of disaster recovery, such as packing or air-drying wet records; in either case, stipends would be paid to the consultants. Opponents of this proposal argue that other resources are available in New Jersey, such as the Princeton Preservation Group and the Records DIRECT initiative of the PARIS grants program of the New Jersey Department of Archives and Records Management. There are other initiatives underway in the archival community. Of particular note, the MARAC Steering Committee has established an Ad Hoc Committee on Disaster Awareness and Preparedness will study initiatives and programs at other regional and national archival organizations and institutions (including resources from the Heritage Emergency Taskforce) looking for gaps which MARAC could fill or opportunities for partnerships; prepare guidelines for a disaster response team including size, training and resource needs; create a plan for a disaster fund drive in consultation with the Development Committee; determine procedures/guidelines for awarding disaster funds; and recommend potential disaster awareness and preparedness activities.

Unquestionably there is valuable expertise to be found in each of those organizations, but the extent to which they can actually send responders to assist in disaster recovery is less clear. The PARIS program serves only county and municipal archives and records. There is no reference to disaster response services on the Princeton Preservation Group's website. No doubt there will be disasters (primarily water-related) in New Jersey archives and cultural institutions in the future, so there will be a need for responders. However, there are not-insignificant downsides to trying to manage a response team whose members have no legal connection to, or presumption of protection by, the affected institution. There will be serious issues surrounding liability, the potential for injury, and questions of whose insurance covers whom and what. Budgeting for unpredictable disaster contingencies complicates funding that is already strained and uncertain. The New Jersey Historical Commission has indicated it would support CAPES expansion in area of disaster *planning*.

Expansion of the Scope of the CAPES Program: Speakers Bureau. Another suggestion for expanding the scope of CAPES is that the program develop a Speakers Bureau. The demand for such a service is not yet known, but this is an idea that is within the mission of CAPES and does not present particular legal or budgetary obstacles.

Recommendations (in priority order)

1. Keeping on.

- There remains a compelling need for the CAPES program. It is highly regarded by the agency that funds it, and some of the successes of its clients have been of such magnitude that they vastly outweigh whatever negative there are. The program should be continued.
- Things change. Reviews of the program's effectiveness should be regularly undertaken, perhaps every five years. It may not always be necessary to engage a paid consultant for these evaluations.

2. Follow-up. The need for more structured follow-up was a theme heard repeatedly in the site interviews. This same recommendation was made in the 1992 evaluation of CAPES by Carmicheal, Brown and Morris. Their report stressed the need for more and better-organized follow-up after consultants' reports were submitted, noting the desire of most sites for more follow-up and feedback. They recommended that each site be contacted six months after the initial visit to assess progress or lack thereof. The 1992 report further recommended that CAPES offer more assistance in the grant-writing process, suggesting that individual consultants be deployed to assist sites they had evaluated, and that CAPES and NJHC track which CAPES evaluations result in subsequent NJHC grant applications. Those same recommendations are still valid today.

- Design a method for following up on every evaluation. Determine a reasonable elapsed time between evaluation and follow-up. The six months recommended by the 1992 report might be overly optimistic; a year may be appropriate.
- Design a flexible approach to the follow-up. It might start (and be limited to) a phone call in which the consultant's prioritized recommendations are reviewed one by one, and progress or lack of progress is discussed. Some situations might then require a second visit, preferably by the same consultant (unless that person's work was grossly unsatisfactory to the site, the coordinator or the advisory committee). In either case, consultants should be compensated for their time, though not at the same rate as the initial visit unless the amount of time spent was comparable.
- Offer more assistance with grant-writing.
- Work with the NJHC to develop a means of tracking which sites apply for subsequent grants, whether those grants are funded, and if not, why not. Synthesize that information and use it to assist other CAPES recipients.

3. Reports.

- Re institute a template to be used for consultant reports, and require that it be used consistently. Review consultants' responses to the 2002 survey regarding the template, eliminate the two elements that consultants generally disliked (requiring an inventory of at least part of the site's collection, and evaluation forms for the site to complete) revise the remainder as needed, and implement its adoption.
- Disaster risk assessment and advice on prevention and planning should be incorporated into every survey.
- If possible require digital photos with each report. Some consultants include them now; others do not. Photographs enhance reports and help reinforce consultants' recommendations. (Are there any consultants who do not have digital cameras?)

4. Outreach. More analysis is needed to determine whether and how eligible institutions are being made aware of CAPES and whether something more or different needs to be done.

- Establish a routine method of determining how the applicant learned of the CAPES program. Either make this a part of the application form, or require CAPES consultants to record that information during their visits. This will make it easier in the future to determine which methods of outreach are effective and which are not.
- Contact the head of each county's office of Historical and Cultural Affairs (if this is not already being done.)
- Put codes on CAPES brochures as a way of finding out which outreach efforts and events are worth the effort.
- Register a separate web address and develop web page for the CAPES program.
- Four outreach activities are specifically named in the guidelines, which state that the coordinator "should" attend or send a representative. The four events are: History Issues Conference (March); NJLA Annual Conference (April); Archives and History Day, Monmouth County Library (October); and NJHC Annual History Conference (November). Monitor attendance, visits to the booth, and other responses carefully and revise and readjust, dropping some functions and adding others, as appropriate.

5. Consultant orientation and continuing training. The current guidelines state that consultants "may be asked to attend an orientation session."

- An orientation session, held annually, should be required of all new consultants, as should their review of sample reports chosen by coordinator for their excellence.
- An annual meeting of all consultants, both new and seasoned, could be scheduled on the same day as the orientation, and would provide an opportunity for a review of successes and problems, and a refresher course in report procedures.

- Explore the development of a review procedure for all new consultants' reports. If fairly administered, it may reduce the risk of hurt feelings and disgruntlement among consultants whose reports are not yet up to the desired standard.

6. Applications. Both the coordinator (in assigning consultants whose with relevant expertise) and consultants (during their survey) should pay close attention to what the applicants state is their reason for seeking the evaluation. Follow-ups with the site should address those points specifically.

7. Disasters.

- Providing advice to repositories struck by disasters is something that fits with the mission of CAPES. The Advisory Committee and NJHC should consider a protocol for rapid action that would get a consultant to a disaster-stricken applicant quickly.
- Providing hands-on assistance is another matter. While Caucus members may informally network and assist their colleagues during emergencies, a formal initiative by CAPES to provide and compensate disaster responders is not recommended.

8. Coordinators' stipend. At \$2,000 per year, coordinators are underpaid. The previous coordinator estimated that she spent 240 hours/year on CAPES business, which works out to \$8.33/hour. The following recommendation urges rigorous adherence to term limits, but at the current rate of compensation, it may be hard to recruit new coordinators every two or three years. The coordinator's stipend should be increased.

9. Coordinators' term.

- Make the coordinator's a single 3-year term; this way it would be staggered with the term of the Caucus chair, and they wouldn't both be new to their responsibilities at the same time. This would improve continuity and make transitions smoother.
- Hold firmly to term limits, whatever they may be.

10. Database. Complete the database, but for reports of a certain vintage (to be determined) consider omitting some fields of questionable usefulness, such as month assigned and month completed. Going forward, enter full information for each site. If done routinely, this will take little time. Having this data will make it easier to act on the suggestion that was offered at the Fall 2007 MARAC meeting in Williamsburg, that CAPES data – and particularly success stories – be sorted geographically, and legislators be apprised of CAPES surveys in their districts – and especially that they be apprised of successful outcomes – as part of consciousness-raising and budget-support efforts. This would also allow for easier studies of the geographic distribution of sites, and the distribution of assignments to consultants.

11. Consultant recruiting. Continue to recruit consultants, judiciously. This requires an on-going balancing act between the number of consultants and the number of applicants for evaluations. Having too many consultants and not enough sites to send them to would be a waste of the coordinator's time and energy and will result in disappointed would-be consultants. Having too few consultants will make it difficult to adhere to the stipulation in the guidelines that consultants be assigned to no more than four sites a year. It will also heighten the risk of "group exhaustion", which one of the NJHC interviewees warned was a danger.

12. Explore idea of a speakers bureau.

- With the NJHC, attempt to determine what the level of interest might be.
- Canvas CAPES consultants and Caucus members to gauge the level of interest in being a speaker.
- If level of interest is high, many details will need to be worked out, including:
 - Speaker topics
 - Speaker requirements
 - Speaker compensation
 - Logistical issues (How will an organization request a speaker? How will speakers be assigned?)
 - Quality control and review procedures.
 - Means of promotion

Appendix A
Interviews Conducted: Sites

| Applicant | Applicant Town | Year Completed | Result |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Allaire Village, Inc. | Allaire | 2003 | Respondent reported that staff who were involved are gone but he'd see if he could find someone else to respond. No one did. |
| Barneгат Historical Society | | 2001 | Interviewed by phone. |
| Buena Historical Society | Buena | 2006 | Interviewed by phone. |
| Centenary College Library, Taylor Learning Center | Hackettstown | 2002 | Interviewed by phone. |
| Felician College Archives | Lodi | 2002 | Interviewed by phone. |
| First Reformed Church of New Brunswick | New Brunswick | 2005 | Interviewed by phone. |
| Jersey City Public Library | Jersey City | 2003 | Interviewed by phone. |
| Joint Free Library of the Chathams | Chatham | 2004 | Interviewed by phone. |
| Lambertville Historical Society | Lambertville | 2002 | Respondent reported that staff who were involved are gone but she would try to respond to emailed questions. She did not. |
| Middlesex County College Library | Edison | 2006 | Interviewed by phone. |
| Murray Grove Association | Lanoka Harbor | 2002 | Interviewed by phone. |
| New Jersey Naval Museum | Hackensack | 2001 | Interviewed by phone. |
| South River Historical and Preservation Society | South River | 2001 | Responded to questions via email. |
| United States Bicycling Hall of Fame | Somerville | 2001 | Interviewed by phone. |
| Wayne Historic House Museums | Wayne | 2004 | No response. |

Appendix B
Questions Asked: Sites

1. How did you find out about the CAPES program?
2. Did your organization follow up on the recommendations in the consultant's report (none, some, most, all)? If yes to any, which recommendations were acted on?
3. For any of the consultant's recommendations not followed, was there something the CAPES program could have helped with? A follow-up phone call? More specific info?
4. Did you find the consultant's visit and report helpful? If so, how?
5. Are there particular successes or achievements that were influenced by the consultant's recommendations?
6. Did you feel anything was lacking? Do you think there are other services that CAPES could provide?
7. Did you apply for further grants from NJHC or other agency, utilizing recommendations or information from the consultant's report? If yes, was the application successful? If yes, please briefly describe the project.

Appendix C

Interviews Conducted and Questions Asked: Others

Individuals interviewed:

Sara Cureton, New Jersey Historical Commission Grants Director, 2007- present
Lois Densky-Wolff, Coordinator, 1989-1994
Dan Linke, MARAC New Jersey Caucus Chair
Lisa Mangiafico, long-time consultant and current Advisory Committee member
Mary Murrin, long-time New Jersey Historical Commission Grants Director (retired)
Elsalyn Palmisano, Coordinator, 2005-2006
Gary Saretzky, long-time consultant and current Advisory Committee chair
Carla Zimmerman, Coordinator, 2007 - present

Questions:

1. Do you feel there are significant problems with the CAPES program?
2. Can you recall any notable successes of the program?
3. What is your opinion of the program's effectiveness?
4. Do you have any suggestions for improvement?
5. Is the outreach effort sufficient? (Or conversely: Given limited resources, is there too much outreach?)
6. Do you have other impressions or opinions you can share?