

Iowa Museum Association Plugged-In

Historical Resource Development Program Grants
January 17th, 2023

Jared McDonald

Museum Director, Madison County Historical Complex, Winterset

Angela Stanford

Assistant Museum Director, Madison County Historical Complex, Winterset

Independent Registrar, Collections Professional, Advanced Museum Services

What is HRDP?

HRDP is a grant program administered by the State Historical Society of Iowa. It provides funding for three categories of projects:

- Documentary

- Documents, photos, newspapers, other records
- Preservation/conservation, collection acquisition or development, interpretation, access, physical environment

What is HRDP?

- **Historic Preservation**

- Acquire/develop/preserve property on the National Register, equipment or surveys used for property, nominations to the Register, interpretation, training staff, hiring consultants
- Projects must comply with the Secretary of the Interior's standards, and must include a trained professional in a directly related discipline

What is HRDP?

- Museums

- Museum object collections
- Cataloging, collection acquisition, conservation, interpretation, exhibition, equipment/supplies/facilities related to collection preservation

How do we apply?

- **Who:** Nonprofits, Governments, Tribes, Individuals, Forprofits
- **What:** Up to \$50,000 with a required match. Match ratios vary.
- **When:** Applications due May 4, 2023 for projects taking place July 1, 2023 - November 30, 2025
- **Go to:** www.iowaculture.gov
- **Program used:** Slideroom

Sample application sections

HRDP Project Information

1. Project Title

Provide a brief project title. Titles should be concise and informative, rather than clever or creative.

2. Project Summary

Summarize the project for which you are requesting funds, including the primary use of requested funds, primary goals of the project and the desired impact that the project will have on the community and the State of Iowa. If the project is awarded a grant, this will be used for reports and press releases.

HRDP Project Scope of Work

This section will allow you to provide a step-by-step description of how the project will be carried out. The scope of work must clearly relate to the major work items provided in the budget as line items. Please identify each work item; provide an estimate of how much time each project element will take; and provide action steps needed to complete each work item.

1. Scope of Work

Identify each project element and timeline in the table below. Detailed explanations of the action steps needed to complete each project element will go in the text box below.

2. Action Steps

Please provide detailed action steps for each work item identified above. Label each action step with the appropriate work item. Identify what you will do, how it will be done, and how you will apply required professional standards.

Sample application sections

HRDP Project Description

1. Specifically identify the historical resource and state its significance.

Prepare a detailed description of the historical resource. Identify the historical resource(s). What is it? Explain why the resource has value to Iowa history and Iowans. Does it have international, national, statewide, or local significance? Does it relate to international, national, statewide, or local issues? What makes this resource unique?

2. Provide an overview of the activities you will complete.

What will you do and how will it be done? Which professional standards will be followed to complete this project? How will you apply the professional standards? How are these activities relevant to your mission? Identify project partners and their responsibilities.

3. How will the proposed activities assist the historical resource?

Explain why this project is needed. Is the resource threatened? How will this project help preserve, conserve, interpret, enhance or educate the public about this resource? Why is this the right thing to do? How will you measure if this project is successful?

4. How will the project impact the local community? Describe the public value of the proposed project to Iowans.

Explain why this project has public value. Does the project address a need in the community or a goal for your organization? What will be the impact on the local community and to the state of Iowa? How will you share the completed project or provide public access to the resulting project activity? Will the resource and project be shared beyond the project site, such as online? How will you sustain the project and public access in the future? Explain why the proposed project merits investment from the State.

Submitted – now what?

Once applications are submitted, they are reviewed by a panel of peers and scored based on a standardized rubric.

- Reviewers – minimum of 3, a mix of peers at the State level and members of the larger museum or records communities
- Observers – SHSI board member, SHSI director, SHSI grants administrator

What do reviewers look for?

- Clear descriptions of what needs to be done, why, and by whom
- Clear and accurate budget and timeframe
- Clearly defined community, state, and national impact
- Photos and other attachments that clearly illustrate the project and why it is needed
- Projects that meet professional standards, have a lasting impact on the institution, and are realistic and sustainable
- Applications that are well-written, thorough, and follow the guidelines posted on SHSHI's website

What do reviewers look for?

Significance

Resource/Project Significance

Exemplary - 3

Applicant clearly identifies the historical resource and presents a strong evidence-based argument why this historical resource has value to the people of Iowa. Applicant provides clear evidence to support their argument for historical significance. Reviewer has no questions about the significance of this historical resource.

Adequate - 2

Applicant identifies the historical resource and presents an adequate argument why this historical resource has value to the people of Iowa. Applicant provides some evidence to support their argument for historical significance. Reviewer has questions about the significance of this historical resource.

Needs Improvement

- 1
Applicant insufficiently identifies the historical resource and/or presents an inadequate argument or evidence to support the claim of historical significance.

Deficient/Missing - 0

Applicant fails to identify the historical resource and/or fails to present an argument or evidence to support the claim of historical significance.

Historical Significance

Exemplary - 3

Applicant clearly explains how the historical resource has national or international significance.

Adequate - 2

Applicant clearly explains how the historical resource has state or local significance.

Needs Improvement

- 1
Applicant insufficiently explains the historical resource's international, national, state, or local significance.

Deficient/Missing - 0

Applicant fails to identify the historical resource's level of significance.

What do reviewers look for?

Implementation

Project Overview

Exemplary - 3

Applicant clearly describes the proposed scope of work. Applicant references appropriate historic preservation standards and how they will be applied to this project. Reviewer has confidence that the project has been well-planned, will be done according to appropriate historic preservation standards, and will be successfully implemented.

Adequate - 2

Applicant describes the proposed scope of work, but leaves the reviewer with questions about some of the following: the project specifics, whether it is the right thing to do, how much planning has been done, or whether the applicant understands how to apply the appropriate historic preservation standards.

Needs Improvement - 1

Applicant provides insufficient information about the proposed scope of work. There is limited evidence of planning, and/or limited explanation about how historic preservation standards will be applied.

Deficient/Missing - 0

Applicant provides no explanation about what they will do or how it will be done, and/or the work proposed does not meet appropriate historic preservation standards. Reviewer does not have confidence that historic preservation standards will be followed, or that the project will be successfully implemented.

What do reviewers look for?

Implementation continued

Project Timeline

Exemplary - 3

The proposed consultant/contractor has demonstrated skills and experience. The timeline is appropriate and realistic for all proposed work elements. The reviewer has no question that the project will be completed in the grant contract time period.

Adequate - 2

Reviewer questions whether the proposed consultant/contractor is appropriate for the project. The timeline is appropriate for some proposed work elements, but reviewer questions if certain work elements can be completed in the proposed time frame.

Needs Improvement - 1

Applicant provides insufficient information about the consultant/contractor's qualifications. The timeline is not appropriate for most of the work elements or reviewer questions if the entire project can be completed in the grant contract period.

Deficient/Missing - 0

There is no information about the qualifications of proposed consultant/contractor. The timeline is either not provided, not appropriate for all of the work elements, or the reviewer does not believe the project can be completed in the grant contract period.

What do reviewers look for?

Implementation continued

Supporting Documents and Photos

Exemplary - 3

The relevant supporting material, such as photographs of the resource, drawings, mortar analysis, rehabilitation studies, or letters of support provided*, clearly help the reviewer understand the need for all work items in the proposed scope of work.

*Applicant does not need to provide all listed items, only those relevant to the project.

Adequate - 2

The applicant provides adequate supporting material to help the reviewer understand the need for most work items in the proposed scope of work.

Needs Improvement - 1

The applicant provides some helpful supporting material but the body of material is incomplete for the reviewer to understand the need for the proposed scope of work.

Deficient/Missing - 0

The supporting material provided is unclear and does not help the reviewer understand the need for the proposed scope of work, or the supporting material is not provided.

What do reviewers look for?

Community Impact

Importance to Local Community

Exemplary - 3

Applicant clearly identifies the local community or audience and makes an evidence-based argument for how this project will have an impact on the local community or audience. The applicant clearly describes how they will measure the project's impact.

Adequate - 2

Applicant adequately identifies the local community or audience and makes an evidence-based argument for how this project will have an impact on the local community or audience. The applicant adequately describes how they will measure the project's impact.

Needs Improvement - 1

Applicant insufficiently identifies the local community or audience and/or makes an unconvincing argument for how this project will impact the local community or audience. Reviewer has questions about the potential for impact or how the project's impact will be measured.

Deficient/Missing - 0

Applicant does not identify the local community or audience and does not make an argument for this project's impact. Alternatively, this project has no impact on the local community or audience.

What do reviewers look for?

Community Impact continued

Project Accessibility and Promotion

Exemplary - 3

The historical resource and relevant work products of this grant are or will be regularly accessible to the public. The applicant identifies a strong plan for how the resource and work products will be shared on site and across multiple platforms including web sites, and social and traditional media.

Adequate - 2

The historical resource and relevant work products are accessible to the public, but the reviewer has questions about the applicant's plan for facilitating access and communication. Alternatively, the applicant identifies a strong plan for facilitating access and communication, but public access to the historical resource will be on a limited basis.

Needs Improvement - 1

The historical resource and relevant work products are accessible to the public on a limited basis. The applicant describes a weak plan for facilitating access and communication.

Deficient/Missing - 0

The historical resource and relevant work products are not accessible to the public. The applicant does not identify a plan for how the resource will be shared on site or across multiple platforms including web sites, and social and traditional media.

What do reviewers look for?

Community Impact continued

Sustainability

Exemplary - 3

Applicant clearly explains how the resource and the benefits of the project will be sustained into the future. The applicant makes a compelling case that there is a critical need for the project.

Adequate - 2

Applicant adequately explains how the resource and the benefits of the project will be sustained into the future. The applicant makes an adequate case that there is a critical need for the project. The reviewer has some questions about either sustainability or critical need.

Needs Improvement - 1

Applicant provides a weak explanation for how the resource and the benefits of the project will be sustained into the future. The applicant makes a weak case that there is a critical need for the project.

Deficient/Missing - 0

Applicant does not explain how the resource and the benefits of the project will be sustained into the future. The applicant does not make a case that there is a critical need for the project.

What do reviewers look for?

Budget

Budget Clarity and Breadth of Matching Support

Exemplary - 3

Project budget and intended use of requested funds are clear. Applicant identifies match beyond staff salaries and in-kind match.

Adequate - 2

Project budget and intended use of funds are adequately explained, but the applicant does not identify potential sources of match or they only include staff salaries and in-kind match.

Needs Improvement - 1

Project budget or intended use of requested funds is unclear or applicant does not identify potential sources of match.

Deficient/Missing - 0

Project budget is incomplete or inaccurate, or does not meet HRDP grant program standards.

Budget Propriety

Exemplary - 3

Budget is appropriate for the type of work proposed and there is a clear connection between the scope of work and the budget items. Applicant provides strong evidence that budget numbers are reliable.

Adequate - 2

Budget is appropriate for most work items and budget is adequately itemized according to the scope of proposed work. Applicant provides adequate evidence that budget numbers are reliable for most work items.

Needs Improvement - 1

Budget is not appropriate for most work items and/or there is a weak connection between the scope of work and budget items. Applicant provides insufficient evidence that budget numbers are reliable for most or all of the work items.

Deficient/Missing - 0

Budget is not appropriate for work items and/or there is no connection between the scope of work and budget items.

Completing the grant project

Applicants are typically notified of decisions in mid-June.

If you are successful in receiving HRDP funding, half of the grant funds are sent at the beginning of the project. Matching funds can be acquired ahead of or throughout the course of the project.

At the conclusion of the project, the final report is submitted via Slideroom. Once reviewed and approved by SHSI, the final check for the second half of your grant award will be released to you.

Other steps to consider

- Consult with other area museums or those that may be located elsewhere but are similar in size or scope. No cost.
- Field Services –provides assistance to potential HRDP grant recipients and those who require guidance once the grant has been awarded. Through this program, you can have a consultant visit your community or project site to offer specific advice on your grant project. Administered by SHSI. Low cost.
- Collections Assessment for Preservation – a study of collections, buildings and related systems, and policies and procedures by professional assessors. After the assessment, you receive a report with prioritized recommendations for collections care. Administered by Foundation for Advancement in Conservation, with partners. Cost varies.

We're happy to help!

- Jared McDonald

jared@historyonthehill.com

515-462-2134

- Angela Stanford

angela@historyonthehill.com

515-462-2134

advancedmuseumservices@gmail.com

515-650-3054

- More information at:

<https://iowaculture.gov/about-us/about/grants/historical-resource-development-program>