


Indiana's Cultural Resources Management Plan

Revision for 2012 – 2019



**INDIANA DIVISION OF
HISTORIC PRESERVATION
AND ARCHAEOLOGY**

Presentation Overview

1. State Preservation Plan Background
2. Survey Development
3. Survey Structure
4. Promoting the Survey
5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation
6. Analysis of the Survey Data
7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

1. State Preservation Plan Background



Downtown Rockville Historic District, Parke County

1. State Preservation Plan Background

National Park Service requirements for States:

- Each State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) periodically must prepare a comprehensive and statewide historic preservation plan;
- The statewide plan will give direction to the use and expenditure of annual federal preservation grant funds (HPF).

1. State Preservation Plan Background

The National Park Service requires that State preservation plan documents must:

- Meet the circumstances of the State;
- Achieve broad-based public and professional involvement throughout the State;
- Take into consideration issues affecting the broad spectrum of historic and cultural resources within the State;

1. State Preservation Plan Background

The National Park Service requires that State preservation plan documents must:

- Consider analysis of resource data and user needs;
- Encourage consideration of preservation concerns within broader planning contexts at the Federal, State, and local levels;
- Be implemented by routine SHPO operations.

1. State Preservation Plan Background

The statewide preservation plan is intended to:

- Describe a vision for historic preservation in the State as a whole;
- Outline a future direction for the State Historic Preservation Office;


1. State Preservation Plan Background

The statewide preservation plan is intended to:

- Be used by the SHPO and others throughout the State as guidance for:
 - Effective decision-making on a general level;
 - Coordinating statewide preservation activities;
 - Communicating statewide preservation policy, goals, and values to the preservation constituency, decision-makers, and interested and affected parties across the State.

Indiana's Cultural Resources Management Plan


2. Survey Development



0 12.5 25 50 75 100 Kilometers

○ Paleolandian/Early Archaic component in database*

*NOTE: component with county-level provenience plotted in in central portion of county for purposes of analysis




Prehistoric and historic artifacts recovered by IUPU-Fort Wayne during an archaeological survey across a broad section of northern Indiana in 2006.

2. Survey Development

DHPA's public engagement efforts for the plan revision process in 2003:

- 1 statewide advisory committee meeting – to help establish the goals;
- 3 special interest group public input meetings – to help prioritize the goals;
- 5 regional public input meetings – to help prioritize the goals.

2. Survey Development



- Statewide Advisory Committee Meeting**
 - Indianapolis

- Special Interest Group Public Input Meeting**
 - BSU MSHP Program, Muncie
 - HLFi Affiliate Council, Indianapolis
 - Indiana Freedom Trails, Indianapolis

- Regional Public Input Meeting**
 - Evansville
 - Elkhart
 - Fort Wayne
 - Madison
 - Porter County

**2003 Plan Revision
Public Outreach Efforts**

2. Survey Development

Results of public outreach efforts in 2003:

- Difficult and time-consuming to arrange public meetings, coordinate logistics with local partners, publicize meetings regionally, etc.;
- Costly and time-consuming for DHPA staff to travel to far away evening meetings;
- Much of the public input gathered was unfocused and not comparable from one meeting to the next due to the small regional audiences that participated;

2. Survey Development

Results of public outreach efforts in 2003:

- Public participation at input meetings was very low overall:
 - Largest audience size was 29 people;
 - Smallest audience size was 4 people;
 - Average audience size was 16 people.

- Grand total of attendance at 9 public meetings was...
only 148 people.

2. Survey Development

TECHNOLOGY to the rescue in 2011!

On-line surveys are the new tool being used by SHPOs for statewide planning.



2. Survey Development

DHPA staff reviewed the on-line statewide surveys recently developed by the SHPOs in:

Alabama	Minnesota	North Dakota
Alaska	Nebraska	Pennsylvania
Florida	Nevada	South Dakota
Georgia	New Hampshire	Tennessee
Kentucky	New Jersey	Texas
Maine	New Mexico	Wisconsin

(These states were in the plan revision process during 2010/2011.)

2. Survey Development

DHPA staff carefully analyzed:

- The number of questions asked;
- Broad categories of questions that were common among multiple states;
- Questions that seemed to be especially effective;
- Survey formats that seemed to be especially effective.

2. Survey Development

DHPA staff identified several main challenges:

- Identify what we hope to learn, then develop the right questions to meet Indiana's planning needs;
- Maximize the information to be gathered by providing meaningful answer options;
- Maintain brevity so people won't be put off by the length of the survey.

3. Survey Structure



Fowler Theater, Benton County, and
Ceylon Covered Bridge, Adams County

3. Survey Structure

DHPA staff developed four main categories of questions for Indiana's on-line survey:

1. About the survey respondents:

- Where do they live?
- What is their connection to the preservation movement in Indiana?

3. Survey Structure

DHPA staff developed four main categories of questions for Indiana's on-line survey:

2. The statewide context for preservation:

- Why should we preserve cultural resources?
- What is the perceived level of support for preservation – both locally and statewide?
- Which resources are least appreciated and which are most threatened?
- What are the threats facing our cultural resources?
- What are priority issues to address in Indiana?

3. Survey Structure

DHPA staff developed four main categories of questions for Indiana's on-line survey:

3. The level of public awareness of various preservation activities:

- How much is the public aware of DHPA's efforts, initiatives, and programs?
- How much is the public aware of local level efforts, initiatives, and programs?

3. Survey Structure

DHPA staff developed four main categories of questions for Indiana's on-line survey:

4. Assessment of the current State Plan Goals:

- What forms of preservation assistance does the public need?
- How much progress has been made toward meeting the current plan goals?
- Are the current plan goals still relevant today?

4. Promoting the Survey



Hoosiers of all ages visited the DHPA's *Hoosier Heritage Day* booth and State Plan exhibit at the 2011 Indiana State Fair.

4. Promoting the Survey

DHPA Staff selected a 5-month survey period –

from

“Indiana Preservation Month”

through

“Indiana Archaeology Month”

(May through September, 2011)

4. Promoting the Survey

In the planning process, the National Park Service requires States to seek broad-based input from:

- The general public – not just the usual preservation and archaeology constituents;
- Private organizations;
- Professional organizations;
- Planning interests.

4. Promoting the Survey

The DHPA's survey promotion efforts consisted of:

- Press releases and interviews with news media;
- Presentations and face-to-face contacts;
- E-mails to selected groups, organizations, and individuals;
- E-newsletters and E-blasts;
- Managed listservs;
- Social media.

4. Promoting the Survey

State Government – Internal:

- DNR Central Office staff in Indianapolis;
- DNR Properties and field staff;
- DNR State Park Inns, interpreters, and field staff;
- Indiana State Museum and Historic Sites staff;
- Indiana Historic Collaborative (a workgroup of heritage-related State agencies);
- “The Torch” E-newsletter to all State employees.

4. Promoting the Survey

State Government – External:

- DHPA's "Archaeology" E-newsletter;
- DHPA's "Eavesdropping" E-newsletter;
- DNR's "MyDNR" E-newsletter;
- DNR press release to news media statewide;
- DNR's Facebook page.

4. Promoting the Survey

DHPA-managed listservs:

- Archaeology listserv;
- Cemetery listserv;
- Jewish Heritage listserv;
- Underground Railroad listserv.

4. Promoting the Survey

DHPA's contact groups:

- DHPA Staff e-mail contacts;
- Certified Local Government (federally recognized) historic preservation commissions in 18 communities;
- Organizations that were recipients of HPF grants from the DHPA in the last 5 years;
- Attendees of the DHPA's 2011 Preserving Historic Places Conference.

4. Promoting the Survey

Heritage-related E-newsletters:

- “Communiqué On-Line” (Indiana Historical Society);
- “GENI” (geography and social studies educators);
- “H-Net” (history professionals);
- “Wednesday Word” (local librarians).

4. Promoting the Survey

Statewide professional organizations:

- Indiana Chapter, American Institute of Architects (AIA);
- Indiana Chapter, American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP);
- Indiana Chapter, American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA);
- Ohio Valley Chapter, Association for Preservation Technology (APT).

4. Promoting the Survey

Statewide local government organizations:

- Association of Indiana Counties;
- Indiana Association of Cities and Towns;
- Indiana Township Association.

4. Promoting the Survey

Preservation and archaeology partners:

- Avocational archaeology groups;
- County and local historical societies and museums;
- County historians;
- Indiana Landmarks and its Affiliate Council members;
- Indiana Main Street communities;
- Local preservation organizations;
- University programs in preservation, archaeology, public history, landscape architecture, etc.

4. Promoting the Survey

Planning interests:

- Indiana Association of City Engineers;
- Indiana Association of County Highway Engineers;
- Indiana Division, Federal Highway Administration;
- Local Technical Assistance Program (LTAP) Staff at Purdue University;
- Regional and Metropolitan Planning Commissions.

4. Promoting the Survey

Indianapolis neighborhoods:

- Irvington Neighborhood Association;
- Near East Side Community Organization (NESCO);
- Woodruff Place Homeowners Association.

4. Promoting the Survey

Several examples of spin-off survey promotions that were not initiated directly by the DHPA:

- Fountain County Government website;
- Historic Indianapolis website / blogspot;
- Indiana Association of Soil Conservation Districts website;
- Midwest Archaeology Conference website;
- Urban Times weekly newspaper for downtown Indianapolis.

4. Promoting the Survey

DHPA Staff presentations, appearances, and face-to-face contacts at public events:

- DHPA Staff announced and discussed the on-line survey at more than 30 different public events throughout the state (April – September);
- These events were located in the following counties: Clark, Decatur, Dubois, Floyd, Hamilton, Hendricks, Jackson, Jennings, Lawrence, Madison, Marion, Montgomery, Steuben, and Warrick;

4. Promoting the Survey

DHPA Staff presentations, appearances, and face-to-face contacts at public events:


- Half-page handouts directed people to DHPA's website to take the survey;
- Hard copy surveys were made available for people without Internet access – more than 70 were filled out and returned to the DHPA.

4. Promoting the Survey

Public events included:

- Archaeology presentations and programs;
- Cemetery preservation workshops;
- DNR's Hoosier Outdoor Experience;
- Historical society and genealogical society meetings;
- Indiana State Fair – 4 different events and days;
- Historic preservation commission training event;
- Preserving Historic Places statewide conference;
- Others – DAR, Girl Scouts, Master Naturalists, etc.

5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation



(L to R) Muncie Carnegie Library, Delaware County; Brookville Cemetery, Franklin County; and W. H. York Round Barn, Parke County.

5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation

Survey Monkey program allows the survey host to peek at the data at any time.


DHPA Staff had no background on which to base expectations about the level of public participation that could be achieved with an on-line survey.

Nevertheless, the DHPA Staff set some preliminary goals for levels of public participation.


5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation

DHPA's goals for public participation:


Goal #1 – every county represented



Goal #2 – more than 5 in every county




Goal #3 – more than 10 in every county




5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation

Survey responses on 7-22-11:



From Indiana	283
Outside Indiana	6
Not Answered	4
Total	293

91-county average = 2



5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation

Half-way through the 5-month survey period, fewer than 300 people had taken the survey.

DHPA Staff realized that the initial efforts to promote the on-line survey were less effective than expected.

Plans were developed to build momentum behind the survey and especially to boost participation levels in under-represented counties.

5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation

Target efforts in the 38 “0-response” counties:

- County historians;
- Local historical societies;
- Local museums;
- Local preservation organizations.

Statewide efforts by DHPA Staff:

- Sent messages to contacts in e-mail address books.

5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation

Target efforts in low-response counties:

- Handled one county at a time;
- Internet search – attempted to find e-mails addresses for 10-20 people in each county;
- Blind-copied all recipients;
- Indicated how many responses received statewide;
- Indicated how few received from their county;
- Strongly encouraged them to forward the survey link to others in their county.


5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation

Target efforts in low-response counties:

- County commissioners, mayors, and clerk-treasurers;
- City planners and other local government staff;
- Historical society organizations and museums;
- Local grassroots preservation groups;
- County historians and genealogy coordinators;
- Economic development corporation staff;
- Community foundation staff;
- Library directors and staff.


5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation

Survey responses on 8-12-11:




From Indiana	1,216
Outside Indiana	23
Not Answered	13
Total	1,252

91-county average = 11




5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation

Survey responses on 8-30-11:




From Indiana	1,591
Outside Indiana	52
Not Answered	16
Total	1,659

91-county average = 14




5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation

Survey responses on 9-30-11:




From Indiana	3,015
Outside Indiana	75
Not Answered	31
Total	3,121

91-county average = 29




5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation

FINAL survey responses on 10-17-11:



From Indiana	3,696
Outside Indiana	75
Not Answered	42
Total	3,813

91-county average = 36



5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation

Summary of efforts to boost participation:

55 counties targeted

(43 counties targeted once)

(12 counties targeted twice)


14 counties containing CLG commissions

(1 CLG county also targeted once)


68 different counties = 74% of the state

5. Efforts to Boost Survey Participation

Counties targeted to increase survey participation:



6. Analysis of the Survey Data



Features of some of Indiana's magnificent county courthouses (L to R): Jasper County, Sullivan County, Pulaski County, and Fountain County.

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

PART 1: ABOUT THE SURVEY RESPONDENTS

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

How many people took the on-line survey?

3,696 Indicated a county of residence

42 Declined to indicate a county of residence

75 Live outside Indiana

3,813 Total survey responses

Average number of responses for 91* counties = **36**

(*excludes Marion County containing Indianapolis)

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Where do respondents live? Top 10 counties:

430	<u>Marion County</u>	11.4%
184	<u>Kosciusko County</u>	4.9%
143	<u>Washington County</u>	3.8%
107	<u>White County</u>	2.8%
102	<u>Jackson County</u>	2.7%
89	Hamilton County	2.4%
85	Starke County	2.3%
80	Vigo County	2.1%
73	Tippecanoe County	1.9%
70	Fayette County	1.9%

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Who took the survey? Top 10 of 22 categories:


22.4%	<u>Citizen interested in Indiana's heritage</u>
15.6%	<u>Government employee (federal, state, or local)</u>
8.2%	Not-for-profit organization, member or staff
6.8%	Local historical society, member or staff
6.4%	Library, museum, arts organization, member or staff
5.6%	Educator (at any level)
5.4%	Other
4.1%	Owner of a historic property
4.0%	Elected official (federal, state, or local)
3.7%	History enthusiast / heritage tourist

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

PART 2: THE STATEWIDE CONTEXT FOR PRESERVATION


6. Analysis of the Survey Data

My community or county appreciates its own cultural resources and historic preservation and archaeology activities:



6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Hoosiers throughout the state appreciate Indiana's cultural resources and historic preservation and archaeology activities:



6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Why is it important to you to preserve Indiana's heritage?

Leaves a legacy for future generations to learn from and enjoy

Retains community character

Creates educational opportunities for teaching about history and culture

Improves our understanding of the past

Makes for livable communities and improves quality of life

Demonstrates respect for our ancestors

Brings tourism dollars to communities

Creates opportunities for economic development

Reduces sprawl and saves farmland and open space

Has environmental benefits like conserving energy and saving space in landfills

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

In your community or county, which cultural resources do you believe are the most threatened?

Top 9 of 16:

Historic downtowns and commercial areas

Rural and historic landscapes

Cemeteries and burial grounds

Historic neighborhoods

Historic bridges (wood, stone, metal, and concrete)

Historic schools

Historic agricultural buildings and resources

Transportation-related resources (gas stations, motor courts, historic signage, etc.)

Historic theaters

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

What classes of resources do you think are the least appreciated in Hoosiers' knowledge and understanding of the past?

(Tie) Native American resources

(Tie) Community infrastructure (water towers, brick streets, bridges, etc.)

Landscapes and recreational resources

Mid-twentieth century resources

African-American resources

Women's resources

Religious resources

Resources linked to other cultural or ethnic groups

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

What do you believe are the most serious threats facing heritage resources right now?

Lack of funding, both public and private

Lack of awareness / understanding of the value and fragility of heritage resources

Owner neglect and disinvestment

Apathy

Development pressure, tear-downs, and sprawl

Big box superstores driving out local businesses

Lack of or ineffective legislation to protect resources / lack of enforcement

Lack of awareness of laws protecting heritage resources

Looting and vandalism

Industrial and agricultural practices

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

What do you believe will be the most serious threats over the next 10 years?

Lack of funding, both public and private

Owner neglect and disinvestment

Lack of awareness / understanding of the value and fragility of heritage resources

Development pressure, tear-downs, and sprawl

Apathy

Big box superstores driving out local businesses

Lack of or ineffective legislation to protect resources / lack of enforcement

Lack of awareness of laws protecting heritage resources

Looting and vandalism

Industrial and agricultural practices

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

What issues should be the top priorities for the statewide preservation community to address over the next 10 years?

Education of the general public about the importance of preserving resources

Education of decision-makers / others who influence fate of the built environment...

Community / neighborhood revitalization planning and implementation

Direct investment to save endangered resources

Advocacy / lobbying for preservation legislation and funding

Info resources / non-financial support to assist local / private preservation activities

Creation of new local preservation groups to broaden the preservation movement

Legal actions to protect resources / expansion of legal protection for resources

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

What training, information, or education topics would be the most useful to you and your community in its preservation efforts? Top 8 of 12:

Financial incentives for preservation and archaeology

Energy efficiency and weatherization in historic buildings

Training for local preservation commissions

Training on laws protecting resources

Rehabilitation of historic masonry or woodwork

Stewardship of archaeological sites

Training for Qualified Professionals

Rehabilitation of historic windows

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

PART 3:

THE LEVEL OF PUBLIC AWARENESS OF VARIOUS PRESERVATION ACTIVITIES

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Prior to taking this survey, did you know that the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (the State Historic Preservation Office) has staff and programs to do the following?

Answer options:

Yes, I know that it does	=	Relatively certain / aware
I think maybe it does	=	Relatively certain / aware

No, I didn't know that	=	Uncertain / unaware
I don't know	=	Uncertain / unaware

6. Analysis of the Survey Data


Review federal projects for their effects on historic properties and archaeological resources:

Yes, I know that it does

I think maybe it does

No, I didn't know that

I don't know



44.5%

22.4%

20.1%

13.0%


Assist property owners with listing resources in the National Register of Historic Places and the State Register:

Yes, I know that it does

I think maybe it does

No, I didn't know that

I don't know



49.8%

24.1%

16.2%

9.9%

6. Analysis of the Survey Data


Provide competitive matching grants for certain local preservation and archaeology activities:

Yes, I know that it does

I think maybe it does

No, I didn't know that

I don't know



31.0%

25.3%

22.3%

21.4%


Conduct surveys to identify and document historic properties and archaeological sites:

Yes, I know that it does

I think maybe it does

No, I didn't know that

I don't know



40.3%

25.8%

19.2%

14.7%

6. Analysis of the Survey Data


Assist residents of owner-occupied historic homes with applications for rehabilitation tax credits:

Yes, I know that it does

I think maybe it does

No, I didn't know that

I don't know



25.7%

26.2%

24.6%

23.4%


Assist owners of income-producing historic properties with applications for rehabilitation tax credits:

Yes, I know that it does

I think maybe it does

No, I didn't know that

I don't know



23.3%

24.9%

25.3%

26.5%

6. Analysis of the Survey Data


Maintain a statewide electronic database of heritage resources (including archaeological sites and all types of historic buildings, structures, and other resources):

Yes, I know that it does

I think maybe it does

No, I didn't know that

I don't know



39.5%

28.0%

19.8%

12.7%


Maintain a registry of historic cemeteries in the state:

Yes, I know that it does

I think maybe it does

No, I didn't know that

I don't know



44.5%

27.2%

16.9%

11.3%

6. Analysis of the Survey Data


Provide educators with heritage-related materials and speakers:

Yes, I know that it does

I think maybe it does

No, I didn't know that

I don't know



34.7%

27.6%

19.8%

17.9%


Provide information to the public through a website and a bi-monthly e-newsletter:

Yes, I know that it does

I think maybe it does

No, I didn't know that

I don't know



28.6%

20.8%

26.2%

24.4%

6. Analysis of the Survey Data


Co-sponsor an annual statewide conference with educational content on preservation and archaeology topics:

Yes, I know that it does

I think maybe it does

No, I didn't know that

I don't know



25.0%

19.8%

27.5%

27.7%


Assist a state commission to make recommendations for preservation of historic courthouses:

Yes, I know that it does

I think maybe it does

No, I didn't know that

I don't know



24.4%

29.2%

24.7%

21.6%

6. Analysis of the Survey Data


Monitor all archaeological activity in the state and investigate disturbances of archaeological sites:

Yes, I know that it does

I think maybe it does

No, I didn't know that

I don't know



6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Are you aware if your community or county is served by any of the following?

Answer options:

Yes, I know that it is = Certain / highly aware

No, I know that it is not = Certain / highly aware

Yes, I think maybe it is = Uncertain / less aware

No, I don't think it is = Uncertain / less aware

I don't know = Don't know / unaware


6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Local or county historical society / museum:

Certain / highly aware

Uncertain / less aware

Don't know / unaware



76.9%

14.1%


9.0%

County historian:

Certain / highly aware

Uncertain / less aware

Don't know / unaware



43.0%

27.6%

29.4%


6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Avocational archaeology group:

Certain / highly aware

Uncertain / less aware

Don't know / unaware



13.2%

30.9%


55.9%

Cemetery preservation committee or commission:

Certain / highly aware

Uncertain / less aware

Don't know / unaware



22.0%

36.1%

41.9%


6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Local or county historic preservation commission:

Certain / highly aware

Uncertain / less aware

Don't know / unaware



42.9%

30.4%


26.6%

Local economic development / main street organization /
community development corporation:

Certain / highly aware

Uncertain / less aware

Don't know / unaware



59.9%

23.3%

16.9%


6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Local non-profit preservation organization:

Certain / highly aware

Uncertain / less aware

Don't know / unaware



40.5%

29.0%


30.5%

Regional non-profit preservation organization:

Certain / highly aware

Uncertain / less aware

Don't know / unaware



24.5%

29.2%

46.3%


6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Statewide preservation advocacy organization:

Certain / highly aware

Uncertain / less aware

Don't know / unaware



29.7%

26.8%

43.4%

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

PART 4:

ASSESSMENT OF THE CURRENT STATE PLAN GOALS

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Since 2005, do you believe that Indiana has made progress toward meeting each of the current five broad goals?

Answer options:

Made a great deal of progress (*but should continue current efforts*)

Made some progress (*but need to increase current efforts*)

Not much progress made (*need to significantly increase efforts*)

Very little or no progress made (*need to drastically increase efforts*)

Don't know / not sure

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Since 2005, has Indiana made progress toward current **Goal #1**?

“Increase public understanding and support for preservation and archaeology”


Made a great deal of progress

Made some progress

Not much progress made

Very little or no progress made

Don't know / not sure



6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Since 2005, has Indiana made progress toward current **Goal #2?**

***“Reverse the decline of main streets
and downtown commercial areas”***


Made a great deal of progress

Made some progress

Not much progress made

Very little or no progress made

Don't know / not sure



6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Since 2005, has Indiana made progress toward current **Goal #3**?

***“Strengthen preservation efforts
for non-traditional resource types”***


Made a great deal of progress

Made some progress

Not much progress made

Very little or no progress made

Don't know / not sure



6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Since 2005, has Indiana made progress toward current **Goal #4**?

“Increase DHPA interaction with other entities that have similar missions”


Made a great deal of progress

Made some progress

Not much progress made

Very little or no progress made

Don't know / not sure



6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Since 2005, has Indiana made progress toward current **Goal #5**?

***“Increase cultural and ethnic diversity
in the preservation movement”***


Made a great deal of progress

Made some progress

Not much progress made

Very little or no progress made

Don't know / not sure



6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Do you believe that each of these five broad goals is still relevant for the preservation community in Indiana?

Answer options:

Highly relevant (*definitely should retain this goal*)

Still relevant (*probably should retain this goal*)

Less relevant (*maybe revise or replace this goal*)

No longer relevant (*definitely should replace this goal*)

Don't know

6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Do you believe that **Goal #1** is still relevant?

“Increase public understanding and support for preservation and archaeology”


Highly relevant

Still relevant

Less relevant

No longer relevant

Don't know



6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Do you believe that **Goal #2** is still relevant?

***“Reverse the decline of main streets
and downtown commercial areas”***


Highly relevant

Still relevant

Less relevant

No longer relevant

Don't know



6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Do you believe that **Goal #3** is still relevant?

***“Strengthen preservation efforts
for non-traditional resource types”***


Highly relevant

Still relevant

Less relevant

No longer relevant

Don't know



6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Do you believe that **Goal #4** is still relevant?

“Increase DHPA interaction with other entities that have similar missions”


Highly relevant

Still relevant

Less relevant

No longer relevant

Don't know



6. Analysis of the Survey Data

Do you believe that **Goal #5** is still relevant?

***“Increase cultural and ethnic diversity
in the preservation movement”***


Highly relevant

Still relevant

Less relevant

No longer relevant

Don't know



Indiana's Cultural Resources Management Plan

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan



Successful preservation requires actively engaged citizens all across the state working to preserve our Hoosier heritage.

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

***“Preservation isn’t about old buildings,
it’s about people.***

***Preservation isn’t about the past,
it’s about the future.”***

Judy O’Bannon

Former First Lady and preservationist

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

Required parts of the Statewide Preservation Plan:

- A summary of how the Plan was developed and how the public participated;
- A summary assessment of the full range of historic and cultural resources found in the state, including discussion of threats, opportunities, and important issues;

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

Required parts of the Statewide Preservation Plan:

- Guidance for the management of the state's cultural resources – this section of the document is generally called “The Plan”;
- The timeframe of the planning cycle;
- Bibliography and references.

(Each state may choose to add to this list.)

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

Key point to remember: Who is the Plan for?

EVERYONE

(Not just the DHPA alone.)

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

The Plan structure – Goals:

- Major themes or very broad statements that address identified opportunities and general needs for preservation activity in the state;
- Incremental progress can be made towards achieving goals, but the goals themselves may never be accomplished totally.

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

The Plan structure – Objectives:

- Broadly focused statements that give structure to the Plan by organizing categorically more discrete ideas for achieving the goals;
- Each goal is supported by several objectives.

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

The Plan structure – Strategies:

- More narrowly focused statements or ideas for specific types of actions or activities that will make incremental progress towards meeting the goals;
- Must be worded just broadly enough to allow for many different activities that can be achieved by many different partners.

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

The path forward today:

1. Advisory Committee considers the relevance of each current goal, provides observations and perspectives;
2. Advisory Committee gives recommendations to retain, revise, discard, or replace each goal;
3. Advisory Committee suggests ideas, purpose, and wording for revised or new goals (if any).

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

The path forward after today:

- DHPA Staff considers Advisory Committee recommendations for goals and develops final draft of goal statements;
- DHPA Staff considers public input from the survey to develop appropriate objectives and strategies;
- DHPA Staff develops all required Plan parts;

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

The path forward after today:

- DHPA Staff sends final draft of the Statewide Preservation Plan to the Advisory Committee for review (April);
- DHPA Staff presents survey findings and draft of the Statewide Preservation Plan at the 2012 Preserving Historic Places Conference in Whiting (April);

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

The path forward after today:

- DHPA Staff finalizes the document and sends it to the National Park Service for review and approval (summer);
- DHPA Staff prepares publication version of the document (summer / fall);
- DHPA Staff works with partners at all levels to distribute, disseminate, and publicize the plan.

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

Committee Discussion of Current Goals

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

Consideration and discussion of current **Goal #1**:

“Increase public understanding and support for historic preservation and archaeology.”

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

“Increase public understanding and support for historic preservation and archaeology.”


Made a great deal of progress

Made some progress

Not much progress made

Very little or no progress made

Don't know / not sure




Highly relevant

Still relevant

Less relevant

No longer relevant

Don't know



7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

Consideration and discussion of current **Goal #2:**

***“Reverse the decline of main streets
and downtown commercial areas.”***

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

“Reverse the decline of main streets and downtown commercial areas.”


Made a great deal of progress

Made some progress

Not much progress made

Very little or no progress made

Don't know / not sure




Highly relevant

Still relevant

Less relevant

No longer relevant

Don't know



7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

Consideration and discussion of current **Goal #3**:

***“Strengthen preservation efforts for
non-traditional resource types.”***

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

“Strengthen preservation efforts for non-traditional resource types.”


Made a great deal of progress

Made some progress

Not much progress made

Very little or no progress made

Don't know / not sure




Highly relevant

Still relevant

Less relevant

No longer relevant

Don't know



7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

Consideration and discussion of current **Goal #4**:

“Increase DHPA interaction with other entities that have similar missions.”

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

“Increase DHPA interaction with other entities that have similar missions.”


Made a great deal of progress

Made some progress

Not much progress made

Very little or no progress made

Don't know / not sure




Highly relevant

Still relevant

Less relevant

No longer relevant

Don't know



7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

Consideration and discussion of current **Goal #5**:

***“Increase cultural and ethnic diversity
in the preservation movement.”***

7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

“Increase cultural and ethnic diversity in the preservation movement.”


Made a great deal of progress

Made some progress

Not much progress made

Very little or no progress made

Don't know / not sure




Highly relevant

Still relevant

Less relevant

No longer relevant

Don't know



7. Revising the Statewide Preservation Plan

Thank you for your valuable time,
insights, and guidance!

