

Baker, S., & Cantillion, Z. (2020). Safeguarding Australia's Community Heritage Sector: A Consideration of the Institutional Wellbeing of Volunteer-Managed Galleries, Libraries, Archives, Museums and Historical Societies. *Australian Historical Studies*, 51(1), 70–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1031461x.2019.1659836>

Australia's community heritage sector encompasses half of all of the heritage collections in the country, and the number of institutions keeps growing. Many of these institutions face threat of closure due to a lack of adequate space, funding, and knowledge of basic archival practices. A three-year Australian Research Council (ARC) study investigated four institutions that closed permanently or temporarily due to these common challenges. Governmental and large institutions have a major part to play in working with community heritage institutions in order to ensure sustainability. Creating grant money for these institutions to help with basic needs such as rent or equipment is a priority, as is training in basic archival principles and planning. An important collaborative method from the United States is a 2018 project from the UCLA Community Archives Lab called *Assessing the Affective Impact of Community Archives* toolkit. This study gave communities a kit of resources and education to plan, collect, analyze and make accessible their unique community knowledge. Guidance and support to be able to more efficiently and effectively preserve artifacts and tell an authentic story is the most effective method of collaboration. Community archives will have more freedom with their collections and an ability to plan for future challenges to sustainability.

Copeland, A. (2015). Public Library: A Place for the Digital Community Archive. *Preservation, Digital Technology & Culture*, 44(1), 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pdte-2015-0004>

Public libraries can be the ideal location for creating and preserving born digital and digital community archives as they already stand as a major epicenter in most communities. However, they already face financial and human resource challenges to provide current levels of service and public engagement. Larger institutions, in many cases, have solutions for preserving digital collections, so a model where community archives can participate in technological collaboration with these institutions can help these archives thrive. Indiana State Library and the Indiana Memory Collection uses a CONTENTdm platform for libraries in the state and offers an example of collaboration through shared technology. California Digital Library and the California Local Digital History Resources Project has a similar digital solution for California State Libraries. The New York Public Library’s “What’s on the Menu?” project uses crowdsourcing as a way to organize and make accessible archival artifacts. The importance of the digital solution for creating and preserving a community collection cannot be understated in a time where born digital content is being created quickly. Public libraries can consolidate what is community oriented and create their own shared histories while using human resources and interoperable technology from larger institutions.

Flinn, A. (2007). Community Histories, Community Archives: Some Opportunities and Challenges. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 28(2), 151–176.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00379810701611936>

The community archives movement is not new in the world of archives and recordkeeping but there is renewed interest from the professional community.

Community archives highlight a discussion of what makes a community and what is an archive. A community creates and defines itself, and that definition can come from qualities such as location, culture, religion, or any number of connective ideas or actions. An archive can be any type of collection such as oral histories, digital objects, and of course, physical objects from that community. Growth in awareness of community voices is partly due to technology allowing people to easily establish connections and reach a wider audience. It is a response from the professional community to recognize a larger, multi-dimensional society as representative of an equitable history. Post-custodial agreements allow professionals to collaborate and help with preservation and access while keeping the collection within the community itself. Some collaborative models have included shared space or shared professional resources. Regardless of the model, the challenges facing sustainable archives tend to be the financial challenge of holding and caring for a collection, and the human challenge of having committed people with the time or experience to organize and care for a collection. This perspective on the importance of community archives and the ways in which the professional archivist can collaborate with these communities is an important consideration for the sustainability of community archives. This article sets a framework for researching collaborative models of community archives and traditional archives as a way to remain sustainable over time.

Han, R. (2019). Building Companionship Between Community and Personal Archiving: Strengthening Personal Digital Archiving Support in Community-Based Mobile Digitization Projects. *Preservation, Digital Technology & Culture*, 48(1), 6–16.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/pdte-2018-0014>

Personal Digital Archives (PDA) have an effect on the growth of archival collections on a personal and community level. The definition of a PDA is daily recordkeeping with the intention of long-term preservation and the definition of a community archive is when members of a community define their own history and actively promote that story through recordkeeping. PDA's and community archives, linked as they are, have many of the same challenges including funding and human resource knowledge. Mobile digitization units and digitizing events have been successful in combating these challenges. Culture in Transit (CIT) was a digitizing project in Brooklyn, NY where the New York Public Library would work with smaller, local museums and historical societies to digitize materials for preservation. The Georgia HomePLACE Digikits service launched in Georgia in 2016 allowed digital kits to go to libraries, outreach events and personal residences while PROUD and PRAVDA by the University of Wisconsin are programs that help migrate digital artifacts from communities to avoid technological obsolescence. These projects are an example of a collaborative method to help sustain community archives. It allows community archives to not have to invest operating costs into digitization projects and preservation while allowing them to bridge the physical to digital divide. Staff to support and preserve the digital collection do not have to be full-time employees as the model allows the archive to use the staff and technology of the mobile digital units.

Ormand-Parker, L., & Sloggett, R. (2011). Local archives and community collecting in the digital age. *Archives & Museum Informatics*, 12(2), 191–212.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10502-011-9154-1>

Australian aboriginal communities have seen a growth in community archives in an attempt to repatriate and control community knowledge and artifacts. However, these communities face a variety of issues seen in most other community archives including the cost of technology and human resources, as well as the knowledge to adequately preserve physical and digital content in an archival manner. Collaborative agreements are highlighted that have been successful, and ideas for a future archival framework are presented. A technological collaborative called the Ara Irititja project has seen the creation of a software program in Filemaker Pro with cultural norms and description embedded in the design of the product. This solution combats technological sustainability challenges as well as protecting artifacts from inappropriate access and usage. This software is transitioning into a standalone database that other communities can use. An additional project called the Mulka Project is focused on training community members in aboriginal communities to use widely available software such as iTunes to capture content for preservation and description. These developments in response to the shared sustainability challenges are very important models for all community archives. Collaborating with other community archives or national institutions to create educational opportunities is a realistic way to combat the knowledge challenge to sustainability. Additionally, CMS systems or software solutions can be used to fit the exclusive needs of an archive similar to the Ara Irititja software in Australia. Collaboration with other community archives to create a custom system can be cost effective and efficient in building core preservation strategy and equitable and secure access.

Real, B., Wagner, T., & Bischoff, B. (2018). Defining Community Archives within Rural South

Carolina. In *Rural and small public libraries: challenges and opportunities* (pp. 155–180).
essay, Emerald. <https://doi.org/10.1108/s0065-283020170000043007>

A case-study of community archives in rural South Carolina consisted of open-ended qualitative interviews from eight different rural community archives their work and their challenges to sustainability. The major problems for these archives continue to be funding and staffing related. Funding issues stem from the difficulty in creating and preserving space for a particular collection. Digital solutions create the dilemma that online collections attract new but decrease the number of physical visits to the archive which is a main funding component. Staffing challenges relate to the lack of knowledge in applying for grants and funding to help sustain these archives. Solutions to these challenges have been to help build new dedicated spaces or share existing spaces with public or governmental buildings. Additionally, a new “professionalism” was created to modify traditional standards of archival practice that work for the needs of the particular archive. Description is not as robust and processing is quick, because displaying the unique artifact is what establishes the importance and popularity of the community archive. Finally, to preserve some artifacts digitally, rural and community archives use mobile transformation resources or pop-up digitization efforts. These rural archives have come up with some creative collaboration methods to raise funds, find locations to store collections, and to digitally preserve artifacts without technological overhead.

Additionally, they have created their own niche in the archival professions by creating their own archival standards as they perceive them. While they may not be traditional ideas of preservation, collaboration and outreach, they work effectively for the cause.

