Slide 1

Hello everyone and welcome to the Applicant Information Webinar for the third call of Recordings at Risk. My name is Pedro Gonzalez-Fernandez and I am the program associate for Recordings at Risk. I'm joined by my colleagues at CLIR: Amy Lucko, Director of Program Administration, and Christa Williford, Director of Research and Assessment.

The purpose of this webinar is to help you all become familiar with the program and all aspects of the application process. We're going to go in-depth with the individual sections of the application, provide some helpful tips, and point to other useful resources when possible. But before we dive into the application, we will provide a brief introduction to CLIR as an organization, as well as the development of Recordings at Risk.

Slide 2

CLIR is a private, nonprofit organization. Our mission--broadly speaking--is to enhance research, teaching, and learning environments through strategic collaborations with libraries, cultural institutions, and communities of higher learning.

Although we're talking about a funding opportunity today, and although many of you may already be familiar with our long-standing Hidden Collections programs, CLIR is not actually a funding agency. We are a private, sponsor-funded research organization that engages in activities related to research, teaching and learning. You may be familiar with our publication series, which is available free on our website at CLIR.org.

We are small, with only 16 employees. Most of our work happens collaboratively with other institutions, agencies, and groups. A few of our programs – such as this one – do provide funding, but this is not the only or even the primary thing we do, and so you may notice we operate somewhat differently from private foundations or government funding agencies.

Slide 3

For more than 20 years, CLIR has partnered with organizations to help raise awareness about the legal and practical threats to audio and audiovisual content. Two recent examples are our work with the National Recording Preservation Board which led to the creation of the *Library of Congress National Recording Preservation Plan* in 2012 and our *Cataloging* and *Digitizing Hidden Collections* programs.

Slide 4

There are a lot of unique challenges facing those performing audio/audiovisual digitization and description.
- Content is often inaccessible. If your organization lacks the proper playback equipment or if the materials are in such bad shape that they can't handle being played, how can you assess what you have?
- Another problem is that materials of significant value often fall under the

stewardship of archivists who lack specialized training regarding their description, storage, and maintenance needs.
- There can be prohibitive storage costs when it comes to creating preservation copies, production copies, access copies
- Another big one is unclear IP issues

Through the Recordings at Risk competition, CLIR hopes to help institutions tackle the current crisis in a/v preservation. It aims to help professionals in a variety of contexts identify institutional priorities for digital reformatting, build relationships with partners, raise awareness of best practices, and develop practical strategies for getting the job done. Furthermore, the lessons gleaned from each successfully funded project will, when openly shared, assist other institutions in their own related work.

Slide 5
You can think of Recordings at Risk as complementary to CLIR's larger Digitizing Hidden Collections program; we focus on smaller projects and are addressing a more specific need.

While on the topic of Digitizing Hidden Collections, I should note that if you have a collection that requires more funding than what is offered by Recordings at Risk, you could potentially apply to RaR for digitizing a small portion of the recordings, with the aim of establishing an efficient workflow and strong use case for a larger grant application to a program like DHC that would allow you to tackle the rest of the collection.

Slide 6
So let's talk about eligibility. First of all, you must be a U.S. nonprofit academic, research, or cultural memory organization. You and your collections must also be located within the United States or a related entity, such as Puerto Rico or American Samoa. Government units and their agencies are eligible, so long as their primary function is cultural heritage.

Federally recognized tribal governments are eligible. The application has a few items that are slightly modified for these types of organizations, such as the proof of nonprofit status--which would be replaced by documentation showing formal status as a Native American tribe. These modifications are all pointed out in the application guidelines.

Slide 7
Moving on, an eligible institution can only put one application forward per cycle. If an institution sends more than one through, CLIR will contact you and require you to settle on one.

In anticipation of a question that we get a lot: we treat each individual campus as its own distinct institution. This means that Campuses X, Y, and Z of the same University

are able to submit different applications during the same cycle, without worrying about CLIR requiring the University to select just one. The same goes for national libraries.

Slide 8
Allowable formats. Recordings at Risk does not have an official list of allowed and/or forbidden formats. So long as you can find a qualified external service provider (aka a vendor) that can perform technically competent and cost-effective digital reformatting services for whatever format, you are good to go.

It is important to note, however, that the program was designed with analog-to-digital reformatting projects in mind. While born digital a/v content is no less important and is surely at-risk, we are primarily focused on digitizing existing analog recordings and creating resources to help institutions tackle these types of holdings.

There are, of course, a few formats that blur the lines when it comes to analog/digital, such as digital audio tape. This particular format, for instance, is *very* eligible and *very* at-risk. So feel free to reach out to us with questions about the eligibility of a certain format.

Slide 9
Before we dive into the contents of the application, let's briefly go over how to start one! A link to our application system is on the Applicant Resources page of the website--just as the red circle shows.

Slide 10
Or you can simply type in the address here to be taken to the application! You will need to register before you can start the application. The registration option can be a little hard to find so I thought it best to point it out here…

Slide 11
Once you have created and verified your account, this is what you will see: your application dashboard. Here you can jump to different sections of the application, view your progress, add collaborators,

You'll notice that some of the tasks listed here have an icon that looks like a page. Those are tasks that require you to fill in fields with information, such as your project title, your requested amount, the description of the materials, and so on. Tasks that have an arrow icon are uploads, such as your budget detail (an excel file) or your recommendation letters and service provider proposals (PDFs).

As you complete individual sections of the application, green check marks will appear next to the tasks. If a section is only finished part way, you will see a half-filled green circle. Some people like to work directly in the application system, saving their work as they go along. But some people...

Slide 12
… Prefer to use this Google Doc that we have provided on the Applicant Resources page of our website. The doc itself is read-only, but you can easily create a copy that you can edit freely (there's a button on the doc that will generate a fresh one for you). Previous applicants have assigned different sections of the app to individual team members and found that it helped keep things organized--a solid strategy!

Of course, you'll need to eventually transfer your responses to the actual application in order to submit! Don't forget!

Slide 13
One last thing before we dive into the application.

You can access our complete guidelines from the Applicant Resources page (the image on the left shows you where to find them). They come up as a handy PDF that you can print out. These guidelines provide information on every question we ask, as well as context on why we ask. I highly suggest looking over this before composing your responses because this can help you formulate stronger and more direct answers.

Slide 14
Okay. Let's get a brief overview of this application. We have 9 sections.

Project Summary; Description of Content; Scholarly and Public Impact; Risk Assessment; Rights, Ethics, and Re-Use; Project Design; Service Provider Information; Funding; and Applicant Information.

Some of these will be fairly self-explanatory, so I'll move through them more quickly. During a webinar I can't give the level of detail seen in the Guidelines, so if you see anything there that isn't clear, feel free to bring it up during Q&A.

Slide 15
Project Summary. This is where you provide the Title, Summary, Size (between $10,000 and $50,000), Length of your project (between 3 - 12 months), an Institutional Letter of Support, and some other basic information.

The summary is a very brief description that touches on the nature of the recordings, major project activities, and why the project is significant. This quick writeup provides reviewers with a good at-a-glance summary, and it also will be used in publicity for the program if you are a recipient.

The letter of institutional support should come from a head administrator at your institution and basically, as our guidelines state, affirm the institution's dedication to the project, including a commitment to the long-term preservation and access of the digital files.

If you are looking at the Guidelines document, you may notice that a little "list" icon is next to all of the items we just discussed. This indicates that this information is to be added to the Hidden Collections Registry. This is an open discovery tool that highlights rare and unique collections, included those nominated for Recordings at Risk and Digitizing Hidden Collections (and ones contributed independent of our funding initiatives). Registry entries are short, just giving basic descriptive information to scholars and the public. To check out the registry yourself go to: registry.clir.org.

Slide 16
Description of Content - This section is where you provide an as-thorough-as-you-can-manage description of the source materials to be reformatted. We are looking for information related to their provenance, arrangement, current accessibility… We also accept URLs that point to descriptions that are available in catalogs and finding aids.

The Condition of the carriers, housing, and storage environment gets its own subsection here. If some of this information is covered in a service provider proposal, it's okay to refer the reviewer to that document and just use this space to write about things that aren't already explained.

Finally, this section requires you to break down the materials by quantity and type. The image at the bottom shows the initial dropdown menu that asks how many different formats are included in your project.

Slide 17
Once you make a selection, the system will generate X number of categories--as seen here.

Slide 18
The Material Type dropdown provides you with a list of common at-risk a/v formats. For example, you can see that I've selected VHS in category one. If your format is not listed, just select Other, as I've done in category two. This will cause the Other Format field to appear and you can specify the format here.

The Amount of Material field is related to the Unit of Measurement field. Amounts can be described in either **items** or recorded **hours**. I've got both types shown here. Pick whichever one makes the most sense for your project, but do not list the same materials in both items and recorded hours--count each recording only once.

The Additional Information box is there to provide extra detail, if available. This is a good spot of to point out brand types and such. Some off-brand format types are more at-risk than others, so this is data that we like to have when available. It's not a dealbreaker if this information isn't included, as sometimes it can be hard to figure out

what the brand is, etc.

Scholarly and Public Impact. This is a big one! Scholarly and public impact are the primary criteria upon which applications to this program are assessed. CLIR instructs reviewers to prioritize projects that include collections that are of high importance to a variety of disciplines and uses, and will have broad national/international impact. Consider how your project will:
- spark the interest of scholars from multiple academic areas, perhaps encouraging interdisciplinary research efforts;
- generate some form of counter-storytelling that will contribute to meaningful public discourse; and
- make a national or even international impact upon scholarship, policy, culture, or the lives of communities.

We've worked hard to get a review panel with members that represent as many relevant disciplines as possible. It's not just audio/video/film experts looking at your proposals; we have folks with backgrounds in anthropology, musicology, African American studies, gender studies, broadcast history, film history, and more.

On a similar note, these four images represent some of the projects that have been funded by RaR.

On the left we have University of California Santa Cruz's collection of avant-garde art music performances at the Cabrillo Festival of Contemporary Music. Next to that is the William Way LGBT Community Center which is digitizing cassettes related to LGBT history, politics, and culture from the 1950s to the 1980s. Then there is University of Alaska Fairbanks with a project involving the digitization of recordings from the first public radio station in Alaska, KUAC-FM. This includes interviews with Alaska Native leaders, discussions of Arctic policy and on global warming. Last up is the Museum of Flight's oral history digitization project which involves American fighter aces from WWI, WWII, and the Korean War.

You may have noticed that all four of these projects are audio only, but don't dismay if you are planning to submit a video or film project! These four projects all were taken from our pilot call, which only allowed audio projects. We encourage projects dealing with audio, video, and film, and do not have any "audio only" funding priorities.

Finally, this section is where you will provide one to three letters of support from experts familiar with the collection. Only one letter is required, more is better. Make sure that letters do not come from individuals directly connected to the project, and it is strongly recommended that you get support letters from experts outside your home institution and, when possible, outside the local region--this can help to demonstrate wider interest.

Risk Assessment. Here is where the urgency of the proposed project is explained. Competitive applications will demonstrate the institution's understanding of these risks, their strategic priorities for mitigating these risks, and how the proposed project advances those priorities. Note that if your materials are in good condition, you aren't necessarily going to be looked at unfavorably by reviewers. Sometimes good condition is a big reason **why** the recordings should be preserved ASAP.

Make sure to note things like storage conditions (previous and current), age, any conservation issues (such as soft binder syndrome on magnetic audio tape, or perhaps you are getting whiffs of the telltale smell of vinegar syndrome on nitrate/acetate film), and note how unique the materials are (value adds to risk!).

Rights, Ethics, and Re-Use. This section helps reviewers to assess an applicant's understanding of the legal and ethical issues affecting the provision of access to the nominated content, as well as the appropriateness of the chosen methods and policies for providing access given any legal and ethical considerations.

We do require you to dedicate all metadata to the public domain under a Creative Commons license and to avoid imposing additional access restrictions on the digitized material (than what is already in place). While this program does prioritize preservation over access, we do not want any unnecessary access restrictions attached. That said, your project is not necessarily going to suffer if access is limited. For instance, it is very typical for applicants to only offer on-site access to the digitized files.

Please take note that imposing reasonable limits upon access to digitized content *due to legal or ethical considerations*, including things like personally identifiable information or culturally-sensitive material, will not necessarily disadvantage you in the competition.

Project Design. There are a few different things required in this section, so I'll address them individually.
- Project plan with timeline: Make this as explicit as possible. Identify all the major activities taken during each phase of your project, including the parties responsible and the deliverables.
- Technical approach: This section is asking for information related to preservation reformatting specs, metadata schema, and so on during the project term. This is another instance in which referencing the service provider proposal or digital preservation plan may be appropriate if some of the information is already covered. But you'll want to describe how the digital files will be ingested and backed up, quality control work… Maybe your staff will take some time to create additional descriptive metadata, etc.
- Digital preservation plan: Here you will describe the processes and parties

responsible for preserving the files created during the project, and how preservation activities will be managed over time. Important tasks to cover include: the creation of multiple copies of files created through the project, scheduled fixity checks, periodic migration of data to new storage media, and any metadata creation that enables these activities.

- Finally, you will provide a list of all envisioned project deliverables and how they will be made available to users. You'll also list conditions and terms that limit their availability. Will users need to be on-site to access the materials? What is the outreach strategy you have for getting the attention of scholars and/or the public? Are you planning to connect these materials with existing collections online? Do you have future plans that involve the work done in this project?
- You'll be able to list names and URLs of any catalogs and repositories that will include the materials or metadata, if any.

Slide 23
I want to point out that Sample Proposals are available on our Applicant Resources page and they can serve as a very helpful tool--especially if you are lacking confidence in some of the more technical aspects, such as the Digital Preservation Plan or the Technical Approach. We are in the middle of getting sample proposals from our second call up--hopefully we'll have a few of them up at some point next week.

I also want to draw attention to the Digital Library Federation's **Digitizing Special Formats** wiki (it's in the Helpful Links box). This resource was initially created for applicants for CLIR's Hidden Collection grants; however, it has been recently updated to provide resources of particular use to Recordings at Risk applicants, especially those working to develop digital preservation plans with limited resources.

Slide 24
Service provider information. This section will include the name, address, and contact information for any service provider involved in the project. I'll note that you are totally allowed to use more than one service provider. Perhaps you need one provider who works on your U-Matic tapes while another handles your wax cylinder recordings. Perhaps one will be doing parallel transfers for the bulk of your items while another does one-to-one.

You also will be providing a Rationale for Service Provider Selection. Here you will demonstrate that you've done your due diligence and found a service provider who is performing technically competent and cost-effective digitization. Here you can definitely reference the service provider proposal(s), but make sure that you clearly explain your decision making process.

And here's an important bit… We technically only require one proposal, but you are strongly encouraged to seek out additional ones. The most we'd like to see is three (including the one that you have selected). This is very much in line with best practices,

as by comparing proposals from different service providers you will be able to compose a more informed application.

Of course, there may be some instances in which you want to submit a sole source justification, or perhaps you can only find two service providers that seem qualified to work with. These aren't dealbreaker situations! But you will need to make a strong case in the Rationale for Service Provider Selection. Help the reviewers understand that due diligence has been observed.

Slide 25
Continuing along with Service Provider Information, we do have a list of Allowable and Disallowed Costs linked to in the Applicant Resources section of our website.

Allowable costs within requests should be directly related to preservation reformatting of nominated materials and may include:

- costs charged by a service provider related to stabilizing media for the purposes of preservation reformatting (or some basic conservation work to ensure a decent capture), conducting preservation reformatting, or basic metadata creation (service providers should be creating technical metadata as they digitize);
- shipping of materials to the service provider; and
- insurance for materials during shipping and handling by the service provider.

As you can see on the slide, there are also some Allowable Costs listed for work done at your home institution. This is all pretty basic stuff so I won't go over it all, but if you will be using a bit of the award for this type of work you will need to make a case for its necessity in your budget narrative. You can definitely make a justification that refers to the limitations of current institutional capacity, but since the purpose of this program is to fund digital preservation reformatting, you are going to be less competitive if an excessive portion of your budget is going toward this kind of work.

Slide 26
Here are some of the Disallowed Costs. And these might not truly belong in the Service Providers section since they often deal with work done at your home institution, but… we might as well deal with them while we're on the topic!

I won't read them all here, but I can point out some of the ones that are particularly relevant:

Software licenses and services is unfortunately something that we can't cover. This can be tough for institutions when it comes to their digital preservation plan because they may be hoping to use RaR award money to cover a subscription for digital storage services. Since these services need to be re-upped regularly, it's not really appropriate to use a RaR grant to cover them.

Film-to-film transfer is unfortunately an expensive endeavor that also falls outside of our digital reformatting scope--so we can't cover that type of service.

Extensive conservation work beyond what is required to get a solid capture of the materials is not covered.

"Miscellaneous" costs are simply anything that is sort of vaguely referenced in your budget detail. I assume most of you are archivists, so you should know better than to use this word!

Of course, you can reach out to us with any questions you have regarding these items. If you have any immediate questions about ones that I didn't cover, feel free to bring them up in the Q&A.

Slide 27
I'd like to touch on two frequently asked questions regarding service providers...

How do you find out which service providers are the most "*qualified*" to partner with? The bad news is that there's no simple "trick" to obtaining this information instantaneously, but the good news is that there are many ways to find this information: reach out to colleagues for recommendations, check to see which service providers partnered with institutions on similar grant projects, check sponsorship lists of various conferences (I've put the logos for 3 relevant conferences here), or look to see if any representatives have participated in webinars/panels.

Some organizations, like the Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA) and the Association for Recorded Sound Collections (ARSC), will publish lists of digitization service providers who meet their standards. This is a very useful resource!

That said, you will need to do your homework when it comes down to assessing proposals. For instance, are the proposed deliverables up to snuff? (File formats, conversion specifications, technical metadata, etc.)

Unfortunately, we can't touch on all these aspects here, but again, the DLF's Digitizing Special Formats wiki has resources that can help you with this. For example, NYU Libraries' Preservation & Conservation Department has an RFP Guide and Template for video digitization projects. AV Preserve also has one for audio RFPs.

Next: what can you do to get the most accurate proposals possible from service providers? RaR calls are pretty quick, so proposals will more than likely be composed by service providers without physical examination of your collections. For this reason, you need to submit as much information as possible. Give them a complete inventory, give them photographs of the materials, their housing, and even the storage environment. If you are supplying photos of materials that you have packaged in boxes, make sure that you aren't simply taking a photo of the first layer in the box!

One last thing I'd like to mention regarding service providers. The Digital Library Federation hosted the Strategies for Audiovisual Digitization Projects webinar series in June and the first video, "Effective Outsourcing with Audiovisual Digitization Service Providers," is a resource that can be quite handy for any of you new to working with vendors. The link is included in our Helpful Links box (and it's in the Digitizing Special Formats wiki).

Slide 28
Funding. There are three budget documents that need to be uploaded here…
- Budget Narrative and Budget/Financial Report Form - Together they break down the budget and justify all costs.The Budget/Financial Report Form is provided by CLIR and you can find it on the Applicant Resources page.
- In the Narrative you will essentially be justifying the need for each budget line and the method used to compute the projected costs.
- The third budget document is the Service Provider Proposal. This is simply a PDF upload of the proposal that you have selected. In the application you will also have the option to include up to two additional proposals. As I've mentioned, you're encouraged to seek multiple proposals, so add them if you have them, and you can cite them in the Service Provider Rationale that we discussed in the previous section. I should note that there isn't really a maximum # of service provider proposals, as you can add more as appendices. But best practice really only asks for three.

Slide 29
I want to touch on only two parts of the Applicant Information section because it's very straightforward.

When providing proof of nonprofit status you have two options: provide your EIN number or submit a PDF of an IRS determination letter.

Slide 30
If you select the first option, a new task will appear on your dashboard. In it, you will type in the EIN, hit "Verify," and--after the system has verified the number--you are good to go!

Slide 31
If you selected the other option, a PDF upload will appear in the list of tasks on your dashboard. Simply attach the file and you're set.

Slide 32
Regarding the Board/Trustee List, colleges, universities, and tribal organizations don't need to provide one. So clicking "yes" will mark the upload task on your dashboard as "optional."

Clicking "no" means that you must upload a PDF copy of your Board/Trustee List.

Slide 33

Okay, there is one more thing to mention regarding the application: you can upload additional relevant appendices.

These include:
- Summary documentation of collection assessments
- Accession documentation
- Donor agreements: Very handy to reference when discussing rights issues.
- Photographs of the nominated materials: Very handy to reference when discussing how at-risk the materials are. Nothing sells the "at-risk-itude" of the carriers to a reviewer quite like seeing the ravages of soft binder syndrome and such.
- Audio/video samples relevant to the nominated materials: Depending on the context, these can give a boost to, say, your argument of the scholarly impact.
- Sample metadata records or even mock ups of how records will appear to users online: These can help illustrate the technical plan and how access will be provided to deliverables.
- As I mentioned earlier, extra service provider proposals.

Again, these *aren't required*, but they can be very helpful to the reviewers and might make all the difference when it comes down to making a tough call between two proposals, so consider what types of available supplementary information you may have available that would make sense to include.

Slide 34

The Cycle Timeline. Applications are due on February 9, 2018. Recipients will be announced by April 30, 2018.

You are able to begin your project immediately after the announcement is made--the earliest project start date being May 1, 2018. The latest that you can start a project is February 1, 2019. This is because projects can have a length between 3 - 12 months, but they need to fit within the year following the award announcement.

And just to reiterate we have one more call left after this one, though we are confident in Mellon's commitment to a/v digitization initiatives and expect to be around a bit longer.

That final call opens on May 1, 2018 and closes June 29, 2018. Awards are announced at the end of September.

Slide 35

Okay. So that about wraps up everything I have to say. Thank you all for being patient--I know that was a lot to get through!

Before we address questions from the chat, let me add that if you have any questions that come up in the future, please feel free to contact me at recordingsatrisk@clir.org. I am here to help you guys out, so don't hesitate to get in touch! ALSO, if you haven't already, make sure to follow us on Twitter: @CLIRRaR. I put up reminders for deadlines, upcoming calls, webinars, and all sorts of a/v preservation goodness.

Slide 36
For any of you thinking about submitting projects that deal with public broadcasting materials, make sure not to miss the American Archive of Public Broadcasting's upcoming webinar on workflows and requirements for contributing digitized content and/or metadata. Partnering with them can be a great way to strengthen your project.

Okay. So let's take a look at the questions we have…

Q&A

What if our institution makes us work in-house before outsourcing?
Recordings at Risk has been designed to meet the needs of institutions that don't have the capacity to handle their own audio and audiovisual digitization work. For those who can and prefer to do in-house digitization, Digitizing Hidden Collections will be the right CLIR program to meet their needs. You can still apply to Recordings at Risk for projects where outsourced digitization makes sense because it's more cost-effective or because you need the special expertise an external vendor can provide.

Should we present more than one service provider in the proposal for the same task?
Yes, you can include quotes or proposals from multiple service providers then explain you selection rationale. This will show reviewers that you have done due diligence in finding the right service provider for your specific needs.

This might be hard to say, but what kind of percentage of the grant going to non-digitization work (e.g., metadata creation) would make us less competitive?
There really isn't a hard-and-fast rule here since the time required to do non-digitization work will vary according to the circumstances of each project, but if you need more money to do metadata creation than you nee to do digitization, you might consider planning to share some of those costs so you can keep non-digitization costs at less than 50% of your request. Transcription costs can often be very large, but creative ways to control those costs and sharing them is much appreciated by our reviewers. In any case, make sure you specifically and strongly justify all costs--including non-digitization costs--in your budget narrative. And as always, write to recordingsatrisk@clir.org if you're confused and/or worried about this issue.

Is there information online about the next call?
Yes, go to https://www.clir.org/recordings-at-risk.

Could you repeat the dates for the next cycle?
The final call opens on May 1, 2018 and closes June 29, 2018. Awards are announced at the end of September.

Are there any subject areas that CLIR is discouraging applicants from considering for submission?
We're interested in all types of recorded information that is important to preserve for posterity. Though our funded projects so far have been largely focused on topics related to the humanities, we are in no way discouraging projects that, as an example, include scientific research data in a/v form.

Additionally, organizations like the National Library of Medicine would be classified as a "cultural memory organization," as they are dedicated to preserving and providing access to their records for research and the production of scholarship. The same would go for, say, an audiovisual collection put forth by the Neils Bohr Archives (part of the American Institute of Physics) that deals with the history of geophysics.

Does budget size of an organization matter?
It can be a factor in hor reviewers assess the reasonableness of a request or the ability of an organization to preserve content for the long-term (aka sustainability). The program is really designed for smaller, under-resourced institutions, so you shouldn't worry that your organization is "too small" to participate.

That said, partnerships with other institutions are a great way to strengthen an application and demonstrate institutional buy-in. In many cases, smaller organizations have teamed up with universities that can give them better digital preservation infrastructure.

Can you digitize a subset of a collection or only an entire collection?
You can do either. I've also seen institutions submit projects that include a/v materials from multiple archival collections in their holdings (aka the "grab bag"). This isn't disallowed and it can make quite a bit of sense to get more "bang for your buck" by, say, getting the recordings from several important collections tackled in one fell swoop; however, there really should be some intellectual coherence to the group of materials that you nominate, in order to help you make make a case for the scholarly and public impact of your project. It will be much harder to put forth an argument for a "grab bag" of materials that aren't necessarily related to one another.