

**COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS:
OPENING RELATIONAL AND DIALOGICAL SPACE IN ARTS
ORGANIZATIONS THROUGH COMMUNITY OUTREACH**

By

Elizabeth (Elsa) Lenz

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the

SCHOOL OF ART

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of**

**MASTER OF ARTS
WITH A MAJOR IN ART EDUCATION**

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2005

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

Elizabeth (Elsa) Lenz
SIGNED: _____

APPROVAL BY THESIS DIRECTOR

This thesis has been approved on the date shown below:

Elizabeth Garber

April 29, 2005

Dr. Elizabeth Garber
Professor of Art Education

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the efforts of my chair and advisor, Dr. Elizabeth Garber for her thoughtful questions, tireless listening, helpful editing, and general good nature. I would also like to acknowledge the useful suggestions, advice, and support of my committee members, Dr. Lynn Beudert and Dr. David Darts. Thank you to Katie May Sharrow for helping with mailings and listening through my thinking process. Thank you to my father, Gerald Lenz, and my brother, Ben Lenz, for comparing their experiences with my own and giving advice along the way. Thank you to my mother, Margaret Lockhart and my stepmother, Wanda Lenz, for being supportive and excited to hear the boring details. Thank you to my graduate colleagues and friends, Kristi HappelChristian, Peter HappelChristian, Todd Eklund, Seemi Raina, Heather Green, Aimee Allen, and Justine Pechuzal for comparing experiences and cheering me on while completing my thesis. And thank you to my tech support, Scott Kothe, for helping me through lost information, formatting, and all other technical problems and for listening when these inevitable problems arose.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	6
 CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
Opening the Door to Democratization	7
My Background	10
Main Questions and Sub-questions	12
Definitions	14
Hypotheses	16
Methodology	16
Limitations	18
Outline of Thesis Chapters	20
 CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	
Introduction	22
Museum History, Theory and Practice	23
The Foundations of the Art Museum	24
What Are the Concerns of the Museum of Today?	27
Serving the Public in Practice	30
Typologies of museums	30
Mission statements	32
Collecting and research	33
Exhibitions	34
Art Museum Education	35
Historical Trends	35
Current Theories in Art Museum Education	39
Art Theory	46
Art Education	49
Community Cultural Development	54
Artists' Communities: History and Practice	56
Summary	60
 CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS	
Introduction	61
Methodology	61
Website Review and Mission Statements	61
Survey	63
Case Study	66
Results	67
Website Review	67
Mission Statements	72
Survey	77
Case Study	83

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Conclusion	85
 CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
Introduction	87
Creating Space for Human Interaction in Arts Organizations	88
Defining Dialogical Space	88
Defining Relational Space	90
Where Are Relational and Dialogical Spaces in Arts Organizations Found?	
.....	93
Mission statements	94
Programs	98
Community Cultural Development in Arts Organizations.....	108
What is Community Cultural Development?	108
Where is Community Cultural Development Present in Arts Organizations?	
.....	109
Levels of Commitment to Serving Community Needs through Outreach	
.....	115
Reasons behind Dialogical and Relational Space and CCD in Arts Organizations	
.....	121
Designing Programs, Barriers to Programming, and Reasons for Success	
.....	126
What is Considered When Designing an Outreach Program?	126
Barriers to Outreach	128
Success Stories	132
Case Study of John Michael Kohler Arts Center	136
Recommendations	144
Implications for Further Study	146
Conclusion	147
APPENDIX A	149
APPENDIX B	171
APPENDIX C	173
REFERENCES	181

ABSTRACT

Arts organizations are moving toward a more open space through community outreach programs. This space allows for art-focused dialogue to occur that facilitates interaction between people. This dialogue then opens the door for new relationships to transpire. The move toward dialogical and relational space in arts organizations is based on demographic, economic, and ideological changes in arts fields that reflect a growing opportunity for democratization through the arts. This study utilizes a website and mission statement review, survey responses, and a case study to explore how arts organizations (including museums, arts centers, artists' communities, arts councils, and art and craft schools) are serving community needs by creating a relational and dialogical space within and outside of their walls.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Opening the Door to Democratization

Democratization through the arts seems, perhaps, like a lofty goal.

But one has only to look to practitioners and theorists in art museums, art education, studio art, artists' communities, and arts centers, to see that creating democratic change in society is not so removed from the possibilities of the arts. As with any lofty goal though, there exists a puzzle made up of the smaller pieces that help to achieve the goal. In this case, the puzzle of democratization is made up of programs, teachers, students, organizations, mission statements, art objects, learning styles, artists and the myriad elements that are coordinated to bring all of these pieces together. A move toward this goal has been made in arts organizations by the incorporation of relational and dialogical community outreach programs which serve community needs. This development marks a change in arts organizations away from object-centered programs to people-centered programs (Bourriaud, 2001; Gablik, 1991; Jeffers, 2003; Lacy, 1995; Mayer, 2005; Morrissey, 2002; Wilkerson, 2002) and reflects the foundational beliefs of community cultural development (Adams and Goldbard, 2002; Bastos, 1998; Sandell, 2002).

Several authors in arts fields have looked more closely at the possibilities of democratization through the arts. For these authors, the democratic process includes critically thinking about one's surroundings (Bastos, 1998), more broadly defining the arts (Bastos, 1998; Chalmers, 1987), creating dialogue (Jeffers, 2003; Trend, 1997), and developing participatory art practices (Adams and Goldbard, 2002; Bastos, 1998; Bourriaud, 1998/2002; Gablik, 1991; Lacy, 1995). Bastos' (1998) discussion of

community-based art education presents the idea that “An art education that is based on encompassing a variety of art frameworks challenges narrowly defined categorizations, inspiring participatory visions of art and society” (p.71). She continues hopefully, stating that “locally-produced art interpretation can inform participation in the local community and society at large, and perhaps fulfill Paolo Freire’s educational utopia of affecting social change” (p.71). Trend (1997) looks more closely at arts organizations’ possible participation in democratic society and even though he speaks in terms of music, his ideas are applicable to visual arts organizations. He states that “Crucial to the development of new political spaces for dialogue and debate are new institutional sites. ...these new postmodern hybrid organizations offer great promise for the development of democratic activism” (p.159). Finally, Adams and Goldbard (2002) explain that “by linking the personal and communal, community cultural development brings people into the civic arena with powerful tools for expression and communication, promoting democratic involvement in public life” (p. 18). Each of these authors, coming from various arts disciplines, sees the opportunity to create social change and the tools for democracy through the arts.

In community outreach programs, opening the door to democratic interactions and social change is occurring through the adoption of relational and dialogical outreach programs. Of course, the door to change has been opened widely in some institutions, while others have only cracked the door to see if they want to let democratization walk through the door. Despite these variations in response to change, the *opportunity* for democratization through programming developments is what is worth noting. Evidence

of this opportunity is again present in the literature (Atlas, Brunner, and deNobriga, 2004; Bolin and Blandy, 2004; Bourriaud, 1998/ 2002; Gablik, 1991; Garoian, 2001; Hicks, 1994; Jeffers, 2003; Lacy, 1995; Sandell, 2002).

Dialogue, participatory relationships, and the possible outcomes in communities and society are discussed in terms of arts organization programming. An alternative museum that is open to dialogue, relationships, and democratic engagement is proposed by Jeffers (2003). She asserts that there is space for this new museum model in the traditional museum, “provided that this is a dialogical space in which dynamic processes of making meaning and building relationships are facilitated in community” (p.116). Garoian (2001) also sees dialogue as essential to democratization of the art museum. In his theory of “performing the museum,” he posits a “pedagogy that re-positions viewers as critical participants [in] ...a critical dialogue ...between viewers and the museum” (p. 235). In artists’ communities, relationships to local communities are essential to the positive functioning of the artists’ community (Atlas, Brunner, and deNobriga, 2004). The authors affirm that “the very premise of community engagement is that it grows out of particular and often unique contexts and relationships” (p. 8). Through these processes, outcomes such as “enhanced community self-determination, and increased participation in decision-making processes and democratic structures” present themselves (Sandell, 2002, p. 7).

The opening of a relational and dialogical space in arts organizations through community outreach programming is discussed in-depth in this study. I draw from information gathered from literature and primary sources in art museums, arts centers,

arts councils, artists' communities, community art programs, community cultural development, art theory, and arts and crafts schools in order to develop the concept of the opportunity for democratization through art organizations' community outreach programs.

My Background

My interest in arts organizations began during my undergraduate studies. While the creation of objects and appreciation of the arts has always been part of my life, it wasn't until reaching Macalester College, in St. Paul, Minnesota that I realized how I could make a career out of work in the arts. In order to explore this world further, I took on a gallery position at the college, as well as an internship position with the Walker Arts Center and the Sheridan School for Arts, a public, arts-based K-8 school. I also had the opportunity to work with two textile artisan cooperatives in Bolivia, and began to understand the benefits that arts organizations of all sizes can have on communities surrounding them. In addition, I spent many hours volunteering with and participating in the exhibitions and performances of local arts organizations and theater companies.

After graduating, I moved to Santa Fe, New Mexico, to work as an intern for the Museum of International Folk Art. I worked with the textiles curator on planning an exhibit on children's clothing. I also worked with the education department in a variety of capacities. I realized that my interests were geared more towards education work in museums because of the opportunity to teach, plan programs, write curriculum, and work with a larger cross-section of the public. I felt that there was a greater possibility for connecting with the surrounding community as a museum educator.

Alongside the growth of my interest in museum work, I developed an interest in local level community development, especially through the arts. Viewing the artisan cooperative model in Bolivia helped me understand that there are significant changes that happen in people's lives through a cooperative's ability to facilitate relationships and create empowerment of traditionally marginalized groups as well as to create financial stability and cultural protection of artistic techniques. Through learning about other cooperative models, especially in agriculture, I developed a growing interest in bringing together the venue of the arts organization and the cooperative model as a means to serve a community. As many arts organizations are now making a distinct effort to broaden their public, the possibility for truly supporting and sustaining communities in the areas of education, culture, economics, and social relationships is growing (Ellis, 1995; Gaither, 1992; Sandell, 2002).

Personally and professionally, I am interested in developing the connections between arts education, outreach, and further providing for communities economically, culturally, intellectually, and creatively. Through either museum work or a residential arts center, gallery space, and education center, I would like to incorporate the worlds of museum exhibition and programming with fulfilling the needs of communities through artistic creation, jobs, and collaborations. In order to gain understanding about how to make that happen, I have developed this thesis project to gather information about how arts organizations are already serving communities and what areas of community need remain to be addressed.

While this research benefits me directly in gaining further insight into the field of community outreach through arts organizations, I also believe this research will benefit the fields of art museum, arts center, arts council, craft school, and artists' community outreach programming. On a practical level, ideas for outreach programming can be culled from this research. I hope that through sharing my research, those working in outreach programming will be able to gather information for change, including contacting other arts organizations for programming ideas and information. On a theoretical level, considerations about why changes are occurring and to what extent they are occurring can help organizations place themselves within these changes. Those working in arts organizations may be able to look to this research in order to compare their work to others or to consider the fundamental reasons behind what they are doing.

Main Questions and Sub-questions

The main question driving this study is, "Are arts organizations serving community needs through outreach? If so, how?" While information is available on trends in arts organization education (Mayer, 1998; Williams, 1996; Zeller, 1989), programming (Blandy and Congdon, 1988; Morrissey, 2002; Wilkerson, 2000), structure (Lavine, 1992; Weil, 1997), purpose (Ellis, 1995; Gaither, 1992), and theoretical development (Jeffers, 2003; Mayer, unpublished), literature is not available that offers an overview of how arts organizations are reaching out to communities. My research is intended to fill this gap. One of my intents is to develop an overview of community outreach programs utilized by arts organizations. This overview of arts organizations presents the types of programs that have been developed in community outreach, to what

extent these programs are available across the country, and who is being served through outreach programs.

There are several sub-questions to my main research question. The first sub-question is “What evidence is there of change in the arts organization community and how is that reflected in art organizations’ outreach and community programs?” While the literature presents various changes that need to occur, or that have occurred in arts organizations, I provide evidence about what changes are actually taking place and to what extent. Additionally, I look more closely in my research at possible reasons for these changes.

The second sub-question is “What elements are involved in developing community outreach programs and what are the barriers to that process?” In order to determine how to develop outreach programming, the fundamental elements included in current program planning by arts organizations are a useful resource. In addition, looking at barriers to outreach will help me and others in the field to understand what areas need to be addressed while in the planning stages of outreach programming.

The third sub-question is “What are the reasons behind a successful outreach program?” As a complement to the previous two questions, I feel it is important to offer information on programs that have been successful, and why. This information provides models for future programming that serves community needs. Information on successful programming is taken from the survey responses.

The fourth and fifth sub-questions include, “What collaborations are being formed between community groups and arts organizations?”, and “What benefits exist for

communities through the presence of arts organizations?” By understanding what types of groups are contacted for collaborative projects, I determine which community groups are actually being served through outreach, and which groups have been left out of outreach programming. The more subjective and elusive question of how arts organizations benefit their public is addressed, again, through survey responses.

Definitions

There are several terms that I use in this study that need to be defined for the purposes of my research. First, I draw on Brown’s (1992) definition of community as “an interacting population of various kinds of individuals in a common location” (p.3). I also draw on Kemper’s (2002) notion that community “shared interests and aspirations ...now frequently serve as a foundation for community” (p. 7). For example, a quilter’s guild, neighborhood association, local school, local museum, or arts advocacy group may be part of the arts organization’s community. Second, community includes groups of people connected to the organization across distance, such as a folk art group in New Mexico that connects with a similar group in New York through arts organizations. Therefore, community, for the purposes of my research, is defined by location and interest, with interests either being local or long distance pursuits.

Second, a “community need” is defined as a physical, social, intellectual, creative, or educational necessity or want that is not fulfilled through other organizations or personal groups. Examples of community needs include English language instruction, job opportunities, mentoring, skill training in the arts, or studio space to create artwork.

Third, “arts organization” refers to art museums, arts centers, arts councils, community art programs, arts and craft schools, and artists’ communities. There may be other arts programs that I am overlooking, but these are the types of organizations that are included in this study. These organizations exist across the nation, and therefore, this study, through the inclusion of a variety of organizations, reflects the types of arts outreach available in the United States.

Fourth, the two major concepts of this paper, dialogical and relational space, are defined in terms of my research. Dialogical space is one in which opportunity for discussion, debate, or dialogue is made possible. This dialogical interaction can take place between a person and an artwork, between a person and themselves, between two people, or between a group of people (McKay and Monteverde, 2003). Relational space is made possible through dialogical space. In this space, an opportunity for relationships is presented. These relationships are most often the result of dialogues that take place in dialogical space. Relational space is based on shared experience, which in the case of this study is most often an artmaking or arts based experience (Bourriaud, 1998/2002; Morrissey, 2002).

Finally, an “outreach program” refers to programs designed to extend the organizations’ reach to a larger community (as defined above). Outreach is not limited to activities that take place outside the organizational walls. Outreach simply refers to focused efforts to bring in groups of people to participate in an arts organization’s programming, whether on or off site.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are based on my experience within arts organizations as an intern, instructor, volunteer, visitor, and participant. In addition, I base these hypotheses on preliminary reading completed before beginning my research. I expect to find a higher level of community outreach taking place in arts centers, community arts programs, and artists' communities, because they are more dependent on local community for funding and program support. I expect that arts centers, community arts programs, and artists' communities have formed more and longer lasting collaborations with community groups than art museums. I expect to find that arts organizations are responding to social, cultural, and educational needs, but are not responding as strongly to the economic needs of a community. I also expect that few museums are attempting discussions of critical issues (such as HIV/AIDS, racism, or economic disparity) in their programs and exhibitions, but may be addressing those issues in outreach programs. Finally, I expect I will find that art organizations other than museums will look to communities to define programs and community needs while museums will define these things themselves.

Methodology

This study is based on information gathered from several sources. These sources include a literature review, public materials (website and publicity pamphlets) analysis, mission statement analysis, a survey, and a case study. First, to gain a theoretical overview of community outreach through the arts, I have conducted a literature review in several research areas. I reviewed materials in the areas of museum education practice,

museum history and theory, community cultural development, art education and art theory. These theoretical underpinnings are provided by administrators, arts organization staff, educational practitioners, and academics.

I included an overview of various materials provided for the public by arts organizations. First, I reviewed websites to gain an overview of programming and types of arts organizations in existence. Second, if a mission statement is publicly available for an organization, I reviewed that information. If a specific educational mission statement is available, that was added to my materials review. Finally, several survey respondents provided pamphlets about their programs, which I included as research materials.

Another source of information is a survey that I sent to one hundred professionals in arts organizations across the United States. The survey pool was identified through a web search for organizations that include outreach in their list of programming. It is important to note that I did not specifically look for the term “outreach,” but rather searched for programs that indicate the organization is implementing some form of programming that is specifically designed to extend the organizations’ reach to a larger community. Additionally, I utilized information from professional organizations (such as the Museum division of the NAEA) in order to locate organizations and individuals. The professionals to whom the survey was sent are integrally involved in outreach programming. Most often, the education director is the person I identified, but occasionally I located a staff member dealing specifically with outreach, or directed the survey to the director of the organization, especially if it is smaller in size. I made an effort to locate arts organizations dealing with all kinds of topics. For example, the arts

organizations involved in the study include areas such as folk art, contemporary art, traditional encyclopedic museums, local arts centers, and residential artists' retreats. At least one arts organization has been identified in each state in the U.S. in order to ensure the broad geographical view of community outreach.

Finally, I have highlighted one organization that I believe is particularly successful in serving community through a case study. The information I gathered about the John Michael Kohler Arts Center's community outreach programs includes an interview with the education director and a staff member, analysis of program pamphlets and the organizations' website, a review of the mission statement, response from a program participant (provided by the center), a DVD of a community dance performance, and site visits. While the Kohler Center model is not completely translatable for other arts organizations, I have included it to provide an idea of what kinds of programming can be offered in order to connect with community.

Limitations

This study is limited by geographic region, scope of study, my biases and expectations, survey responses, data analysis, and definitions of arts organizations. Geographically, I gathered information about arts organizations in the United States only. Though I researched an arts organization from each state, there are some regions that are researched in more depth because of the density of arts organizations in existence there. Some regions with higher representation are New York City, Los Angeles, the San Francisco area, and the Chicago area.

The scope of my study is almost entirely limited to community outreach programs in order to keep the study manageable and focused. I have made one exception to this in asking survey respondents to list what areas of programming, outreach, and exhibitions planning are used to address community needs. I feel that there may be valuable information about how in-house activities are taking place with the community in mind.

The limitations of my own expectations have been listed above in the hypotheses section. My study is limited as well by my bias that art museums are less community oriented than arts centers, artists' communities, or other community arts programs. This bias comes from observations of museums and arts centers, as well as work I have done within these types of organizations.

The survey responses that I have received are limiting to the overall view of arts organizations. To start, I received twenty-eight responses of the one hundred surveys sent. Within the twenty-eight responses, some information was not usable. This limits the amount of information I had to work with in this study. Each survey represents only one person's experience, knowledge, and attitude with the outreach programs they are discussing. The survey responses are limited by the variations in understanding of the questions posed. The open-ended responses in my surveys reflect only the perceptions and beliefs of the respondents themselves. These responses may be limited by the lack of inclusion of certain information about the programs in the response, or about programs that aren't mentioned. Finally, the survey information is restricted to the point of view of staff within the arts organizations. I have not included the viewpoint of participants in these programs in this study.

My data analysis methods have limited the comparison of data. The analysis techniques I have used when reviewing website data, mission statements, and the survey responses blend thematic analysis and tallying of programs. While I used these two methods for specific purposes in my study, it has proven to make cross-data comparisons difficult because my results and conclusions have been arrived at from different methods.

The definition I used in determining which arts organizations are included is broad. I contacted and researched various types of art museums, arts centers, specific community arts programs, craft schools, residential artist retreats, and arts council programs. While this variety of organizations may have complicated comparison in my study, I feel that to fully understand how community needs are addressed through the arts, a cross-section of the types of organizations that are addressing those needs ought to be included. Additionally, each arts organization itself is limited by the extent to which it involves community outreach as part of its programming and/ or mission.

Outline of Thesis Chapters

In chapter two, I address the literature I have reviewed for this study. Areas of literature that I include are: museum history, museum education theory and history, art theory, art education, artists' community history, and community cultural development history. In chapter three, I address the methodology and the results of the information I collected. My methodology includes a website review, mission statement review, examination of survey responses, and a case study. The results to my website review and survey responses are provided in a statistical format. The results to the mission statement review are presented thematically, and the case study is presented comprehensively. In

chapter four, I analyze my findings in relation to the literature. I look more closely at the evidence that I have collected indicating that arts organizations are serving community needs through outreach. Recommendations for outreach programming changes in arts organizations, as well as suggestions for continued study are included in this chapter.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

How are community needs served through arts organizations' outreach programs? This question, which guides this study, can only be fully addressed by looking at areas of literature to fill in the gaps of how, when, why, who, and what is creating the push towards serving communities through arts organizations. The subject areas I have looked towards for more information include museum theory and practice, museum education, art theory, art education, community cultural development theory, and artists' community practices.

Through looking at these various areas, several themes became evident. First, there is a general move in arts organizations towards serving public and community needs through the arts, whether that is making art, designing programs or exhibitions, creating new museums, or creating artists' residency programs. Second, historical trends in ideology and economy can be traced to localize the reasons *why* arts organizations have made community responsiveness a larger part of their mission and practice. Third, the move toward serving community needs follows trends that reflect a move away from modernity in arts organizations towards postmodernity. Fourth, the unique nature of focusing on object-centered learning, especially in museums, affords arts organizations unique opportunities to serve communal and personal needs within their walls. Finally, many of the theoretical and actual strategies employed by arts organizations reflect the creation of dialogical and relational spaces through which community needs are addressed.

Each subject area I have reviewed (museum theory and practice, museum education, art education, art theory, community cultural development theory, and artists' communities) is considered through an historical, theoretical, and practical lens. Through this comparison of purpose, practice, historical development, and pedagogy, I have been able to gather information on the general themes outlined in the previous paragraph.

Museum History, Theory and Practice

In reviewing current literature (from the past 20 years) in the museum field, it became clear that a new form of museum is emerging. This museum is responsive to public needs and it is sensitive to issues of pluralism in society. It has adjusted its organizational structure to reflect its reliance on public monies, it is part of new typologies of museums, and it incorporates strategies in all areas of its activities, such as collecting, research, exhibition, and education in order to reflect its public responsiveness. The new museum is not a product simply of the past twenty years, nor does it reflect elements that are completely novel in museum history. Instead, the new museum rises out of economic turns in the 1940s and '50s, social events of the 1960s and '70s, and ideological discussions of the 1990s (Weil, 1997). I will begin with a brief overview of the development of museum history, during which it is important to keep in mind Stephen Weil's words of caution that the "museum" does not exist as a "sharply defined reality" because using a generalization, while offering information on broad trends, does not allow for the subtleties and variations within the field (1997, p. 257). What I will describe is a general sense of the shifts in ideology, economy, and society that have led to the conversations prevalent in today's museum world. Also, it should be

noted that the historical trends listed are mostly limited to art museums, but in some cases the trends reflect the museum world at large.

The Foundations of the Art Museum

Terry Zeller traces the development of art museum education and thereby of art museums in his 1989 essay “The Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Art Museum Education in America.” The following is a synopsis of that essay, with interjections from Stephen Weil’s tracing of museum history from his 1997 article “The Museum and the Public:”

Art museums grew primarily out of the industrial and commercial expansion in the United States between 1870 and 1929. The missions of most art museums reflected their desire to preserve, collect, and exhibit objects, as well as to create educational opportunities for the public through the display of these objects. Museums were seen as a means to support industry and share beautiful objects with the general public thereby elevating moral conditions and taste. This model of the American art museum was based on the South Kensington Museum, rather than more prominent European museums, such as the Louvre. The South Kensington became the model because of its more populist approach to exhibition and education. As Terry Zeller (1989) states, “the history of art museum education [and art museums in general] in America might be viewed as the story of efforts of museums to make their collections accessible to the public” (p. 13).

The missions of most art museums were founded upon the idea of the museum as an educational tool, but that education was one defined by wealthier classes to be disseminated to the workingman and his family (mainly recent immigrant families).

Zeller (1989) states that “art museums were used as instruments for instilling ideas, habits, and attitudes the propertied classes valued, thereby promoting the cultural hegemony of the socially dominant classes” (p. 20). Weil (1997) views the beginnings of museums as a relationship between a superior museum and an inferior public, where “the museum was established to ‘do’. What was to be ‘done’ was the public” (p. 257).

Through visiting the art museum, visitors were able to learn to be better citizens, develop their aesthetic taste, develop their industrial skills through educational programs and exposure to examples of quality decorative arts, and generally improve their character in order to become model Americans. It is important to note here that despite these seemingly obvious overtones of upper class socialization, the foundations of the American art museum were grounded in democratic and egalitarian intentions. What today appears as a plan of social and political inculcation of values arose from a goal to serve perceived “needs” of the general public (Weil, 1997, p. 259).

There were three major philosophies employed in the missions of early art museums in the United States, as defined by Theodore Low, of which variations still exist in present-day art museums. The first philosophy is the aesthetic mission, characterized by its mission to preserve the best possible examples of artwork, to create people who could see quality artwork, and to exist as an institution of culture. Education was seen as a bi-product of the museum existence, whereby entrance in the hallowed halls would result in an educational experience. The second philosophy is that of the educational mission. The educational museum was a democratic museum that saw itself as “[a house] of systematically presented ideas” represented by objects (Zeller, 1989, p. 34).

This museum was created for the working person as much as the professional or wealthy person, and was seen as an important resource for the community. Educational tools, such as instructional guides and labels as well as locally relevant objects were seen as valued elements of the museum's workings. The final philosophy is that of the social mission. This mission championed the museum as a community-centered service where its value was determined by what it offered the public. It supported original thinking, genuine response and "critical intelligence" (Zeller, 1989, p. 40).

These three philosophies follow the social and economic change in the United States. The social mission was concurrent with the Great Depression, New Deal politics and World War II. As economics limited what was available to museums, it was pressing that they proved their importance to the public through social programs. Weil (1997) states that this general shift in economics led to a "revolution" in museum history (p. 261). As money became limited, the power structure of the museum shifted "a full 180 degrees" to a place where "the museum's role [was] transformed from one of mastery to one of service" (Weil, 1997, p. 257). The economic changes of the 1930s and 1940s began an ideological shift in museums.

While these foundations remain in place, they have developed over time in various and circuitous ways until the social upheaval of the 1960s and 1970s gave cause for another overhaul in museum ideology. Neal Harris (1992) describes this period of time as "an age of populist deference" in which both public demands, primarily dealing with societal pluralism, were paramount (quoted in Karp, p. 9). Lavine (1992) states that "every institution – cultural, educational, and governmental- that is seen to hold power

has been open to question... since the civil rights and war protest movements of the 1960s and 1970s” (p. 138). This includes museums, which from the ‘60s forward, were held at a greater accountability for their multicultural representation, or lack thereof. This inclusion of pluralist concerns as well as economic change into museum field discussions marks the jumping off point for the museum of today.

What Are the Concerns of the Museum of Today?

One feature of the contemporary museum stands out above all others. It is a museum that is fundamentally responsive to the public. This responsiveness is visible in various ways, and has developed from the historical trends mentioned above. Accountability to the public is highlighted in the literature in two main themes. First, demographic changes in the United States require that museums revamp their missions to reflect a more pluralist society. Second, the strong reliance upon public funding demands that museums respond to the public because of an economic obligation.

Demographic change in the American public has greatly affected the museum of today. Initiatives in the American Association of Museums (AAM) mark the importance of pluralism in museum conversations. *Excellence and Equity* (1992) is a report from AAM that was founded upon three major principles, the second being that “museums must achieve greater inclusiveness” not only in their programming, but also in the make-up of their staff, boards, and volunteer groups (p. 8). This directive follows on the heels of AAM’s 1984 publication *Museums for a New Century*, which states that a “major force of change we believe to have implications for museums is our society’s evolving sense of its own pluralism” (quoted in Gaither, 1992, p. 56). What is interesting is that

Museums for a New Century outlines expected forces of change, while *Excellence and Equity* reads nearly as a set of directives for museums to follow. Both of these publications express the growing sense of urgency to address the concerns of a pluralist society.

These concerns are also expressed in much of the literature written by practitioners in the museum field. Gaither (1992) states two implications of demographic change for the museum field: first that “museums must serve [an] ever-broader public in ever-bolder ways,” and second, that “museums must honor America’s diversity without paternalism and condescension” (p. 58). Rex Ellis (1995), of the Smithsonian Institution, minces no words when he states boldly that “we cannot afford another monument to a small cultural elite that is in no way reflective of the people and times in which they live” (p.16). Lavine (1992) also observes that demographic change in the United States means that museums will have growing “external pressures” to reflect all of the public, rather than a privileged few (p. 138). He also notes that as “canons that justified inclusion and exclusion are being exploded... an ever-greater self consciousness can be anticipated among museum practitioners” (1992, p. 138). Each of these authors clearly state what AAM has outlined as a primary focus for museums that demographic change in the public means ideological and structural change within the museum.

The museum of today is also being held accountable on economic terms. Weil (quoted in Ellis, 1995) clearly outlines the questions that museums are asking themselves in the following:

When the anticipated crunch in public and private funding materializes, worthiness alone may not justify the continued support of every museum or similar institution. The questions that each museum may have to answer are just these hardball ones: Are you really worth what you cost, or merely worthwhile? Could somebody else do as much or more than you do for less? Are you truly able to accomplish anything that makes a difference, or are you simply an old habit, or possibly even a kind of indulgence? (p. 14)

As the economic base for museums shifts more and more toward public funding, questions of cost-effectiveness come into view.

Questions of worth, purpose, and accountability are all discussed in current museum literature. Gaither (1992) “believe[s] there exists an implied contract between museums, as tax-exempt entities, and the public, which directly or indirectly supports them” (p. 58). Weil (1997) mentions that museums in 1995 received just under 30% of their funding from governmental sources. He goes on to observe that this high percentage of funding requires that museums serve not only their actual visitors, but also the “larger tax-paying public upon whose good will and at least tacit approval they have made themselves so dependent” (p. 261). Karp (1992) reminds the reader that economics are often the cause of change within museums. When the survival of the museum is perceived to be at risk, changes have developed. He states that “the means of change have been social; major redefinitions of the audience were undertaken, and museums increasingly asserted that they were essential components of the social order” (1992, p.

9). Therefore, museums' economic dependence on public funding results in focusing outward to serve public needs rather than inward on museum needs.

Serving the Public in Practice

How have museums evolved to address the concerns of accountability to the public? Change is evident in the literature throughout all areas of museum work; mission, collections, research, exhibition, education, and even in the types of museums that exist today. I will start by outlining museum typologies, some of which are fundamentally based on serving the public. I will then follow by outlining examples present in the literature of how each area of museum practice has been affected by accountability to the public.

Typologies of museums.

New types of museums have been developing as communities look for ways to fulfill their needs. Maggi (2000) outlines four museum typologies, the encyclopedia-museum, the company-based museum, the public-service museum, and the forum-museum. The encyclopedia museum is the modernist museum in which knowledge is fixed and transmitted to visitors; this is the type of museum that publicly responsive proponents are fighting against. Sherman Lee's conception of the museum fits the traditional encyclopedic museum model. He is quoted in Eisner and Dobbs (1988) as stating, "Merely by existing ...it [the museum] is educational in the broadest and best sense" (p.7).

The second typology is the company-model museum. The company-model museum is a widespread model which sees visitors as "customers who must be satisfied"

(2000, p. 51). It serves public need of a sort through focusing on innovation in order to please the visitor. This sort of market-based museum is acknowledged by Weil (1997) when he states that “museum visitors... have been transformed into customers. And, as customers... they can with increasing frequency call the tune” (p. 262).

The third typology is that of the public-service museum, which is similar to the second model. In this model, there is “an explicit contract between taxpayers and the state” and the visitor is seen as a “user-taxpayer” that has their concerns attended to “for reasons of fiscal equity” (2000, p. 51). This model clearly follows the statements of previously quoted authors (Ellis, 1995, Gaither, 1992, Weil, 1997) that receiving public funding exacts an expected return for visitors.

The final model is that of the forum-museum. In this model, the museum is seen as a mutually beneficial place that reflects the past and the future of the public. The museum that relies on community also sees itself as an institution that can act as a “cultural animator” in order to “interpret community changes” (Maggi, 2000, p. 52). This model takes the museum a step farther in that it exists explicitly to serve the community as the community sees fit.

The forum-museum model is one that is present in some museums in the United States. Gaither (1992) describes how the African American community has developed multiple “neighborhood museums” (p. 61). He describes these museums as “an experience that enfranchised a community of people and enabled them to talk about their lives and to take greater responsibility for the reconstruction of themselves and their children” (p. 61). The neighborhood museum exists as a service, as a place that draws all

of its actions from community needs. Without its surrounding community, it would not exist and would not be relevant. He lists the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, the Rhode Island Black Heritage Society, and the Afro-American Historical and Cultural Museum as examples of neighborhood museums.

Another example of Maggi's forum-museum is that of the community museum. This is a model that developed in the Zapotec community of Santa Ana del Valle in Oaxaca, Mexico (Healy, 2003). The community museum there sprang from the realization of community members that they could economically benefit from housing their archaeological artifacts in their hometown rather than shipping them off to larger museums in Mexico City. The intention was to draw museum-goers to a local museum rather than displaying the local objects out of context in a removed geographical setting. The community museum model has become an economic and cultural development movement where control of interpretation, collections, staffing, and physical location are defined by the people that will be represented in the museum, rather than outsiders (ibid.). This model has been utilized in Arizona by the Ak-Chin Indian community in the development of their own community museum (Fuller, 1992).

Mission statements.

Apart from structural changes in the creation of new museums, evidence of public responsiveness is present in every area of museum work. To start, the driving document of the museum, the mission statement, now reflects a call to serve communities. Listed as the first key idea in *Excellence and Equity* is: "The commitment to education as central to museum's public service must be clearly expressed in every museum's mission" (p. 3).

As the major body which serves to accredit museums, a directive such as this must be adhered to in order to maintain professional status within a museum. Weil (1997) gives the example of the Glenbow museum (a Canadian museum), which holds as its mission “To be a place where people find meaning and value, and delight in exploring the diversity of the human experience” (p. 268). The wording of the mission is visitor focused, rather than the object-focused mission statements of old that privilege collecting, preserving, and exhibiting as their main functions.

In *Excellence and Equity* (1992) the authors also point out that internal structure is being questioned in the new museum. The second key idea in the AAM report states that inclusiveness and diversity need to be a priority, but that this cannot be limited to the audience, but must also be reflected in operations and staff. Ellis (1995) describes the 1994 document “Willful Neglect: The Smithsonian Institution and U.S. Latinos” in which the lack of Latino presence in staff and exhibitions was outlined. The response to this was to create a scholarship and internship program for Latinos in order to remedy their lack of representation amongst museum professionals.

Collecting and research.

Collecting and research have changed under the publicly focused museum. Gaither (1992) describes the five-step collecting and research process of African American objects that Rowena Stewart developed. The process is distinctive in that it is “people oriented” rather than object-oriented (Gaither, 1992, p. 65). The steps include identifying the keeper of the object from the community; then time is spent making the keeper comfortable with the idea of the museum. Following this, the keeper of the object

helps in the interpretation process, sharing the knowledge they have about the object.

Only then does a professional historian join the conversation to give a broader background of the object. The exhibition, which Stewart sees as “giving back to the community,” is the presentation of the object to the public (Gaither, 1992, p. 62).

Finally, educational plans are set, in which the keeper of the object is invited back as a docent to teach about the object. In this way, community and layman’s knowledge is privileged above that of the professional. The public is served in that connections are allowed to be made between the owner and the community through the source of the object.

Exhibitions.

Exhibitions have also changed in the publicly responsive museum. Blandy and Congdon (1988) describe the process they followed of creating a community-based exhibition. The exhibition “Boats, Bait, and Fishing Paraphernalia: A Local Folk Aesthetic” was created collaboratively with the fishing community of Northern Ohio. The curation of the exhibit, or the choosing of the objects, was done jointly with experts in “folklore, folk art, art education, art, fishing, taxidermy, model boat building, rod making, net making, fly tying and lure making” along with the authors (Blandy and Congdon, 1988, p. 245). Instead of looking only toward museum professionals, it was understood that the exhibition would be made more meaningful if community input on the objects displayed was present from the beginning. The National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI) also utilizes knowledge from its own community members (American Indians from the United States) to interpret their collection (Popson, 2004).

Joe Watkins, of New Mexico State University, and a Choctaw, states that “Now Native Americans are using the NMAI’s collection to tell their story” rather than having their story told to them by an outsider using native objects (Popson, 2004, p. 62).

Education is quite possibly the area most affected by public responsiveness. As it requires a much larger discussion, I will discuss education more fully in the following section.

Art Museum Education

Historical Trends

As can be expected, art museum education followed along the same historical trends as museums themselves. Education, though, can be viewed as a barometer of the times, as that area of museum work is contested and debated most heatedly during periods of ideological change in the museums (Ellis, 1995; Gaither, 1992; Weil, 1997). Zeller (1989), in his history of art museum education, outlines several strands of education philosophy that can be traced from the beginnings of the art museum to the 1960s. These strands are still present in art museum education today, and are discussed in current literature. In addition to Zeller, Mayer (1998, unpublished) has followed changes in art museum education from its modernist beginnings to evidence of postmodernity in museum practice. Finally, Eisner and Dobbs (1988) and Williams (1996) look at trends in museum education during the late 1980s and from 1984 to 1996, respectively.

Zeller (1989) looks at the development of art museum education and describes it as following four philosophical schools of thought: aesthetics or art appreciation

philosophy, art history philosophy, interdisciplinary or humanities philosophy, and the social education philosophy. The first, aesthetics or art appreciation philosophy, is based on the idea that “only by exhibiting works of the greatest artistic merit can the museum fulfill its educational responsibility to the public” (p. 48). The aesthetics philosophy is also marked by its focus on relaxation and recreation, on formal discussion of the elements of art and principles of design, and on art as a model for betterment of the general public. It is interesting to note that while this philosophy is centered on a formal study of art, with “good art” being dictated by the upper echelons of the museum, they still see themselves in a role of serving the public good through this activity. Zeller notes that the aesthetics philosophy is still in existence in museums of the present, “albeit in a modified form” (ibid.).

The second philosophical strand is the art history school of thought. This philosophy focuses on “attribution, iconography, period and national styles, and biographical information” (Zeller, 1989, p. 56). Mayer (1998) notes that the art history philosophy gained strength as the field of art history grew in another institution - the university. The art history philosophy is closely related to the third philosophical strand, the interdisciplinary or humanities philosophy. In this school of thought, all forms of the arts should be brought together in events that celebrate the arts as a whole. It is thought that the arts could be more beneficial if other subjects were taught through the arts, such as history or philosophy. Both of these philosophies have in common an art-centered focus and shared a growing popularity during same historical period of the early 1900s onward (Zeller, 1989).

The final school of thought is the social education philosophy. This philosophy is at the foundation of most current discussions of the purpose of museum education today. The social education philosophy is a people-centered, rather than art-centered approach to museum education. Zeller (1989) states that, “It intends to make a direct and practical difference by improving the quality of everyday life” of museum visitors and education participants (p. 66). Museum educators following the social education philosophy work to “[address] the needs of individuals to define and validate themselves” (ibid.). While the aesthetics branch of philosophy also attempted to better the quality of life of visitors, its goals were based on imposing the tastes of the upper-classes. In social education philosophy, the goal is to help working, lower, and middle classes achieve “a better standard of living and a more complete life” (ibid.).

Melinda Mayer (1998, unpublished) follows the trends in art museum education from the mid-20th century to the present, arguing that while change occurs in the art history field, change happens in art museum education. She believes that following trends in art history will give an accurate portrayal of what will occur in art museum education because most art museum educators are primarily trained in art history before entering the field. She cites the development of semiotic, feminist, Marxist, and multicultural analysis as postmodern methods of art historical research. She states that “the ‘new’ art historian, like the museum educator... is shifting from object-centered to people-centered values” (1998, p. 19). In her article “A Postmodern Puzzle” (unpublished) she mentions that interactive dialogue, relevancy of museum practice to people’s lives, and a focus on museum literacy (museum education that is based on

contextual understanding that artwork in a museum is limited by professional decisions made by staff), are all examples of how postmodernism is entering into the art museum education realm. She does explain, though, that her examples come from theorists and peripheral studies, rather than from direct observation of museum educators. Therefore, she only makes claims that there is a beginning to the presence of postmodern ideas in art museum education, rather than widespread use of these ideas.

Morrissey (2002) supports Mayer's position that the museum education field is moving toward a postmodern practice. Morrissey describes how museums have explained visitor experience in terms of postmodern constructs such as meaning-making, constructivism, and narrative. She observes that "these constructs share assumptions that: (a) the visitor is actively engaged in creating knowledge; (b) learning is a process, not a product; and (c) knowledge is not transmitted from one person to another, but constructed and continually negotiated and renegotiated" (p. 288).

While Mayer focuses on the literature to trace practice, Eisner and Dobbs (1988) and Williams (1996) looked at actual art museum education practice in order to trace change or lack thereof in that field. While conducting their research in 1987, Eisner and Dobbs looked at questions about how and why museums help visitors connect with artwork, as well as what museums might change in order to better serve their visitors. Overall, they found that the aesthetics or art appreciation philosophy that Zeller noted was still prevalent. They stated that most museums still saw themselves as "'sacred groves,' quiet places for the cognoscente to enjoy profound objects without intervention, assistance, [or] discursive language" (1988, p.7). They cited the reluctance of museum

professionals to give relevant contextual information or layman's terms in signage, the lack of introductory information about the layout of the museum, and the lack of pedagogical influence in exhibition design as examples of the continuation of the aesthetic focus in art museum education practice.

Williams (1996) looks at a broad perspective of art museum education at a later date, noting changes or lack of changes in museum education since 1984. Williams notes that museum educators who were surveyed felt that education was more fundamental to the workings of the museum and that their political status within the museum had also improved. While she reports that the field is opening to those trained in art education, along with studio art and museum studies rather than just the traditional studies in art history, there is still little correlation between museum education and art education literature. She also reported that there had been significant growth in partnerships between museums and schools that were of an educational nature, as well as growth of museum and community collaborations. Overall, change had occurred in the museum field since 1984, as well as since Eisner's and Dobb's 1988 report.

Current Theories in Art Museum Education

The following is an overview of literature documenting current museum education theories, primarily in art museum education. Four themes are repeated that have relevance to this study's focus on art organizations serving the general public. The first and second themes are that museums are incorporating methods of education that are dialogical and relational in practice. The third theme is that museums are reviewing more closely how strategies that focus on object-centered learning can utilize the museum more

effectively. Finally, the fourth theme demonstrates that the possibility for creating individual and communal change has been documented through museum education practice.

McKay and Monteverde (2003) most clearly state how dialogic looking occurs. They state that “in *dialogic looking*, viewers exchange observations, memories, and associations with partners, while maintaining a second, internal dialogue as they work to understand the images they encounter” (p. 40, italics in original). Dialogic looking occurs on three levels: an external dialogue between visitors, an internal dialogue within the viewer, and a dialogue between the artwork and the visitor. The authors claim that as most museum visitors attend without the benefit of a mediator, such as a docent or educator, that this sort of practice takes place naturally. What educators must do, and are doing, is to encourage dialogic looking through pamphlets, brochures, or by creating the expectation of an active visit. In dialogic looking, the knowledge that develops from bringing a personal set of questions to the dialogue between viewer and object, viewer and other viewers, and viewer and self is more valuable than the transmitted knowledge of the more traditional didactic label. This new model of visiting the art museum takes into account the importance of the viewer’s voice, not just the voice of the museum.

Jeffers (2003) supports the need for dialogical space in museums. She presents a model of the museum as a place of engagement. She states that “what is needed is the free and open space that allows for people to construct and contextualize meanings about art through the community-building process of dialogue” (p. 113). Furthermore, dialogic looking supports Mayer’s (1998, unpublished) and Morrissey’s (2002) observations of

postmodernism in museum education. Inherently, this model is a process, it requires the visitor to become a knowledge maker rather than knowledge receiver, and is constructed between individuals and groups (Morrissey, 2002).

Dialogic looking is grounded in the constructive process of knowledge creation. Lankford (1992) explains Koroscik's theorizing of cumulative knowledge construction. Past experiences, expectations, learning, and methods of understanding and seeing, along with new information, are all combined in order to create new knowledge. This theory of constructivism, a postmodern concept, allows for the learner's previous knowledge to be acknowledged and put to use. Mayer (2005) further explains that constructivism is based on two primary features. She states that "First, the participant must be actively engaged in the learning process. Second, what is learned must be confirmed not through external criteria ...but through the visitor's own sense-making mechanism" (p.14). Similarly, dialogic looking expects that a viewer will bring their previous knowledge, and in fact develops education activities around that expectation. In art museum education, as Jeffers (2003), Morrissey (2002) and McKay and Monteverde (2003) argue, the visitor's knowledge should be as important as that of the museum.

Garoian (2001) also discusses dialogic possibilities in the art museum. He describes the museums as a "performative site" where perception, autobiography, museum culture, interdisciplinarity, and the institution are "performed" (pps. 234-245). In performing the museum, viewers become active participants in creating knowledge about artworks. Garoian states that "a performative museum pedagogy ...re-positions viewers as critical participants and enables their creative and political agency within

museum culture. ...In doing so, a critical dialogue is created between viewers and the museum.” (p. 235). Indeed, his model is based primarily on the notion that in performing the museum, the viewer, their experiences, and their knowledge become a critical element in the “dialogic process, a play between the public narratives of the museum, and the private narratives of viewers” (p. 239).

The dialogical possibilities of the art museum also give rise to relational possibilities within the museum. As part of the interaction between visitors in their dialogic looking, they are forging new knowledge of each other, and furthering their relationships. Morrissey (2002) explains this process as a pattern of pathways that develop between visitors and the objects they encounter. She explains that “when visitors... openly and spontaneously respond to the objects and to each other, they are responding to the language of the object and using the lexicon of the objects to connect with each other” (p. 287). Looking at an artwork, or other museum object, and discussing it together provides an opportunity, in Morrissey’s observations, for relational encounters to occur. Morrissey specifically outlines examples of pathways that can occur between individuals and objects, between children and adults, and between visitors. Thus, the patterns of dialogic looking are also the pathways that forge relationships between viewers.

Hein and Alexander (1998) cite that in the case of family groups, a visit to the museum often becomes a means to further the relationship between family members. They assert that while viewing an exhibition, the visit is often transformed “into personal activities based on their family background, mode of interaction, or the adults’ parenting

and teaching styles” (p. 23). Visitors may opt to use interactive materials, such as maps, to explain a family migration, rather than explain the exhibit’s objects further. Jeffers (2003) claims that in an alternative model of museums, “the construction of knowledge [happens] within a group context” (p. 116). She continues by stating that the construction of group knowledge allows for “transformative and informative relationships” (p. 116). Sandell (2002) proposes that these transformative relationships can be individual, community based, or societal.

The unique nature of objects as a catalyst for learning experiences is discussed broadly. As Weil (1997) discusses why museums are still relevant given the difficulties of gathering funding, he cites the “all-but-unique power of objects” as the primary reason for the existence of museums (p. 265). He argues that there is a dialogue that occurs between object and self that helps the viewer to understand themselves. He states “among the services which the museum is able to offer to its community is this capacity to provide the individual visitor with an important degree of personal self-affirmation” drawn out by the interaction with an object (p. 266). Pilbaum (quoted by Weil, 1997), while reflecting on his review of responses to an exhibition of American flags in contemporary art, observes that most visitors experienced a process of learning about themselves. He says, “In essence... the exhibition became a looking-glass for visitors. They experienced what they were capable of experiencing. They experienced who they were” (p. 265).

In explaining the long-term social values that museums can offer through educational experiences, Scott (2002) recommends that an emphasis be placed on the opportunity for people to engage with objects in these institutions. She states that:

Through objects, museums can provide unique experiences associated with the collective meaning, sharing discussion, and debate that are the foundation of good citizenry. Through objects, museums can reinforce personal identity and belonging. Objects convey a sense of place and can, therefore, introduce outsiders to the significance of a culture through its material heritage. (p. 47)

She continues by exploring more specific areas in which the object-centered learning process is beneficial to the public. Morrissey (2002) supports Scott, by explaining how having an encounter with a real object can “provide an opportunity for dialogue, inquiry, and conversation through which individuals find deeper connections not only to the world around them, but to each other” (p. 285). Each of these authors supports the notion that an encounter with an object creates an environment for a more valuable learning experience.

Finally, there is a strong theme in the literature that museum education creates a possibility for individual and communal change. In the AAM report *Excellence and Equity* (1992), the authors clearly state that “museums perform their most fruitful public service by providing an educational experience in the broadest sense: by fostering the ability to live productively in a pluralistic society and to contribute to the resolution of the challenges we face as global citizens” (p. 6). Sandell (2002) offers the idea “that museums can impact positively on the lives of disadvantaged or marginalized *individuals*,

act as a catalyst for social regeneration and as a vehicle for empowerment with specific *communities* and also contribute towards the creation of more equitable *societies*” (p. 4, italics in original). This sense of the museum as an educational force allowing for change is echoed by both practitioners and theorists.

As noted before, the notion of dialogic looking offers an opportunity for change individually. This change can occur because of knowledge that is affirmed, as Weil (1997) suggests, or because of cultural encounters outside of themselves, as Hein and Alexander (1998) suggest. Morrissey (2002) describes this process of interaction with objects as “life-giving learning” (p. 287). She feels that “life-giving learning is not about getting information, but about renewing the vitality of life and claiming our place in the world” (ibid.). Scott (2002) also believes that change happens individually within a museum. In addition to further understanding of one’s self, she presents the notion that the museum can offer the opportunity to understand one’s self in relation to a collective whole.

Jeffers (2003) proposes that as group meanings of an artwork are created in the dialogic process, the group will enter a process involving conflict, interpretation, criticism, and entertaining different perspectives. This encounter within a group would require “critical and empathic listening” (p. 117). These are the sorts of interactions that Maggi (2000) notes as placing the museum in the role of the cultural animator. In his model of the forum-museum, he expects that the debates and challenges that Jeffers describes will offer groups the opportunity to practice democratic interactions through discussions revolving around the museum object. Miller (1998), in summing up his

interviews with several art museum educators across the nation states, “Community. That’s really the core issue in museum education” (p. 6). He observes that museums are now viewing themselves in the role of an “innovative community resource center,” rather than a storing house for objects (p. 6). As a resource center, education programs focus on creating democratic relationships through an inclusive process.

Art Theory

Themes within the art theory literature reflect growing attempts to serve public needs through the arts. In art theory, similar dialogical and relational practices discussed in museum education literature are present. Community-based art is also an area that suggests a move to serve public needs.

There is a movement in the artworld towards a process of artmaking that moves away from the privileged, individual maker (Bourriaud, 1998/ 2002, p. 11). Bourriaud (1998/ 2002) discusses this new form of artmaking as one that responds to the “existing real” of our lives (p. 13). Instead of focusing on “imaginary and utopian realities,” artists are choosing to discuss their neighborhoods, economic difficulties, political exchanges, and the people they interact with daily (pp. 13-14). This move from utopian to existing real has created a space which he describes as “relational;” it is a space where the viewer interacts with the artwork, rather than simply receiving the work (p. 14). The viewer moves from a passive to active viewer, both receiving information, but also interacting with the artwork and with other viewers at the same time. He explains this space as a “social interstice” in which “barter” (of ideas, experiences, and/or expectations), take place (pp. 15-16).

Gablik (1991) and Lacy (1995) further this discussion of a relational space by offering examples of artists that incorporate and develop human interactions through their artmaking. They both promote the possibility of art as a life-changing tool. In her discussion of “new genre public art,” Lacy presents the possibility and examples of “art [as a] social intervention” (p. 19). She states that this new form of art uses “concepts of audience, relationship, communication, and political intention” as its basis rather than “materials, spaces, or artistic media” (p. 28). Gablik (1991) discusses this new form of artmaking as “art in the partnership mode,” where the artist no longer views the world through “the disembodied eye,” but makes art with a “responsive heart” (p. 106). She presents artists that have left behind individual creation in favor of a process that is based on communal and relational interactions, positing that art is no longer “the solitary process it has been since the Renaissance, but [is] *something we do with others*” (p. 106, italics in original).

Bourriaud (1998/ 2002), Gablik (1991), and Lacy (1995) all see this notion of a relational form of artmaking as a direct outcome of the fact that as humans we do not function in a solitary manner. They view the concept of “selfhood as intrinsically *relational*” (Gablik, p. 108, italics in original). Therefore, artmaking need not promote a forced solitary process, but rather should take into account our innate human desire for sociability, and develop human interaction as part of the artistic process. Furthermore, new genre public art looks for ways to solve human problems while working within this partnership mode. Gablik (1991) goes so far as to suggest that this is an art that can save lives. The relationships and life possibilities that are presented to participants in a theater

project created and performed by homeless people, in a group mural project created by inner-city youth or by a group of women gathering to talk about their hopes and fears (Gablik, 1991), represent an outcome or product that is of equal importance as the actual art object (Lacy, 1995).

Community-based artists theorize about what role it is they are playing in their communities. Mancillas (1998) discusses her role as a “citizen artist” (p. 335). She states that this role came about simply because she wanted “a good cup of coffee, a well-stocked bookstore and a pleasant place to eat, all within an aesthetically vibrant, urban environment” (p. 336). Drawing upon her skills as an individual artist, she began her work as a community artist who was viewed as a “creative problem-[solver] ...who [could] help communities resolve issues that seem intractable” (p. 337). She states as a community artist, or citizen artist, she “helped focus the community on what they wanted all along - a strong statement of identity and neighborhood pride” (p. 338). As she sees it, her role as an active citizen and artist is to “integrate seemingly disparate points of view, to re-present the community to itself, to imagine solutions outside the usual, to forge alliances or act as bridges - these qualities of the community artist make possible a living malleable artwork” (p. 340).

The occupation and creation of public spaces and redirecting relationships between neighboring groups is a focus in Baca’s (2002) community artist role. In discussing an early mural project that she led, she states that “It ...marked the first step in the development of a unique collective process that employs art to mediate between rival gang members competing for public space and public identity” (p. 112). She sees her

role as a community mural artist as one that guides “creating capacity for the imagery of the people to occupy public space, [as well as speaking] ...to the cultural demands of previously under-represented peoples” (p. 111). Ultimately, Baca sees community-based art as art that “is not simply one’s individual notion of the creation of a masterpiece, but public work that is greatly influenced by the people for whom the work is made” (p. 123).

Art Education

A review of relevant literature in art education shows that art and community are present in discussions of that field. Community based art education, multicultural art education, material culture studies, and discussions of democratization through these areas build a framework for serving community needs through art education.

Community-based art and art education is discussed by several authors in the field of art education (Adejumo, 2000; Ballengee Morris, 2002; Bastos, 2002; Garber and Pearson, 1998; Irwin and Kindler, 1999; Patterson, 2002; Ulbricht, 2005). Adejumo (2000) explains that community-based art “describe[s] works of art produced by people living within the same locality, and defined by common interests” (p.12) He continues, stating that “Community-based art consists of a wide variety of aesthetic objects” (ibid.). He feels that community-based art can fit into the model of comprehensive art education, which “emphasizes ideas and procedures that are expected to engender appreciation of art and cultivate aptitudes that will result in productive citizenship” (ibid.). He states that school art programs can be made meaningful if “art educators ...look beyond the classroom for ways and reasons to build bridges between their program and the community” (ibid.). In Adejumo’s comprehensive art education model, personal

experience, community, and community-based artists can be utilized to make art education more relevant and meaningful for students.

Community-based art education is discussed by Ulbricht (2005) as well. He explains that there are several areas of art education which inform community-based art education. These include informal teaching, organized community teaching, outreach, ethnography, and public art. Ulbricht explains that these areas must be considered before a school teacher incorporates community-based strategies, thereby creating a program that will most effectively “build on what [students] have already learned” about their own communities (p. 10). By utilizing community-based art education Ulbricht states that “classroom teachers can begin to see opportunities for enhanced skill development, collaboration, communication, and empowerment” (p. 11).

Two successful community-based art projects are described by Ballengee Morris (2002) and Clark and Zimmerman (2000). The Living Heritage Museum Project in Mineral Wells, West Virginia is a transformed one-room school house that is now a local archive and site for integrated learning. Ballengee Morris and David Morris visited during a community in-service in order to “discuss ways of connecting art forms to their community and curriculum” (p. 44). She explains that the goals of the project in-service were to “teach skills that were life-long and could be transferred to other situations or needs,” and to “produce culturally proud citizens that value diversity, traditions, community, and the arts through critical analysis and rituals of life” (p. 45). Clark and Zimmerman (2000) describe the community-based art education project they led titled “Project ARTS (Arts for Rural Teachers and Students)” (p. 34). Project ARTS sprung

from the realization that just as at-risk students in urban areas need specialized art programs, “Students in rural schools are also at risk and require educational programs designed to meet their special needs” (p. 33). The project was based in rural areas of New Mexico, South Carolina, and Indiana. Project ARTS was guided by the notion that “there is a need for community involvement in successful programs for teaching art in rural areas, where teachers, parents and community members should be involved actively in developing arts programs that build upon local resources and histories” (p. 34). Similar to Ballengee Morris, Clark and Zimmerman feel that community-based art programs “can become a source of pride, enhanced self-esteem, and validation” (p. 38).

Bastos (2002) describes community-based education broadly as “practices that are attentive to possible relationships between the arts and communities” (p. 70). She furthers this model by presenting what she calls “change-oriented community-based art education” (p. 70). Based on Paulo Freire’s educational models, and drawing from Ana Mae Barbosa’s work, Bastos proposes an idea that looking more closely at familiar cultural objects, such as local art in the community, will “awak[en] one’s consciousness of belonging historically and culturally, which then leads to critical reflection and participation” (p. 72). By examining familiar local art, and repositioning one’s self historically, politically, economically, and culturally, students, and other community members, are able to step onto a path to deeper understanding of their place in society.

Writings about multicultural education echo the possibility for democratization, resembling Bastos’ assertions that learning about community will help develop more critical and reflective members of communities. Hicks (1994) describes

what she sees as the ability for art education to be a player in social reconstruction. Grounding her arguments in feminist and multicultural art education, she states that “The goal of social reconstruction in art education is both to critique the privileged perceptions of dominant communities and to facilitate the negotiation of community boundaries by all students” (p. 155). Similar to Bastos, Hicks believes that social reconstruction will occur by learning about “one’s own cultural experiences” alongside others’ cultural experiences in order to facilitate a true sense of community (p. 154).

Chalmers (1987) discusses the importance of broadening art educators’ views beyond the Western canon. He states that “If we, as art educators, are to produce artists or art consumers who can see art’s function in society, then we need to consider the cultural foundations of art and broaden our definitions of art to include the cultural artifacts of all cultures and subcultures” (p. 5). A broader view on the arts, in Chalmer’s view, allows art educators to be “more democratic” (p. 9). He proposes that opening a more democratic view on the arts will offer more people the opportunity “to reach out to others for mutuality, to say ‘we belong’” (p. 9). The central driving forces of multicultural and community-based art education are parallel, as can be seen in these writings. Both highlight the notion that broadening the study and definitions of art will allow for participatory art education practice that holds transformative power.

Material culture studies is another area that theorizes a space for community and democratization through art education. Bolin and Blandy (2003) outline reasoning for the incorporation of material culture studies in art education. They explain that:

A healthy, vital, and sustainable democracy requires a citizenry educated around cultural issues of individual and collective concern as well as having the capability to consider such issues from a critical perspective. Art educators can uniquely contribute to this preparation of citizens by promoting the investigation and appreciation of the broadest possible range of objects, artifacts, spaces, expressions, and experiences. (p. 246)

In their view, studying objects that affect all senses, rather than just the visual sense, in the art education classroom would assist “students in comprehending and engaging the cultural forms and practices encountered on a daily basis [as well as] ...understanding and appreciating their cultural heritage” (p.247). Again, as Bastos and Hicks propose, examining the familiar, the everyday, more closely will offer an opportunity for a broader view on the world and the students’ place in it.

Bolin (2004, 2005), in explaining projects based on material culture studies, describes the opportunity for dialogue and interaction between various groups of people based on the stories surrounding objects. He describes a process in which objects’ stories and telling of these stories facilitates an understanding of the self and history through objects. In describing the basic tenets of this process, he states that “Life-stories are associated with objects. Many objects gain meaning and are made meaningful through stories. Sensory contact with objects triggers stories and then triggers other stories; these stories weave a life for people-shared experience” (2004, 2005). This process echoes object-centered and dialogical learning in museum education, in which dialogue about objects and the relationships formed by discussing objects are of primary importance.

Community Cultural Development

Those in the community cultural development field are purposefully searching for a means to serve communities and the public through the arts. Artwork that privileges human interaction is at the core of community cultural development theory and practice. Adams and Goldbard (2002) define community cultural development as “the work of artist-organizers ...who collaborate with others to express identity, concerns and aspirations through the arts and communications media, while building cultural capacity and contributing to social change” (p. 8). These efforts are focused on creating group change rather than individual change, as studying community intrinsically means looking at group dynamics. Similar to new genre public art, community cultural development looks toward the building of interactions as a primary product of the art process. Community cultural development moves beyond interaction though, and seeks social change as an outcome and product. It also focuses on culture as its medium, seeking to maintain the principles of equal cultural representation, culture as a means of expression, culture as a dynamic, rather than static, force, and cultural diversity while creating social change (Adams and Goldbard, 2002).

Community cultural development views the artmaking process as one that allows for democratic and transformative possibilities. At its core, community cultural development is a means to “fully inhabit our human lives, bringing to consciousness the values and choices that animate our communities and thus equipping ourselves to act ...as subjects in history, rather than merely its objects” (Adams and Goldbard, 2002, p. 17). This belief draws strongly upon Freire’s theories of “conscientization,” whereby a

person examines the oppressive forces in their lives and works to take action, rather than be acted upon in their lives (Adams and Goldbard, 2002, p. 18). Bringing people to consciousness occurs through the tools of community cultural development, namely, “critical thinking, interrogating one’s own assumptions, exercising social imagination and creative problem solving”, while considering both individual and community needs (ibid.). Augusto Boal’s theater of the oppressed has become a strong model for the notion of political practice through the arts. In the theater of the oppressed, “spect-actors” participate in a theatrical performance that models a future political situation in which they will take part, such as union negotiations (Cohen-Cruz, 2004, p. 6). All forms of art are viewed as potential mediums for this sort of political practice, in which people can envision and test potential actions through arts mediums in a safe and supportive group setting.

The transformative processes of community cultural development take place in mural, dance, and theater projects, puppet performances, and the use of oral histories, in addition to other arts areas. What brings community cultural development, new genre public art, art museum education, and art education together is the belief that the arts have the innate ability to transform lives and be a vehicle for social and individual change. This change happens during the course of artmaking that is focused on a process of developing interaction between groups of people. Artmaking is privileged as a tool for change because of its intrinsic use of creative processes that promote “envisioning of possibilities that reach beyond the status quo,” thereby forcing the artmaking group into considering an alternate future for themselves (Krensky, 2001, p. 431).

Artists' Communities: History and Practice

In looking at the literature of arts organizations, it became clear that artists' communities are fully immersed in discussions of how to reach out to the general public. The Alliance for Artists Communities (2003, 2004) has recently released two reports on "Lessons Learned" in the field, including how community engagement is occurring in the field. Of three major publications, (the third being a directory of artists' communities published in 2000), one addresses questions of outreach, one devotes a third of the report to outreach, and one is written solely to tackle the issue of outreach, or community engagement. The amount of writing available in current reports itself speaks to how important this topic is in artists' communities. In this section, I will give an overview of what artists communities are, what their goals are, strategies that have been reported on for community engagement, and how these areas connect to community cultural development, museum, and art education discussions of public service.

Professionals in the artists' community field see themselves as the "research and development laboratories for the arts" (Wilkerson, 2000, p. 19). These artists' communities are created as retreats for artists of all areas of the arts to have concentrated time to focus on their work. There is a long history of artists' communities, going back to the Greek and Roman era. Today, artists' communities exist to give several weeks to several months of time for artwork to be created. Within these communities, artists are supported in a variety of ways, including through scholarships and grants, through taking care of housing and cooking, through materials support, and through the offering of studio space, often in some of the United States' most beautiful locations. It is also

important to note that the professionalization of this field has occurred in the past fifteen years, making it privy to the most current developments and discussions in the arts field. The Alliance for Artists Communities began through a gathering in 1991 funded by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. In 1992 the Alliance began with 18 members (Wilkerson, 2000). Today, there are over 200 organizations involved in the alliance (<http://www.artistcommunities.org/>), which shows the immense growth within only 13 years.

As in any other field, the goals for artists' communities are varied, and depend on each individual organization. Some communities are focused on crafts, some on writing, some on long-term residencies, and some on developing connections between artists and communities in need. Overall, though, generalizations can be drawn about the goals for the artists' community field. Artist communities are focused on serving artists. They exist to provide much needed breaks from everyday work and life in order to focus on artistic creation. They see themselves as a means to continue the production of innovative artwork and to support creative thinkers in society. Artists' communities almost always see themselves as active members of their immediate geographic community as well. Also, they often feel that they have a role to play as a mediator between the general public and artists (Wilkerson, 2003).

As I mentioned, community engagement has become an important topic of discussion for artists' communities. Wilkerson (2003) mentions the reasons why artists' communities have specifically chosen the term community engagement. He states, "The semantics are important: either you are a part of your community, a participant and a

partner in its success, engaged in building its future along with business, government, and other nonprofits, or you are standing outside of it, operating somewhat like a walled city, deigning to 'reach out' when it's convenient" (p. 38). Community engagement in the field can be marked in several areas, including mission statements, programming, and the professional conversations in the field.

Through survey research, Wilkerson (2003) found that the majority of artists' communities, as part of their basic mission, see themselves engaging with their geographic communities. His survey showed that "for a 21st century residency program, there really is little or no distinction between the core activity of the organization and 'outreach'" (p. 38). Similar to current discussion in museums, there is a sense that funding creates public obligation. Atlas, Brunner and deNobriga (2004) observe that since most artists' communities have tax-exempt 501(c)(3) status, there is an inherent need to include public service in order to justify this status. Inclusion of public service, or community engagement, in mission statements occurs because many artists' communities see their role as a "public citizen" (Atlas, Brunner, and deNobriga, 2004, p.9). This role is a reciprocal relationship of helping the public understand the arts more clearly, and thereby the purpose of the existence of artists' communities, as well as serving the public through programming, collaboration, and economic support.

Community engagement manifests itself in various forms in artists' communities. Community engagement is seen to be highly contextual. Atlas, Brunner and deNobriga (2004) state that "the very premise of community engagement is that it grows out of particular and often unique contexts and relationships" (p. 8). Some examples of how

engagement occurs are through festivals, community development, hiring local artists for educational programs, and creating collaborative programs with local schools. It is important to note that central to programming decisions and discussions, there is always the dual effort of serving the residents of the artists' community, while at the same time engaging with the larger community outside of the organizations' walls (Atlas, Brunner, and deNobriga, 2004, Wilkerson, 2003). In essence, what occurs is programming for the community of artist residents, programming with the larger community, and collaborative programming between the two groups.

An artists' community often acts similarly to the role of the museum or a community cultural developer in their capacity as a mediator between various communities. While reviewing survey responses and literature, Atlas, Brunner, and deNobriga (2004) note that often the staff of the artist community must function as an intermediary. They explain that often artists are looking for ways to create collaboratively with the public, as was mentioned in the section on art theory, but need a mediator in that process. The organization's staff then acts as a mediator to ensure that expectations of each group (artists and the community) are clear and are met, that matches are properly made, that the collaboration is one that has been or can be developed into a long-term relationship, and that it will be a mutually beneficial collaboration (Atlas, Brunner, and deNobriga, 2004). In addition, there is a focus on developing practical and democratic skills, going to the community, rather than bringing the community to the organization, being transparent about funding and power structures, utilizing a theory of change, and "thinking of engagement as an artform itself that values

creativity, collaborative problem-solving and sustainability” (Atlas, Brunner, and deNobriga, 2004, p. 18). Each of these elements is of great importance in community cultural development, and is of growing importance to the museum field.

Summary

To sum up the findings of this literature review, I will review the main themes found throughout the readings. First, all of the arts organizations discussed in the readings have made serving the public a main focus in professional discussions. Second, the reasons behind this focus on the public appear to stem from economic and ideological change within arts organizations. Third, postmodern trends of inclusion of the viewer in educational practice, collaborative practice, a breakdown of power structures, and a focus on pluralism in arts organizations are evident. While modern practices are still in place, the literature marks a movement in theory and practice away from more traditional models of interaction between the public and arts organizations. Fourth, the object-centered nature of any arts organization, but especially museums, offers a unique ability to spark personal and communal connections. In addition to affirming previous knowledge and experience for individuals, object-centered activity can spark communal interactions that may lead to more democratic practices outside of the immediate museum experience. Finally, dialogue and relationships are privileged in the practice and mission of arts organizations. Instead of existing solely as institutions to transmit ideas, they are becoming a place to share, interact, and collaborate.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

Introduction

In order to research if and how arts organizations are serving community needs, I used three research methods: a review of arts organizations' websites, a survey, and a case study of the John Michael Kohler Arts Center. My goal in using these methods was to gain a broader look at what strategies arts organizations are using to reach out to communities. I also used these methods to study areas related to outreach programs, such as barriers to programming, content of programs, and populations reached by arts organizations. Finally, through a case study I provided an example of an arts organization that I consider to be implementing a holistic approach to community outreach. Each of these techniques do not provide an equal amount of information, as I base my survey findings on twenty-eight responses, but base my website and mission statements review on one hundred organizations and my case study is focused on one organization. My findings show that the majority of the arts organizations in this study consider themselves to serve community needs through outreach, but the strategies for outreach vary. I outline the three methods used in this project and provide a brief overview of my findings below.

Methodology

Website Review and Mission Statements

In order to locate the one hundred arts organizations included in my survey, I began by looking at arts organizations' websites (please refer to a list of arts organizations included in Appendix A). I reviewed each website's listing of educational

programs, community programs, and mission statements. To decide which organizations to include in the research, I assessed whether outreach was included on the website's listing of activities. If not, the organization was not included in the study. It is important to note that I did not specifically look for the term "outreach," but rather looked for types of programs that indicate the organization is implementing some form of programming that is specifically designed to extend the organization's reach to a larger community.

After choosing the organizations that would be a part of my research, I looked through each website systematically. I started by searching the website for information about programs that involved community outreach. In this review, I looked for the terms "community" and "outreach," but did not limit my search to these terms. Each program that I found that related to community outreach was recorded in an Excel spreadsheet. In each website I searched through three areas including Education, Community Programs or Events, and the Calendar when these were available. If one or more of the three areas was not listed, I searched through the other sections and recorded the data found on outreach programs. After searching these sections, I then looked at web pages focused on a single outstanding program that served a specific community need if that was available. Then, I looked for the person to contact for the survey that was most closely connected to outreach in the organization. Most often, that was the education director, but outreach directors or coordinators were sometimes listed in the staff directory, in which case they were the recipients of the survey. Finally, I retrieved a copy of the organization's mission statement and a copy of their educational mission statement if

those were available. I then prepared an overview of outreach programs available for the community and schools in an Excel spreadsheet format (see Appendix A).

I followed a systematic process in a thematic review of the mission statements. First, each available mission statement and educational mission statement was copied into a Word document. I then searched through each mission statement, highlighting terms that were repeated several times. I also highlighted terms that were specific to outreach and community. I then compared the highlighted terms across the mission statements in order to determine themes that were most relevant and prevalent. Five themes were evident after a close reading of the available mission statements. The themes were: traditional purposes of arts organizations, acting as a creative stimulant, opening organizational doors to all audiences, providing a community space, and using inquiry based and interdisciplinary methods.

Survey

In order to gain more specific information regarding outreach, one hundred arts organizations were included in the survey portion of this study. Twenty-eight responses were received. These organizations were chosen during my website review. The criteria for inclusion in the survey included the presence of community outreach programs or strategies, a geographical distribution of organizations, and a distribution of content and purpose of organizations. At least one organization was included from each state, with population centers (such as Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York) receiving a greater number of surveys. Most arts organizations were included based on their professional affiliations with either the National Art Education Association (NAEA) or the Alliance of

Artists' Communities (AAC). These affiliations were determined by looking at booklets listing participants from the 2004 NAEA museum pre-conference and by reviewing AAC's website (www.artistcommunities.org). The remaining organizations were located during a state by state search for organizations using the website <http://artcollecting.com/artcenters.htm>, which provides a comprehensive list of non-profit arts organizations in each state.

I included sixty-nine museums, seventeen arts centers, four artists' communities, four artists' communities/ arts centers, one museum/ artists' community, one arts council, one craft center, and three craft schools/ artists' communities in this survey. All of these arts organizations vary in type and purpose. Type and purpose refer to the collection, and/or exhibition types, and the audience that the organization aims to serve. This variance provides a cross-section in my research of how various arts organizations are approaching outreach. Through the survey I addressed questions of a program overview, considerations and barriers to program planning, populations served, collaborations formed, current issues that are addressed, and the benefits to communities through arts organization outreach. These questions were designed to be open-ended and to move from an overview of programs to more specific projects.

I looked at specific areas of outreach through my survey questions (please refer to survey in Appendix B). First, through the survey, I reviewed the types of programs offered that the organizations consider as part of their outreach activities. In addition to the information gathered from the website review, I used this first question to create an overview of strategies employed for community outreach. The second question

examined which types of programs are considered successful and why. This is important in order to gain a sense of what actually *works* in the area of outreach, rather than what simply *exists*. In the third and fourth questions, the elements that arts organizations consider, as well as what they have confronted as barriers in the development of outreach programs, are examined. This area provided me information on the process of program development from the planning to implementation to evaluation stages.

The second half of the survey was designed to look more broadly at community outreach, branching to other areas of arts organizations' work. The fifth and sixth questions related to the actual numbers served through the arts organization, as well as the breakdown of the population included in those numbers. I asked for information on age, interest group, ethnicity, nationality, and gender that they serve or target through their organization's activities. The seventh question asked for the current issues and/or community needs that are addressed through programming, exhibitions, and outreach. Through this question, I examined how community is considered in other areas of organizational work. In addition, I looked for information on current topics of relevance to communities that are addressed through arts organizations' activities. In the eighth question I asked for information on the collaborations that have been formed between the institution and community groups. In addition to looking at successful programs, collaborations are a way to gauge the types of activities and relationships that are successful over long periods of time. I assessed what sectors of communities are being reached, and which are being left out of the collaborative efforts of arts organizations. The ninth question asked for the benefits to community through the organization's

presence. This includes economic, cultural, social, and educational benefits, as well as others that the respondent considered to be of importance. The survey concluded with a request for pamphlets giving further information about the programs mentioned in the survey.

The survey information was collected in a variety of ways. The survey was initially sent via mail with a cover letter explaining my research project. I received responses on the survey form, as well as via email. Two respondents included research conducted by their own institution regarding outreach to supplement the survey responses. In addition, three respondents chose to address the survey questions over the phone with me. In several cases, the survey was passed from the education director or organization director to the staff member that works most closely with outreach programs.

In order to analyze the survey data, I used an Excel spreadsheet comparing responses (see sample in Appendix C). Similar to the website analysis and mission statement analysis, I determined common themes and terms and then tallied responses and programs that were noted in the survey.

Case Study

One arts organization was reviewed as a case study in my research: The John Michael Kohler Arts Center (JMKAC) in Sheboygan, WI. Because of JMKAC's innovative and successful programming used to connect with community members, I chose to explain their outreach strategies more fully. They have developed ways to address community needs through exhibitions, use of space, and programming. JMKAC

staff provided me with a variety of information about their programs. This information is in addition to that which I have gathered through a variety of methods.

In order to present a detailed look at JMKAC's outreach strategies, I analyzed all of the information sources gathered. These sources include a website, program pamphlets, exhibition activity pamphlets, performance flyers, communication from a community participant, and a DVD of a community dance performance. I also included information from an interview with the education director and staff member in charge of the Connecting Communities program, the survey response completed by the education director, two site visits to the arts center, participation in a conference organized by the center, and articles about the center and their programs. I attempted to provide a broad and balanced look at how JMKAC has found ways to address community needs through their organizational activities. While this example cannot be entirely replicable in other organizations, there are broader themes about one organization's methods of community inclusion that can be gained through this case study.

Results

Website Review

In order to gain a broad overview of how arts organizations are serving communities, I reviewed websites. I first narrowed down my choices of which organizations to include in the website analysis, as well as in the survey. This choice was made based on the previously mentioned criteria of geographical distribution, presence of outreach programming, and variation in type and purpose of the organizations. In my review, I included sixty-nine museums, seventeen arts centers, four artists' communities,

four artists' communities/ arts centers, one museum/ artists' community, one arts council, one craft center, and three craft schools/ artists' communities. The review of these results was completed using an Excel worksheet.

The website review was completed between January 28 and February 4, 2005. The accuracy of reporting on the presence of programs is dependent on the information available on the web during that week-long period of time. As each website is maintained regularly, some programs that are actually in existence may not have been present on the web during my review of the site. Likewise, it is possible that some programs listed on a website may be cut in the near future. In addition, as occurs with all web searches, it is likely that I overlooked some information that is buried deep within the pages of information. I am reporting to the best of my abilities on each of these organizations' programs. With those disclaimers in mind, I will move onto an overview of my findings.

To start, my review showed that areas of outreach programming can be broken into three categories: school programs, community programs, and community/ school programs. I have included the hybrid category of school/ community programs as there are many programs listed that served both the school and the community within the same type of programming. Finally, I included an overview of the types of collaborations or partnerships that have been formed between arts organizations and community organizations.

Sixteen different types of school programming are identified in this study. The schools served are primarily K-12, but also include colleges and universities. Eighty of

the organizations listed on-site school tours as part of their outreach programming. Fifty-three of the organizations listed school visits as part of their programming. Three of the organizations listed distance learning in their programs. Twenty-four of organizations offered some sort of financial assistance for schools, including paying for transportation, substitute teachers, entrance fees, or materials. While 58 of the organizations offered some sort of in-service teacher training (either on-site workshops, collaborative curriculum development, teacher institutes, or professional development at the school site), only one organization offered pre-service teacher training. Making resources available is common, as thirty-seven offered online curriculum, forty-six offered in-house curriculum, forty-seven offered multimedia resources, twenty-two offered books to borrow, and eight offered outreach trunks, exhibitions, or boxes. Seventeen of the organizations had an on-site school. Twenty-one offered an after-school program, either on-site, at a local center, or at a school. Sixteen offered programs for paid student workers along with career training, and six offered a student docent program. Thirty-four organized and presented student art exhibitions, while six planned collaborative exhibitions between students and faculty of schools alongside arts organization staff. Last, five had teacher advisory groups.

Nineteen types of community programs are listed on the websites. One of the most common was the family day, which seventy-three of the organizations listed on their websites. Two of the organizations had an ESL program for community members. Forty-six offered an arts or crafts festival or market. Twenty-six offered speaker's bureau talks, which involve sending an organizational representative (usually a docent) off-site

to give a lecture on an arts topic. Seventy-seven offered lectures by academics, artists, staff, or other relevant speakers. Ninety-one offered arts workshops or classes, ranging from afternoon or drop-in art-making experiences to sequential art courses. Twenty-one planned an arts camp for community members. Fifteen offered workshops specifically for parents, either on topics related to parenting, or designed to fit the schedule of a parent with young children. Fourteen included programming designed for cross-community connections. These programs bring together groups of people within the same community that might otherwise not interact. Thirty-five presented symposia, panel discussions, or conferences on relevant topics. Ten offered programs specifically designed for senior populations. Eighteen organized off-site tours, either within the community, to regional arts centers, or, in some cases, international arts tours. Thirty-two of the organizations made their physical space available for rental or for community use free-of-charge. Nineteen had breakfast or lunch break lectures. One offered commercial space for rent within their organizational structure in order to have a blend of outside industry along with their arts offerings. For instance, this organization rents commercial space to a graphic design firm on their complex. Ten presented research on community interactions, or ways in which they have restructured their organization in order to serve their communities more efficiently. One offered equipment rental to the public. One had a community farm used for arts materials, and one participated in historic preservation.

Seventeen school/ community programs are offered throughout these organizations. Fifty offered internships to students and community members, usually

targeting high school to graduate student age ranges. Twenty had programs designed for one-on-one mentorship with students of middle school or high school age. Nineteen offered bilingual programming, while fourteen provided bilingual materials. Seventy-five had a free day, free admission, or free events. These free programs ranged from free admission for county or state residents to free admission for all visitors. Fifty-one created community art exhibitions. Twenty-three had traveling collections, either in single object form, traveling exhibitions, or an outreach collections van. Forty offered artists' residencies that are designed for community arts collaborations. Seventy-one planned arts performances, including literature readings, dance, theater, and music performances, and film events. Twelve had programs for at-risk students, while ten had programs designed for special needs visitors. Fifty-three offered programming that occurs outside of the organizations' walls. Nine had community advisory groups, including student groups, and community groups. Thirteen offered scholarships or financial awards, mainly for students and artists. Forty-two offered after-hours social events. Eleven planned mural projects. Last, twelve designed programs that respond to community problems.

Collaborations with fifteen types of community organizations were present in the organizational websites. Fifty-two formed collaborations or partnerships with K-12 schools. Fifty-six partnered with various arts groups in their area. Twenty-six collaborated with colleges or universities. Thirteen collaborated with libraries. Twenty-one worked with government agencies. Thirty-eight partnered with civic groups, while eighteen partnered with social services groups. Sixteen partnered with neighborhood

associations. Sixteen also partnered with ethnic organizations. Three collaborated with hospitals, and four collaborated with childcare centers. Two partnered with senior care centers, as well as two with religious groups. Three collaborated with ecological groups. Finally, one has formed a partnership with a local newspaper.

Mission Statements

Each available general and/ or educational mission statement was reviewed for general themes and similarities. Five themes were evident after a close reading of the available mission statements, including variations within those themes. The themes were: traditional purposes of arts organizations, acting as a creative stimulant, opening organizational doors to all audiences, providing a community space, and using inquiry based and interdisciplinary methods. As a note, organizations may cross over into several categories through their mission statement.

Traditionally, arts organizations, especially museums, have listed collecting, preserving, researching, and exhibiting as their main purpose and mission (AAM, 1992). These areas were still prevalent in the mission statements of many of the reviewed organizations. While very few solely listed these areas as their entire mission, collecting, preserving, scholarship, exhibition, and interpretation (a subsection of exhibition), were present in many of the mission statements. For instance the Boise Art Museum's mission reads "The Boise Art Museum champions excellence in the visual arts through exhibitions, collections and educational experiences" (www.boiseartmuseum.org). In addition, the notion of an arts organization as a protector of cultural heritage was present in many mission statements. Protecting cultural heritage can be seen as part of the

traditional activities of collecting, preservation, and scholarship. An example is the Museum of New Mexico's mission, of which the Museum of International Folk Art, Museum of Spanish Colonial Art, and the Museum of Indian Arts and Culture are a part. Part of their mission reads, "The Museum of New Mexico serves the people of New Mexico as the primary steward of its cultural heritage while it presents an active forum for changing ideas and concepts" (www.museumofnewmexico.org). Finally, many mission statements listed a goal of leading their audience to a heightened appreciation of the arts through their programs and exhibitions. Art appreciation has long been seen as the outcome of educational activities in arts organizations (Zeller, 1989).

The second theme, acting as a creative stimulant, was more prevalent within arts centers, contemporary art museums, and artist's communities' mission statements. The word "catalyst" was often cited within the goals of these particular statements. In addition, words such as "inspiration" and "stimulation" were used with the sense of the organization existing to promote creative impulse (Anchorage Museum of Art and History, Anderson Ranch and Arts Center, Artpace, Blanton Museum of Art, Cleveland Museum of Art, Intermedia Arts, JMKAC, Massachusetts Museum of Contemporary Art (MASS MoCA), National Museum of Wildlife Art, Santa Fe Art Institute, Scottsdale Center for the Arts, Tacoma Art Museum, Wexner Center for the Arts). Similarly, these types of organizations saw themselves as research laboratories, where new developments in the arts occurred through the programs of the organization. The focus on contemporary and living artists in these organizations privileged the present-day creation

of art, thereby making the notion of creative stimulant in the arts community a valid and relevant goal.

Creating a more open and welcoming environment was strongly present across all types of organizations' mission statements. This focus was seen in the use of phrases such as "public programs have been developed to address the educational needs of diverse populations" (El Museo del Barrio, 2005), "making the Museum accessible to the widest possible audience" (Cleveland Museum of Art, 2005), "art is for everyone" (Detroit Institute of Arts, 2005), and "to design programs that are inclusive of the whole community" (Frist Center for the Arts, 2005). The welcoming environment of arts organizations was present in some mission statements that strive to serve financially disadvantaged students and artists. Several arts centers made it a focus to provide studio space for artists without means to rent such a space (AS220, John Michael Kohler Arts Center, Artpace, MASS MoCA). Additionally, many educational statements listed their commitment to providing free educational services or services to underserved populations within their mission. The term "access" was often quoted while expressing the commitment to provide arts education or studio work space.

The fourth theme was that of the arts organization as a community space. The regional focus of several organizations reflected their desire to act as a community space. The collections of these organizations, such as the Museum of Nebraska Art, which highlights artists from Nebraska, or the Vermont Folklife Center, which focuses on folkways in Vermont, are founded on the artistic creations of the community. The Museum of Nebraska Art's mission states "The Museum continues to enhance the

historical significance of the collection, while taking an active role in the ever unfolding story of the cultural development of Nebraska” (<http://monet.unk.edu/mona/home.html>).

The Vermont Folklife Center defines itself as a “cultural research and public programming organization that ...has amassed a significant body of material documenting the traditional culture of Vermont and the surrounding region”

(<http://www.vermontfolklifecenter.org/>). Many other arts organizations saw themselves as a regional community center as they are the main arts museum, center, etc. in the area. This sense of regional service came through in phrases such as “a cultural center for the community and state” (Anchorage Museum of Art and History, 2005), “the Corcoran is ever mindful of its special obligation to serve the greater Washington region” (Corcoran Museum of Art, 2005), and “The museum serves scholars and students within and beyond the university as a cultural resource for the entire Phoenix metropolitan area” (ASU Art Museum, 2005).

As a community center, many art organizations listed their purpose as bringing people together through the arts or to appreciate art together. The former focuses on the act of interaction, and the latter focuses on the act of interacting with artwork, but in a communal situation. For example, the Tacoma Art Museum’s mission is simply, “Connecting people through art” (<http://www.tacomaartmuseum.org/default.asp>). This is an example of bringing people together through the arts. Another example is the Minneapolis Institute of Art’s mission which states they are “dedicated to national leadership in bringing arts and people together to discover, enjoy, and understand the world’s diverse artistic heritage” (<http://www.artsmia.org/index.cfm>). A similar mission

statement is, “The Plains Art Museum brings people and art together” (<http://www.plainsart.org/index.shtml>). The second two examples highlight communally interacting with art. In both of these purposes, the focus was the communal nature of observing and interacting with art, rather than an individual experience with an artwork.

Similarly, several mission statements cited their purpose as being a forum, platform, or center for dialogue. Some examples are Artpace, which states they are “providing a forum for ongoing dialogue (<http://www.artpace.org/>),” “MASS MoCA is an open platform – a welcoming place that encourages dynamic interchange (<http://massmoca.org/>),” and The Montana Arts Refuge “makes every effort to enhance the artistic and creative expression of the community and provide opportunities for interaction with artists” (<http://www.montanaartistsrefuge.org/index.htm>). All of these roles were focused on the communal act of artmaking, learning, or discussion. Other organizations even listed in their mission that they see themselves as a “community builder” (John Michael Kohler Arts Center, 2005) or as a center for the community. Each organization in these cases was viewing itself as a catalyst for community through the arts. Whether as a platform for interaction, dialogue, or a space that develops community interaction, each of these organizations focused on its role in the community in its mission statements.

Finally, inquiry and interdisciplinarity were present in several mission statements. Inquiry-based teaching methods were found more in educational mission statements, either as a method for instruction, or as an outcome of participation in educational programs. The interdisciplinary nature of some organizations was highlighted in their

mission. For instance, the National Museum of Wildlife Art (2005) stated that “the museum strives to enrich and inspire public appreciation of fine art and humanity's relationship with nature by focusing its exhibitions and programs on wildlife.” Similarly, in the Sitka Center for the Arts website, they state their mission as being “to expand the relationships between art, nature and humanity (2005).” Additionally, several arts centers, by their nature of being an *arts* rather than *art* center, are focused on interdisciplinary programming.

Survey

There were 28 responses to the survey. The majority of the responses were from art museums, with twenty-three respondents, followed by four arts centers, and one artist's community/ arts center. The responses were provided on the paper survey, via email, or through phone interviews. In a few cases, pamphlets were offered in order to give a general response to the programs. In these cases, not all of the answers were completed. Again, the statistical review was done in an Excel worksheet.

The first question was, “Please briefly give an overview of the programs your institution has offered in the past 1-3 years that involved community outreach.” This question provided an overview of outreach programs. Forty different programs were outlined. Twenty organizations offered school programs and five had after-school programs. Seventeen organizations provided cultural programming and fourteen offered festivals. Three had art markets. Four had cross-community programs. Nine had community exhibitions. Three had on-site schools. Eighteen offered family programs. Fourteen provided teacher workshops. Eleven offered curriculum and resource sharing

with teachers and community members. Eight provided traveling collections through exhibitions, boxes, and objects. One provided hospital visits. Six provided community workshops. Ten exhibited student artwork. Three held conferences. Three had community advisory groups. Three put together arts tours. All twenty-eight had partnerships with community organizations. Six had programs for special needs visitors. Five offered artist-residencies. Four actively supported local artists. Twenty-three offered lectures. Thirteen held arts performances. Eleven provided free events. One had community associates which are satellite groups that offer programs using the organizations' resources. Nine had speaker's bureaus that provide lectures for off-site groups. Fourteen provided events in public spaces. One had an art and reading program. Five held art camps. Eight had mentorship programs. Two held public art programs. Two had student docent programs. One organized collaborative exhibits. Six had student work programs. One had a pre-service teacher training program. Three had scholarship programs. Three had financial assistance for transportation. One held senior programs. One offered distance learning. And finally, one provided an English as a second language (ESL) program.

The second question was, "Please describe one of your successful community outreach projects, including why it was successful." Twelve programs were listed in the responses to this question. These programs included community cultural festivals or programs, school and teacher outreach, hospital outreach, an arts conference, speaker's bureau talks, traveling exhibitions or vans, artists' residencies, arts mentorship programs,

high school photo day, a cross-cultural program, a teen docent program, and a collaborative reading program.

The reasons why these programs were successful varied. Most respondents listed several reasons for their program's success. Flexibility, bilingual materials, arts activism training for students, future career opportunity for participants, and breaking down racism were listed once by different organizations as the reason for their respective programs' success. Sixteen organizations listed collaboration with community groups as a reason for success. Nine listed collaboration within their organizations' staffs as a successful component. Five listed stability, and eleven cited the repetition of the program as a reason for success. Six listed cultural relevance of the program as a reason. Eight found that providing a program for a clearly defined audience helped. Three believed that bringing in new visitors made the program successful. Fourteen found that offering art education through the program made it successful. Three believed that the welcoming environment they offered was a reason for success. Two found that a lot of communication between collaborators helped the program. Nine felt that the worthwhile cause behind the program made it successful. Four believed that offering work opportunities for artists made the program work well. Five cited that putting art in public spaces was successful. Community use of the organizations' site space, free programming, and fun programs were listed as reasons for success by two organizations. Five said the trust built during collaboration created a good program. Nine felt their program supported school needs. Four found that their program serves underserved populations. Finally, three listed the presence of long-term goals as a reason for success.

The third question was, “What are some of the elements you consider when designing a community outreach program?” Twenty-five elements of consideration were given by respondents in response to this question. They included: program open to public, publicity, content, input from collaborators, high caliber artists, locally relevant program content, the target audience, purpose, cost, staff, timing, compatible with mission, staff advocacy, a welcoming environment, targeting underserved populations, bringing in new visitors, presentation style, fun factor, what community need is served, if organization’s resources are used, the sustainability of the program, the commitment from partners, the transparency of purpose, and if the program is related to exhibitions.

The fourth question asked, “What are some of the barriers you have come across in reaching out to the community?” The barriers included: inability to offer off-site programs, lack of organization, lack of communication, lack of funding, lack of staff time, program sustainability, museum intimidation, visitor distrust, visitor perception of cost to attend programs, visitor conflicts with timing, money, or other details, transportation, visitors’ misconceptions of organization, unfamiliarity with community organizations, lack of community interest, differing community interests, lack of visitor diversity, lack of collaboration, trying to serve a “unique” need, competing with other local activities, planning with teachers, need for audience research, high turnover of university population, and lack of publicity.

Question five asked, “What groups do you serve in terms of age, interest group, ethnicity, nationality, gender, etc.?” All respondents said they served the general public. Within this, certain groups were targeted for participation. Twelve targeted certain ethnic

groups. Sixteen targeted schools. Three targeted social service groups. Five targeted both senior groups as well as artists. One reached out to labor unions. Four reached out to regional populations. Fourteen organizations targeted youth while two targeted at-risk youth. Three targeted special needs groups. Eight reached out to families. Finally, one organization each targeted gay and lesbian groups, outdoor enthusiasts, and ESL learners.

The sixth question was, “How many people do you serve annually?” The answers to this question vary from specific outreach programs, to outreach programs only, to education programs, and to total population served. The responses giving total numbers served ranged from 53,000 to 1.6 million total visitors served. For those who reported on their education programs, 8,000 to 213,000 people were served. For those who gave the amount reached through outreach programs, 5,000 to 652,000 people were served. Finally, for respondents citing specific programs, 400 to 6500 people were served.

Question seven asked, “What current issues and/ or community needs do you address in your programming, exhibitions, and/ or community outreach programs?” The responses to this question fell into two categories: general needs addressed, and specific issues addressed. In the category of general needs, twelve answers were given. These included: connecting to relevant exhibit themes, offering artmaking experience, offering preventative programs, building self-confidence, fundraising, supporting artists, offering art education in schools, celebrating community, bringing people together, offering access to museums, reaching underserved populations, and offering programming expertise. Specific current issues addressed included: genetic engineering, corporate structures, healthcare, religion, misconceptions about native people, identity, gender and

art, local artists, body issues, drug use, economics, family, ethnic issues, conservation, wildlife, university research, and cultural heritage.

The eighth question asked, “What kinds of collaborations have been created between your institution and community groups?” Eighteen types of groups were listed as collaborative partners with arts organizations. Twenty-four arts organizations formed collaborations with other arts organizations. Twenty-four respondents formed partnerships with K-12 schools. Nine collaborated with youth centers. Ten partnered with ethnic groups. Seventeen partnered with civic groups. Two collaborated with religious groups. Two collaborated with social service organizations. Five partnered with colleges or universities. Six worked with government agencies. Two worked with hospitals. Nine collaborated with artists. Five partnered with neighborhood groups. Three worked with local businesses. Four partnered with libraries. Six partnered with educational advocacy groups. One worked with a military base. Four collaborated with senior groups. Finally, one partnered with ecological organizations.

The ninth, and final, question was, “What are the benefits to the community from the presence and participation of your art institution (economic, cultural, social, educational, etc.)?” Twelve benefits were listed, with most respondents listing several benefits. Ten respondents reported that sharing resources with other groups is a benefit. Fifteen listed reciprocity between organizations as a benefit. Five cited the opening of future possibilities for program participants as a benefit. Twelve listed cross-community and social experiences as a benefit. Five cited economic development through their organizations’ presence as a benefit. Twenty listed that arts exposure aided their visitors.

Seventeen found that offering art education was beneficial. Seven said they opened lines of dialogue through programs. Four felt offering space for events was beneficial. One cited the organization's risk-taking with contemporary art as a benefit. Three saw themselves as a resource for artists. Two stated that they protect and share cultural heritage. Finally, three respondents stated they felt uncomfortable answering as this was really a question to be posed to participating community members.

Case Study

Through my case study of the John Michael Kohler Arts Center (JMKAC), I looked for information on the ways that they are reaching out to community. I researched their organizational and educational mission statements, programs, and exhibitions through a variety of materials (see above) to gain an overview of their outreach and community-focused activities. Through my research, it became clear that JMKAC is an active participant in their local, geographic community, as well as the contemporary folk art, contemporary art, and artist's community fields.

JMKAC serves and participates in their local community through several programs. First, they offer a program titled "Connecting Communities," which is designed to "help unite and strengthen [Sheboygan's] communities" (www.jmkac.org). Sheboygan is a medium sized city of about 50,000 (www.city-data.com/city/Sheboygan-Wisconsin.html) that is comprised of French, German, Dutch, Irish, Lithuanian, English, Hispanic, Hmong and other immigrants (www.sheboygan.org, JMKAC). The native population to the area includes Chippewa, Potawatomi, Ottawa, Winnebago, and Menomine tribes (www.sheboygan.org). These varied communities "felt isolated from

each other, the mainstream, and generations in history (JMKAC),” so JMKAC, along with religious and social service organizations devised programming between national arts groups and the local community to bring people together (www.jmkac.org).

Another program that involves the local community is the Community Gallery (Vihos, 2004a). This gallery is an exhibition space for exhibits that highlight local professional, student, and amateur artists. In addition, the collections of local residents are put on display at various times. The crafts and folk art of various cultural communities or individuals are also put on display in this gallery (Vihos, 2004a). Similarly, exhibitions which highlight regional artists are put on display in the main galleries of JMKAC. Exhibitions displaying the work of artists in the closest counties to JMKAC, or presenting various folk artists of Wisconsin emphasize the artists and artworks that are created in JMKAC’s geographic community are displayed in these galleries.

Other programs that involve the local Sheboygan community include the pre-school that is housed on JMKAC’s premises. The pre-school offers an arts-based program for children ages 3-5. JMKAC offers more traditional educational programming that is open to the local community, such as hands-on workshops, art classes, a summer camp, guided tours, lectures, and symposia (jmkac.org). Finally, JMKAC makes an effort to take part in local festivals, such as the “Brat Days” festival, by offering art activities and information to celebrants (Vihos, 2004a).

JMKAC is also active in the contemporary fine and folk art communities. Their mission statement explains that “A major focus of the program shall be exhibitions

devoted to a wide range of concepts and directions in contemporary art, with particular consideration of craft-related forms, installation works, photography, new genres, ongoing cultural traditions, and the work of self-taught artists” (jmkac.org). The exhibition of works of this nature, as well as articles, website information, and catalogues involve JMKAC in the discussions of the contemporary folk and fine art world. In addition, JMKAC holds conferences relating to topics relevant specifically to folk art. For instance, in 2000 a conference titled “Negotiating Boundaries,” which looked specifically at the works of self-taught artists, brought people in the folk art field from across the nation, and even from other countries, to convene in discussion about the topic at hand.

Finally, JMKAC is an active part of the artists’ community field. They offer a unique program called Arts/Industry. This program allows about 16 artists annually to live and work near Sheboygan in the Kohler Company’s factory space. These artists are able to work in clay, cast iron, or brass to create artwork. JMKAC financially supports the artists, as well as provides the artist with training by factory workers at the Kohler Company. The artists are expected to take part in an educational activity of a lecture, slide talk, workshop, or studio tour during their residency (www.jmkac.org). Through all of these programs, JMKAC demonstrates its commitment to local community, to the contemporary fine and folk art worlds, and to the field of artists’ communities.

Conclusion

The results of my research establish the presence of a commitment to serving community in arts organizations through a variety of types of programming. Through

education, community, and combined programs, there is a pronounced presence of means to serve community needs on varying levels. A review of mission statements reveals a differentiation in methods of serving community as well as levels of commitment to serving community. A discussion of my findings, including a closer look at how the outlined programs serve community needs and the degree to which the commitment to serve community needs exists will be provided in the following chapter. In addition, recommendations for future study and for the field are included in chapter four.

CHAPTER 4: DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

While researching this study's major question, "Are arts organizations serving community needs through outreach? If so, how?," I have found promising results. A trend in arts organizations shows that relational and dialogical space is being created in the work of these organizations. This means that human interaction is privileged over art or object focused activities in programming and, at times, organizational structure. This trend also suggests that the tenets of community cultural development are being incorporated into the work of these arts organizations.

In order to look more closely at evidence of this relational and dialogical space, as well as how community cultural development is being incorporated, I utilize information found in my literature review, program research, survey responses, and mission statement review. First I look at what constitutes that basis of this relational and dialogical space: how it is theorized, and how it is put into practice. Second, I explain how arts organizations are incorporating community cultural development ideas. Then I look at possible reasons behind the incorporation of these elements into arts organizations' programming and structure.

While evidence of the two major trends is apparent in my research, the developments are present at varying levels. I have identified four levels of commitment to serving community through outreach programming. These are maintaining the traditional role of "education through existence," (Zeller, 1989) introducing limited programs that address community needs (usually in a more superficial way), introducing

focused programs that serve community needs more thoroughly, and fourth, organizations that are completely committed to serving community in most areas of their work. My research suggests that commitment to community is less prevalent in art museums than other types of arts organizations, and I propose several reasons for why this occurs.

Elements that are considered when designing outreach programs, along with the barriers to, and reasons for, success in community outreach are discussed in more depth in a separate section of this paper. The survey responses in these areas reveal insights that are important to note in my discussion of community outreach.

Finally, I examine an arts organization that is exemplary in the area of serving community needs. Through a case study, information about the John Michael Kohler Arts Center (JMKAC) reveals that they have successfully integrated community needs into many areas of their organization's programs and structure. I explain how community is integrated into the mission, exhibitions, public programming, and into their artists' residency program at JMKAC.

Creating Space for Human Interaction in Arts Organizations

Defining Dialogical Space

To look more closely at how human interaction is becoming a focus in arts organizations, it is necessary to start by defining the types of spaces that are created to promote these interactions. To begin with, a dialogical space is being opened in arts organizations. Dialogic space is characterized by a focus on discussion of an artwork in order to gain knowledge about it, rather than the transmission of information about

artwork. In a dialogic model, the museum becomes a space not to house and transmit ideas, but to make connections between people and objects through discussion and dialogue.

Carol Jeffers (2003) explains her view of an “alternative museum” where there is a “free and open space that allows for people to construct and contextualize meanings about art through the community-building process of dialogue” (p.115). Jeffers also mentions the importance of “critical and empathic listening” in her dialogical model (p. 117). In comparison, McKay and Monteverde (2003) focus on three types of dialogue where sharing and connecting are the primary activities. These three types of dialogue include an “exchange of observations, memories, and associations with partners, while maintaining a second, internal dialogue,” which is then accompanied by “a third dialogue [which] develops with the work of art itself” (p.40). Finally, Morrissey (2002) supports McKay and Monteverde’s model, by stating that:

Encounters with objects provide an opportunity for dialogue, inquiry and conversation through which individuals find deeper connections not only to the world around them, but to each other as conversations twist around the object, the content, and the thoughts and experiences of each individual. Individuals learn *about* each other while they learn *through* each other. (p. 285, italics in original)

In these dialogical models, personal connections and meaning-making with artwork and between viewers are given priority over other types of interactions.

Dialogical space is theorized and described in art-making practices and art history literature as well. Suzi Gablik (1991) discusses a form of artmaking which incorporates

“reciprocal listening” (p. 110). She quotes Levin as stating that this form of reciprocal listening ““needs to return to the intertwining of self and other, subject and object, for it is there that the roots of communicativeness take hold and thrive”” (p. 110). She calls this form of artmaking “art in the empathic mode,” as it allows participants “to attend to other people’s plights, enter into their emotions, [and] make their conditions our own” (p. 112). This form of artmaking intrinsically requires a dialogue between the maker, the viewers, and the subjects of the work. The dialogue takes place when active listening and sharing take place.

In summary, dialogical space can be thought of as a space in an arts organization that allows for interaction, discussion, and/or personal connection between viewers, between the viewer and the self, between the viewer and the art object, and between the viewer and the artist.

Defining Relational Space

Just as dialogical space needed to be defined, so does relational space. These two go hand in hand, with dialogical space providing a forum for relational space in an arts organization. Relational space is created during and after dialogue is created between people and art objects. In order to facilitate dialogue, people must be brought together. In this bringing together of people, a relational space is created. Again, this space is described and theorized in art, art education, and arts organizations’ literature.

Bourriaud (2002) clearly describes his view of a “*relational* art (an art taking as its theoretical horizon the realm of human interactions and its social context, rather than the assertion of an independent and *private* symbolic space)” (p. 14, italics in original).

In his view, offering a work of art to the public creates an opportunity for interaction, rather than the transmission of academic or institutional knowledge. This opportunity for interaction is the basis for a relational space between object and viewer. He goes on to discuss the interactions or “sociability” of art, especially in terms of exhibition space (p. 16). In the area of exhibitions, interactions are broadened to those viewers that are taking part in the social activity of viewing works of art together. Similarly to Bourriaud, Lacy feels that “all art posits a space between the perceiver of the work, traditionally filled with the art object” (p.35). She continues to state that in this new form of art, the “space is filled with the relationship between artists and audience” forming a dialogue between viewer and artist through the object (p. 35).

Bolin and Blandy (2003) explain that through using a material culture model, objects are allowed a more important role in fostering human interaction. They state that “all human-mediated objects or expressions are worthy of study,” including the everyday objects that people surround themselves with (2003, p. 254). Bolin (2004, 2005) explains his five fundamental ideas about material culture studies in relation to art education. These include the ideas that objects help shape who we are and life stories are associated with objects, that the meaning of an object is often portrayed through a story, and that sensory contact with objects triggers stories. These stories then weave a life for people-shared experience. In Bolin’s model of material culture studies in art education, the basis of interaction with objects comes through stories that are shared which further develop relationships with people. Given that most arts organizations house art objects as a focal

point, stories connected to these objects create a dialogical space, which then fosters a relationship between those that share these stories.

Gablik (1991) and Lacy (1994) go further to discuss forms of artmaking which take into account relational space as part of the process of creation. Gablik discusses communal artmaking processes which move away from the “disembodied eye” of modernist aesthetics to a communal focus on art as “*something we do with others*” (p. 106, italics in original). Whereas artmaking was, and still is in many cases, seen as a solitary, individual, and unresponsive pursuit, she presents the work of artists that give priority to the relationships that form during the artmaking process. Lacy discusses how “creative works can be a representation of or an actual manifestation of relationship” (p. 37). In this relational form of artwork, the audience is factored into the artwork, and often “the relationship *is* the artwork” (italics in original, p. 35). Instead of following the model of artist as an individual maker, this new model allows for collaborative practice in which interactions are prioritized.

A relational model is present in Morrissey’s (2002) discussion of “pathways” between visitors and objects (p. 289). Similar to Bolin, she describes how “Language creates pathways between individuals and objects as it also creates paths that connect people” (p. 289). In other words, the dialogue that is sparked in exhibitions or artmaking processes between people leads to the creation of a relational space in which personal and communal connections can be made. Jeffers (2003), specifically discussing art museums, also contends that opening a dialogical space will promote relational interactions. She states, “the possibility of creating a space for an alternative museum inside the traditional

museum does exist - provided that this is a dialogical space in which dynamic processes of making meaning and building relationships are facilitated in community” (p. 116). Finally, Weil (1998) discusses how constructivist learning in museums is derived from a relational model. He quotes Silverman as saying, ““Often, visitors learn new things through the past experience and knowledge of their companions. Thus ...people create content and meaning in museums through the filter of their interpersonal relationships”” (p. 270).

In summary, a relational space is one that is derived from a dialogical space. Offering the opportunity for interaction with art objects, artmaking, and with other people allows for human connections to take place. A relational space offers people the opportunity to create new relationships, as well as to build on their relationships in order to generate meaning about an art object. In this way, a relational space is both a product and a process of viewing, making, and interpreting art.

Where Are Relational and Dialogical Spaces in Arts Organizations Found?

Now that dialogical and relational space have been defined the question arises, “Where and how are these spaces present in arts organizations?” The presence of dialogical and relational spaces is seen broadly in mission statements, programming, and in fewer cases, in the structuring of the arts organization. The missions that reflect a move to act as a creative stimulant, to open organizational doors to all audiences, to provide a community space, and to use inquiry based teaching methods reflect these new spaces. Several themes in the programs reviewed reflect these spaces, including museum programs serving community needs, offering a welcoming environment, meeting the

needs of underserved populations, offering training for youth, developing contact between disparate groups of people, bringing people together socially or to create, providing a forum for ideas from community, offering gathering space or moving into communal space, reflecting community identity, and by moving physically beyond the museum walls.

Mission statements.

Stephen Weil's (1998) comment that "museums have reformulated their missions entirely in an effort to connect more directly with their visitors and potential visitors" (p. 267) holds true in the themes that were present in mission statements I reviewed. While there is still a strong presence of the traditional, object-focused mission of collecting, preserving, researching, and exhibiting in the arts organizations I researched, there is an equally strong, if not stronger, presence of people-focused missions. The general categories which reflect this change are those that aim to act as a creative stimulant, act as a forum for dialogue, open organizational doors to all audiences, provide a community gathering space, and create a space that reflects and attends to the surrounding region.

The role of a "catalyst," "inspirer," "creative laboratory," or other type of creative stimulant is seen in multiple mission statements (Anchorage Museum of Art and History, Anderson Ranch and Arts Center, Artpace, Blanton Museum of Art, Cleveland Museum of Art, Intermedia Arts, JMKAC, Massachusetts Museum of Contemporary Art (MASS MoCA), National Museum of Wildlife Art, Santa Fe Art Institute, Scottsdale Center for the Arts, Tacoma Art Museum, Wexner Center for the Arts). This role represents a coming together of people with creative ideas who need institutional or organizational

support in order to further their creative impulse. This sort of forum or inspirational mission represents Lacy's (1994) and Gablik's (1991) notion of art as a collaborative endeavor. In this case, the arts organization plays the role of the collaborator and organizer, while the general public, students, or artists come to the organization in order to share the open creative space they offer.

In playing the role of creative stimulant, some organizations also see themselves as a forum for discussion about the arts. JMKAC's "mission is to encourage and support innovative explorations in the arts and to foster an exchange between a national community of artists and a broad public that will help realize the power of the arts to inspire and transform our world" (www.jmkac.org). MASS MoCA sees itself as "an open platform – a welcoming place that encourages dynamic interchange between making and presenting art, between the visual and performing arts, and between our extraordinary historic factory campus and the patrons, workers and tenants who again inhabit it" (www.massmoca.org). Artpace states that "Our programs support the evolution of new ideas in contemporary art and cultivate diverse audiences while providing a forum for ongoing dialogue" (www.artpace.org). Finally, P.S.1 is "dedicated to maintaining an open dialogue around the new ideas presented by contemporary culture" (www.ps1.org). Each of these examples exemplifies the notion of the arts organization as a forum for dialogue, especially through, and in relation to, new and innovative artworks.

Opening doors to all populations and audiences reflects the American Association of Museums' (1992) recommendation to the museum field that a "commitment to serve

the public is clearly stated in every museum's mission and central to every museum's activities" (p. 7). The following are samples of this mission:

We strive to provide programs that are accessible and inclusive (Santa Fe Institute of Art, www.sfai.org/).

The Corcoran is committed to making the historic art in its collections and the emerging art of our time accessible and understandable to the broadest possible audience (Corcoran Museum, www.corcoran.org).

The RISD Museum works with a variety of community partners to develop programs that bring the Museum to diverse communities of Rhode Island (and vice versa) (www.risd.edu/museum.cfm).

The Museum endeavors to serve the widest possible audience (Anchorage Museum of History and Art, www.anchoragemuseum.org).

... The Contemporary Art Center of Virginia emphasizes outreach to a broad and diverse population (www.cacv.org).

In these examples, representative of many mission statements reviewed, the push to open doors and offer opportunities to all people and populations is apparent. By attempting to create a more open and welcoming environment, dialogue and relationships can more successfully be fostered.

Another theme found in mission statements was that of a community gathering place. Intermedia Arts states that they are "a gathering place where the arts engage community members to build connections, locally and globally. ... We create a context in which those multiple perspectives can be understood and ultimately bring people

together” (www.intermediaarts.org). The Tacoma Art Museum has a simple mission statement which is “Connecting people through art” (www.tacomaartmuseum.org). The Honolulu Academy of Arts sees themselves as “a gathering place where members of our community and visitors to our islands enjoy” various programs and events (www.honoluluacademy.org/index.html). Each of these sample mission statements represents Jeffers’ (2002) vision of “the alternative museum” (or arts organization), which is “concerned with the construction of knowledge within a group context” (p. 116). These samples also exemplify Bourriaud’s (2002) notion of the arts as a “*state of encounter*” (p. 15, italics in original). The opportunity for knowledge or an encounter with artwork is also seen as an opportunity for an encounter with other people in these arts organizations.

Finally, many mission statements reflected the sense that the organization, while open to the general public, is focused on serving the regional population surrounding it. In some cases, this purpose is present by the organization being based on a specific population. The Heard Museum’s mission “is to educate the public about the heritage and the living cultures and arts of Native peoples, with an emphasis on the peoples of the Southwest” (www.heard.org). Within this mission, they hold “a deep commitment to the accurate and sensitive interpretation of Native cultures and art” (www.heard.org). Museo del Barrio’s focus “is to present and preserve the art and culture of Puerto Ricans and all Latin Americans in the United States” (www.elmuseo.org). The Museum of Nebraska Art seeks to “tak[e] an active role in the ever unfolding story of the cultural development of Nebraska” (monet.unk.edu/mona/home.html). Each of these arts

organizations acts as a space that promotes dialogue through their collections about the population that they serve and represent.

Other organizations presented the notion that they sought to serve their regional audience specifically, though their collections are not focused on this population. The Noyes Museum of Art's website states that it "is the place in southern New Jersey for people to meet, and explore and enjoy art" (www.noyesmuseum.org, emphasis in original). The Hood Museum states that "As the only institution of its kind in the region, the museum serves as a vital cultural resource for the students, faculty, and staff of Dartmouth College as well as the many rural communities of the Upper Connecticut River Valley of New Hampshire and Vermont" (www.hoodmuseum.dartmouth.edu). The Corcoran Museum explains that "Though proud of its important place in the international world of art history and scholarship, the Corcoran is ever mindful of its special obligation to serve the greater Washington region, especially its artists and its young people" (www.corcoran.org). Similar to the notion of the arts organization as a community gathering place, these examples show that these arts organizations see themselves as a cultural and communal resource for their immediate geographic communities.

Programs.

With a sense of how mission statements reflect relational and dialogical space, the question of how these statements are actually put into practice presents itself. Several themes in the programs reviewed reflect the opening of a dialogical and relational space, including museum programs offering a welcoming environment, serving community

needs - including those of underserved populations, offering apprenticeship or work programs for youth, bringing people together socially, developing relationships between disparate groups of people, providing a forum for ideas from community, offering gathering space or moving into communal space, reflecting community identity, and moving physically beyond the museum walls.

The welcoming attitude that many outreach and community programs adopt is aimed at creating an open, relational space. Alicia Vogl Saenz from the Los Angeles County Museum (LACMA) describes their “Family Sundays” as a successful program simply because they “are friendly, welcoming, and organized” (2004). They support their community relationships by paying to bus people to the museums from schools and community centers, hiring bilingual staff, and greeting the visitors as they exit the bus because they “want the families to feel welcomed and that they belong” (ibid.). These simple actions are often overlooked as the basis of creating a relational space. If museums are aiming to open their doors to new ideas and new visitors, they must first make those doors appealing to walk through. Vogl Saenz explains the simple rule of thumb that makes LACMA a space in which further transformation is ripe to occur: make visitors welcome.

Hiring bilingual staff has also become a method for opening doors to new visitors. In many urban centers in the United States, hiring a Spanish-speaking education staff member or members ensures that more people will be able to enter the dialogical space available for them. Literally in this case, if language is a barrier, no dialogue will occur between individuals and within groups. As a response to this need, museums such as

LACMA, Denver Art Museum, Museum of International Folk Art, and the Getty Museum, among others, have hired bilingual education staff members to open up museum spaces for dialogue to occur.

Fulfilling tangible needs in communities helps provide an open, relational space. For instance, the Getty Museum has developed a program titled “Language through Art: English as a Second Language Enrichment Program,” which is aimed at enriching English acquisition through objects from the museum’s collection. The Getty has identified a need within their community (for community members to learn English), and has created a program that sends museum professionals to work in collaboration with the L.A. unified community adult schools to fulfill that need (Getty Museum, 2004). MASS MoCA is another example of fulfilling tangible community needs, as it was expressly created in order to stimulate the stifled economy in North Adams, Massachusetts. The buildings that once had housed the key industries of North Adams (textile and electronics production), were revamped to create a unique space for large-scale contemporary installation and sculptures, as well as dance, theater, and music performances (MASS MoCA, 2004). The presence of Mass MoCA and the Getty’s programs moves beyond a cultural respite; instead they exist to meet specific needs that have been identified within the community.

Providing opportunity and programming for underserved populations also reflects the creation of a relational space. Several arts organizations direct programming towards senior populations. For instance, The Studio Museum in Harlem provides special tours for seniors. They create a friendly, social environment by offering seating, refreshments,

and creating a program focused on interaction (www.studiomuseum.org). GRACE's (Grass Roots Art and Community Effort) mission "is to discover, develop and promote visual art produced primarily, but not exclusively, by elderly self taught artists in rural Vermont" (www.graceart.org, emphasis in original). To meet this goal, they provide programming to senior centers, mental health centers, and nursing homes. In this way, these organizations are able to reach a population that is often overlooked in programming.

Many arts organizations work to reach underserved or at-risk student populations. Often, art outreach programs are developed in order to offer art to students in schools that would otherwise never receive art education. The George Ohr O'Keefe Art Museum in Biloxi, Mississippi, for instance, has created an alternative school program for students with behavioral problems or disorders to participate in the hands-on learning of pottery and ceramic techniques (Carpenter, 2004). Montalvo Arts Center, similar to many other arts organizations, offers on-site and off-site school tours and educational programs. Though some organizations charge, Montalvo makes it a priority to offer free educational programs to school students. In this way they are able to reach out to underserved populations. They report on their website that they provide "educational experiences for approximately 12,000 students in Santa Clara County annually. Almost half of these students are from under-served communities" (www.villamontalvo.org). Other organizations use collaborations to reach underserved populations. For instance, Joel Tan (2005) reports that the Yerba Buena Arts Center has formed a collaboration with a local Asian American organization in order to better serve that population.

Similar to reaching out to underserved populations, arts organizations are organizing apprenticeship and work programs for at-risk youth. The American Folk Art Museum in New York City has a teen docent program that targets students who are at risk of failing to graduate. This structured work environment opens up the possibility of a new future for many of these students. According to Janet Lo (2004), manager of school and docent programs, many of the participants “have said that without this program and the encouragement of their school staff, they would have been on the street or dead.” This clearly illustrates what Gablik (1991) sees as the power of the arts to save people’s lives. Similarly, the Corcoran Museum offers their ArtReach program. This is a three-tiered program. First, workshops and educational activities are provided in community centers to “Washington's young people, many of whom receive limited exposure to the visual arts through the District's public school system” (www.corcoran.org/education/artreach.htm). Second, they provide a public art apprenticeship program which pairs local public artists with students to create public art projects. In this program, the students receive a stipend along with their training. Finally, the third tier is the mentorship program, in which twelve students receive one-on-one mentoring with local artists. These students are hand-picked based on recommendations from teachers and previous ArtReach teachers. Through the mentoring process, it is hoped that students will have new possibilities opened to them, including the advancement of their artistic skills.

Another way that a relational and dialogical space is opened to arts organization visitors is through social programs. After hours social events have become quite popular

as a means to draw younger populations into the organization. The Ringling Museum of Art offers Cocktails at *Ca d'Zan*, where, for a small fee, the public can enjoy drinks, food, and entertainment (www.ringling.org). The Speed Museum offers a similar after-hours event each month. Their *AfterHours* program is described as “an opportunity for visitors to experience great art and great people, while listening to live music” (www.speedmuseum.org). Community festivals, markets, and fairs are also popular in arts organizations. The Cleveland Museum of Art holds several community festivals each year. These include a mask festival, a cultural festival called “Parade the Circle,” a chalk mural festival, a winter lights festival, and a performing arts festival. Each of these festivals incorporates communal artmaking activities and performances which provide “educational opportunities for families, friends, and community groups” (www.clevelandart.org). Finally artmaking workshops, classes, lectures, symposia, and conferences offered by arts organizations also offer opportunities for gathering that is related to arts based themes. Each of these areas offers groups of people the opportunity to gather socially or professionally, interact, and share a common experience.

Some of the outreach programs researched are designed to bring together disparate populations in order to facilitate relationships between these groups. The Tacoma Art Museum in Tacoma, Washington, for example, developed a program called “Life Experiences: An Intergenerational Art Project,” that uses “the museum’s exhibitions as catalysts for connections between middle school students and senior citizens” (Tacoma Art Museum, 2004). This program was developed to facilitate the “pathways” among participants by encouraging them to “openly and spontaneously

respond to the objects and to each other ... [within] the language of the object and using the lexicon of the objects to connect with each other” (Morrissey, 2002, p. 287). The Scottsdale Center for the Arts offers a program for youth titled “Cultural Connections through the Arts.” The program is designed to bring together groups of students from various backgrounds to create a shared arts project or performance. They state that “The program’s focus on the arts provides a common ground for students who normally would not interact with one another, while providing an important arts education experience” (www.scottsdaleperformingarts.org). The participants in these cross-community programs are able to share their experiences and knowledge through a new creation process in order to form new interactions, dialogue, and hopefully, relationships.

A literal space for dialogue has been created in several arts organizations through community, teacher, and student advisory groups. These groups provide feedback on classes, training, workshops, and other programming offered by arts organizations. The Virginia Museum of Fine Arts has both a teachers’ and teen advisory council. The teachers’ and teens’ advisory councils “involve educators [and students] in developing, piloting, and evaluating educational programs produced by the Museum’s Education and Outreach staff” (www.vmfa.state.va.us/LearnMoreTeachers.html). The Wexner Center for the Arts has a teacher’s advisory council. The purpose of their council is “to discuss and evaluate current and proposed Wexner Center programs for teachers and schools and to generate educational resources” (www.wexarts.org/ed). The Museum of Chinese in the Americas has a student advisory council as well. They formed this council “in 1993 to provide youth with a forum to express their experiences through visual arts, writings,

and oral histories” (www.moca-nyc.org). Each of these councils provides a voice for arts organization participants, as well as creating a space for dialogue and interaction between participants and organizational staff.

A physical relational space is created by the offering of arts organizations’ space for public programs as well as by taking public programming into community space. Many organizations offer their premises for rental purposes, whether for weddings, meetings, conferences, or other events. In most cases, there is a charge associated for the use of the organization’s premises. In some cases, the organization sees the use of their physical space as part of their mission as a community space, and offers use of the space for free. Additionally, many organizations take their programming out into the public. An example of this is the speaker’s bureau program. The Chicago Art Institute offers a program they call ArtExpress. This program offers lectures to businesses through the education department. The business can choose the number of sessions and the time of day they would like to involve their staff, and the Art Institute then provides the speaker, visuals and other materials at these events (www.artic.edu/aic). The Museum of Fine Arts in Houston also offers a speaker’s bureau program. They offer docent-led talks at any Houston-based organization in order to share their resources and knowledge. Other programs offered off-site include after-school programs, library collaborations, public mural projects, and off-site student and community exhibitions (www.mfah.org). Each of these off-site and community space programs provides the opportunity for either creating a physical relational space within the organization, or creating a relationship with other groups by stepping into community space.

Several museum programs have been developed in order to reflect the community in which they are set. These are not solely outreach programs, but also exhibitions and in-house school programs. JMKAC, the Museum of International Folk Art (MOIFA) in Santa Fe, New Mexico, and Michigan State University Museum, to name a few, have developed exhibitions that showcase the culture of their geographic region. JMKAC created an exhibition called “Our Wisconsin Home,” showcasing Wisconsin folk artists; MOIFA developed the “Familia y Fe” exhibit, highlighting Spanish colonial folk arts in New Mexico; and Michigan State University Museum presented “Fiestas de la Fe: Celebrations of Faith,” illustrating the traditions of the Day of the Dead as practiced by Mexican-Americans in south Detroit (Morrissey, 2002). Each of these exhibits provides museum educators the opportunity to strike up dialogue about cultural traditions within a community.

Arts organizations are literally taking the organization to the community through outreach buses, exhibits, classes, sharing of materials, and artist-in-residency programs. The Plains Art Museum in Fargo, North Dakota, developed the “Rolling Plains Art Gallery” in order to reach rural populations in the Plains region with their art objects. The Rolling Plains Art Gallery provides a “comprehensive art experience,” offering “vital access to original visual art [as well as] ...a week-long guest artist residency and a highly-qualified Museum educator” (Plains Art Museum, 2004). Similarly, the Museum of New Mexico offers the “Van of Enchantment” for rural areas in New Mexico. They take objects from the various museums that make up the Museum of New Mexico system to communities that request their presence.

Other programs have been developed in various arts organizations to offset the lack of availability of access to the arts. The Indianapolis Museum of Art, the Cleveland Museum of Art, and the South Dakota Art Museum all offer distance learning programs. Through this program they seek to reach populations that do not have access to their collections, tours, or other programming. Several organizations offer traveling exhibitions. As part of a statewide partnership, the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts is able to offer up to 50 traveling exhibitions each year (www.vmfa.state.va.us). Many organizations offer online curricula to teachers, as well as providing loans of arts resources. For instance, the Blanton Museum of Art offers four comprehensive curriculum packets that are connected to the Texas state standards (TEKS). These packets include, “The Texas Cowboy: Myth and Reality,” “Assembling a Story,” “Learning Empathy through Art,” and “Overcoming Censorship through Art” (www.blantonmuseum.org/index.html). In addition to providing a resource to teachers, these curricula offer ways to create dialogue about important issues through the arts.

Finally, artist-in-residency programs are another way that arts organizations have moved beyond their institutional setting to reach out to the surrounding community. The Montana Artists’ Refuge offers residency space to practicing artists. During the artist’s residency, they request that the artist partake in a community outreach program, which could be a workshop, lecture, studio opening or performance (www.montanaartistsrefuge.org). Penland School of Arts and Crafts offers residencies to practicing artists, alongside its arts and crafts courses. They reach out to their community by offering workshops, residencies with high school students, and teacher training

workshops (www.penland.org). The artists' residencies described above serve both artists and the surrounding geographic communities. These examples of taking the art to the people demonstrate that not only are arts organizations working to create a relational space within their museums and within their immediate communities, they are also reaching to more rural populations that they feel are part of their greater community in order to spark dialogue throughout varied populations.

Community Cultural Development in Arts Organizations

What is Community Cultural Development?

Artwork that privileges human interaction is at the core of community cultural development (CCD) theory and practice. Adams and Goldbard (2002) define CCD as “the work of artist-organizers ...who collaborate with others to express identity, concerns and aspirations through the arts and communications media, while building cultural capacity and contributing to social change” (p. 8). These efforts are focused on creating group change rather than individual change, as studying community intrinsically requires looking at group dynamics. CCD looks toward the building of relationships as a primary product of the art process. The process of CCD relies heavily on an apprenticeship model, utilizing community artists as organizers who then impart their experience and knowledge to new groups of people at varying skill levels. Community cultural development moves beyond interaction and training though, as its practitioners seek social change as an outcome and product. CCD practitioners also focus on culture as their medium, seeking to maintain the principles of equal cultural representation, culture

as a means of expression, culture as a dynamic, rather than static, force, and cultural diversity while creating social change (Adams and Goldbard, 2002).

Where is Community Cultural Development Present in Arts Organizations?

Community cultural development is seen in many areas in arts organizations. Despite comments in CCD literature that “establishment arts institutions [such as museums, arts centers, opera, or theater] focus primarily on bringing new populations into contact with received culture” (Adams and Goldbard, 2001, p.42), it is apparent that the transmission model of sharing the arts is being reconsidered, not only outside arts organizations and institutions, but also within them. This can be seen in the presence of opening doors to all people, conversations about community, reciprocity in community interactions, community art programs, programs that help participants cross cultural and generational borders, and apprenticeship and mentorship models of programming for youth.

Adams and Goldbard (2001) state that one of the key principles to CCD is that “All communities are essentially equal, and society should not promote any one as superior to the other” (p. 19). The previously mentioned directive and policy of opening doors to all people present in many organizational mission statements promotes this same principle. Stating that “art is for everyone” (Detroit Institute of Art, www.dia.org/), or that the Minneapolis Institute of Art is “dedicated to ...bringing arts and people together to discover, enjoy, and understand the world’s diverse artistic heritage (www.artsmia.org/)” encourages an equality and focus on diversity, similar to that of CCD’s commitment to these same ideals.

Conversations about community and CCD are found in arts organizations' programs and literature. In the Alliance for Artists Communities publication *Lessons Learned: Engaging Communities*, the authors not only cite CCD principles and literature, but their outlined "cornerstones" for practice speak directly to CCD principles (Atlas, Brunner, and deNobriga, 2004, p. 16). These cornerstones include "being responsive to community needs," "insuring reciprocity [and] ...a sense of mutuality," "focusing on *with, not for,*" "maintaining a transparency" between partners, "developing a cogent theory of change," and "thinking of engagement as an artform itself that values creativity, collaborative problem-solving, and sustainability" (Atlas, Brunner, and deNobriga, 2004, pps. 17-18, italics in original). Similarly, Intermedia Arts is actively involved in CCD by its participation as a lead member of the Institute for Community Cultural Development (ICCD). Through ICCD, they provide "comprehensive, professional-level training and support for artists of various disciplines and community development workers" (www.intermediaarts.org). This involvement includes fellowships, partnerships, community art events, and holding professional conferences about CCD.

CCD has entered the conversation through the restructuring and research of various arts organizations. The Cleveland Art Museum undertook a three-year research process on community involvement titled *Convening the Community*. They state that "Convening the Community was designed to bring the pleasure and meaning of art to the broadest possible Cleveland audience" (www.clevelandart.org). They go further to state that the conversations about community were focused on bringing in populations to the

museum that historically were not reached by museum activities. They also hoped to “enrich the lives of people in the many different areas of the city” (www.clevelandart.org). Each of these is an example of how conversations regarding community, service to community, and CCD have entered into arts organizations.

Reciprocity, a principle that is not explicitly included in CCD literature, but is implicitly present in discussions of collaboration and participatory practice, is present in several arts organizations’ programs. Artists’ communities make reciprocity with the geographic communities in which they exist a high priority. The Women’s Studio Workshop, for example, has an arts-in-education program in which they collaborate with the local Kingston city schools in New York. Through this program, students of all ages are able to enter into the studio space in order to “provide young artists with an alternative experience beyond the classroom” (www.wsworkshop.org). Similarly, the Vermont Studio Center offers a free summer art program for local children, a community art program for adults and teenagers, and the director of the center offers free art classes in the local school. In the spirit of reciprocity, they share lectures and workshops given by their artists-in-residence to the local public (www.vermontstudiocenter.org). Finally, Arrowmont School of Arts and Crafts offers four weeks of summer arts camp to local students for a nominal fee. These programs are staffed by former participants and teachers that have attended Arrowmont (www.arrowmont.org). Each of these programs takes the resources of the artists’ community, namely first-class studio space, experienced artists and art educators, and high quality materials, and shares them with their local populations to form a reciprocal relationship through art education.

Community art projects organized by arts organizations demonstrate a commitment to community similar to CCD's focus. The Museum of Fine Arts in Houston (MFAH) developed a two-part community program initiative in order to better serve local underserved communities. While this initiative includes exhibitions, media literacy, collaborations, and community advisory groups, its inclusion of a mural program is of great interest in relation to CCD. Through this program, 30 murals have been created so far in city parks by local artists and local children. Each mural is created collaboratively, and "reflects the local community and is inspired by the children's visit to the museum" (murals.mfah.org). According to local Parks and Recreation staff, "As a result of this project, parks were beautified, children and adults took greater pride in their park-based community centers, and HPARD staff reported less graffiti in public parks" (www.mfah.org). Judy Baca (2002) discusses this sort of community pride through mural-making in public parks while reflecting on her many years of experience in this area. She states that these types of public and community art "marked the first step in the development of a unique collective for public space and public identity (p. 112)." MFAH's mural projects, similar to Baca's murals, support the utilization of public space for "civic life" (Baca, 2002, p. 120).

Programs that focus on creating cross-community interaction are also steeped in the principles of CCD. In a discussion between various CCD practitioners, several ideal outcomes are mentioned, including "cultural exchange," "connectivity between people," "create a space for dialogue," and for "people to discover themselves in relation to a community or group" (Adams and Goldbard, 2002, pps. 20-22). The Studio Museum of

Harlem offers a program called “Expanding the Walls.” In this program, 15 youth are chosen to participate in workshops, discussion groups, and outings in order to learn about photography, community history, current community issues, and art history. Through their training, the participants “are able to work effectively with families and elders, and build a dialogue around the ever-evolving notion of community”

(www.studiomuseum.org). They state that “Expanding the Walls is a program that has been conceived to challenge habitual museum education practices by creating an environment where there is a clear exchange of information and an interactive pedagogical process between community and the institution, and between different generations” (www.studiomuseum.org). This is a program that highlights community exchange, growing knowledge about current issues relevant to community, and a means to create dialogue between generations.

The final area to discuss that is relevant to CCD practice is that of youth apprenticeship and mentorship programs. Several of these programs have already been mentioned, including the Corcoran’s “ArtReach,” the Studio Museum of Harlem’s “Expanding the Walls,” and the American Folk Art Museum’s student docent program. Two programs that are also of interest in this area are Indianapolis Museum of Art’s (IMA) “Community Connection” and Yerba Buena Center for the Arts’ (YBCA) “Young Artists at Work.” Community Connection is designed as a student work program for high school students to travel around Indiana giving lectures on various areas of the arts and humanities. They essentially become cultural ambassadors as they first give presentations on an area of culture relevant to the IMA’s collections, and then lead a

hands-on art project related to the subject. IMA's program Community Connection "not only aims to eliminate real and perceived barriers which might exist between the museum and the communities it serves; it also acts as a powerful agent for disseminating accurate cultural and artistic information about global communities" (cc.ima-art.org/). IMA staff see this program as a benefit to participants because they "not only [earn] a paycheck, but actually [engage] in meaningful activities while gaining invaluable human life skills" (cc.ima-art.org).

YBCA's Young Artists at Work also offers a stipend to participants, but focuses more heavily on art-making and activism. In this program, youth of ages 14-19 are recruited to participate in two classes a week, one focusing on either spoken word or public art, and the other focusing on art as activism. As part of the program, participants learn new skills from their course facilitators, create artwork relevant to current issues, and engage in dialogue about how the arts can be, and have been, used in combating health, civil rights, and war issues, among others. Finally, the participants take part in an internship program in which they "partner with various community organizations, including Youth Speaks, Kid Serve, HIFY, and Yerba Buena Center for the Arts, to engage in various projects, such as community arts organizing, serving on a youth advisory board, and facilitating art workshops" (www.ybca.org). Both Community Connection and Youth Artists at Work represent the CCD goal of developing programs "in which the process of conscientization - discovering one's own voice and learning to speak one's own words- emancipates those who experience it, equipping them to enter

the public sphere and take action to realize their ideals” (Adams and Goldbard, 2002, p. 26).

Levels of Commitment to Serving Community Needs through Outreach

While I would love to report that each arts organization I reviewed shows a deep commitment to serving community needs, such is not the case. I have mentioned some of the exemplary programs that exist in community outreach, but there are other organizations and programs that are more minimally committed to community needs. Though categorization is always a somewhat inaccurate activity, I attempt to give a sense of organizations’ commitment to serving community through outreach by description of three levels of commitment. As a note, all of the organizations in this study have shown some sort of commitment to outreach through the listing of their programs on their website, so there should be an assumed level (education through existence) that does not have a commitment to community outreach.

The first level of commitment is based on the traditional museum mission of collecting, preserving, researching and exhibiting. The organizations in this level are object-focused, concerned more with the maintenance and/ or creation of art than with the audiences that interact with art objects. There is the presence of outreach or educational programming, but these are generally focused on a formalist or an art historical view on creation. An example of a mission statement that is representative of this level is “The purpose of the Wichita Art Museum is to collect, preserve, exhibit, interpret and promote the study of American art, and to engage the public in the enjoyment and understanding of America’s artistic heritage and evolving cultural identity”

(www.wichitaartmuseum.org). A brief look the Wichita Art Museum's website shows that they provide school tours, a resource center, a pre-school, a museum in a box program, and online curricula. These programs are helpful in providing some sort of arts access, but the information is based primarily on formalist discussions of the work, rather than attempting to take interactive or constructivist learning models into account.

The Haystack Mountain School of Crafts also falls into this category. They cite their mission as:

Created as a research and studio program in the arts, Haystack's original mission was to teach fine craftsmanship, develop latent or inherent creative ability, and carry on research and development in connection with the crafts. Over the years, the vision was refined to include the investigation of craft in an aesthetic climate, honoring tradition while acknowledging the rich potential of contemporary visual art. People come to Haystack to develop and discover skills, to nurture their creativity, to ask questions, to reassess their work, and to push into the unknown. (www.haystack-mtn.org)

While Haystack works to create a supportive and challenging community within its gates, and offers lectures and an open house to the local community outside its walls, there is little focus on serving community needs. The need to create art is nurtured, but again, in an object-focused way that privileges individual artmaking over community artmaking or outreach programming.

A final example of this category is the Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art. They have no mission present on their website, but in their explanation of the museum

they cite examples of the modern artists and artworks hosted, collected, and promoted through the Wadsworth Atheneum's practice. A review of their educational programming reveals that they offer a Saturday program for children, teacher training, and art history courses. They offer programs to support interdisciplinary curriculum writing for teachers. The description of all these programs is again formalist or based on standard art historical content.

The second level of commitment to serving community through the arts is the most commonly found area. The organizations in this category fall in a middle ground, where they include traditional models of arts programming, but also offer at least one, but usually several, programs that are focused on serving community in an in-depth, and audience focused way. The first example of this category is the Smart Museum of Art. The Smart Museum's mission reads as:

As the art museum of the University of Chicago, the David and Alfred Smart Museum of Art promotes the understanding of the visual arts and their importance to cultural and intellectual history through direct experiences with original works of art and through an interdisciplinary approach to its collections, exhibitions, publications, and programs. These activities support life-long learning among a range of audiences including the university and the broader community.

(smartmuseum.uchicago.edu)

The Smart Museum offers school tours, family programs, lectures, internships, student art exhibitions, advisory councils, and collaborative exhibitions. The programs they offer that are most notable in relation to serving community needs are the advisory council and

collaborative exhibitions. The educational advisory council is comprised of teachers, principals, community affairs staff, students, and art education colleagues. The council provides feedback on programming and organizational questions, making sure that the museum is offering necessary and useful programs. The collaborative exhibition program, titled the Mellon Projects, allows University of Chicago professors and students to work with museum staff to create an art exhibition that demonstrates a topic discussed or researched during a course. This allows for the university community's research to be presented in a visual manner (Terrassa, 2005).

A second example of this category is SITE Santa Fe. They list their mission as “SITE Santa Fe is a private not-for-profit contemporary arts organization committed to enriching the cultural atmosphere in Santa Fe, New Mexico, by providing an ongoing venue for regional, national, and international exhibitions and interdisciplinary programs” (www.sitesantafe.org). Their mission is primarily object-focused, as they see themselves as a venue, providing a community service through their existence. A look at their programs shows that they are engaged in more in-depth service to the community, though. They have student art exhibitions, discussions and “dialogues” about contemporary art, performances, internships, and off-site workshops in schools and community centers. Their educational mission is markedly different from their overall mission, stating that:

The aim of SITE Santa Fe's education program is to make contemporary art accessible to the widest range of audiences within the community. Through various programs and workshops, SITE Santa Fe uses contemporary art to bridge

the gaps between different cultures, socio-economic backgrounds, ethnicities, languages, ages, learning styles, and physical and mental abilities.

(www.sitesantafe.org)

Here the people-centered mission comes into view. One of their notable educational programs is their “Young Curators” program. In this program, middle and high school students organize contemporary art exhibits, learning all of the salient steps of this process, including research, writing, publicity, and other organizational elements. They also engage in discussions around the impact of the artwork they are dealing with, its place in society, and its place in their communities. While learning practical artworld and organizational skills, the participants are also asked to make the artwork they view relevant to their own lives (www.sitesantafe.org)

The third, and final, level of commitment to serving the community through arts outreach is a holistic approach to community. These organizations, a minority of those reviewed, are structured in a manner that promotes community responsiveness, have programs that look critically at community needs, and devote staff and resources to serving community needs. The Heard Museum in Phoenix is an example of an arts organization holistically committed to serving community needs. Their mission reads, “The mission and philosophy of the Heard Museum today is to educate the public about the heritage and the living cultures and arts of Native peoples, with an emphasis on the peoples of the Southwest” (heard.extremezone.com). Their initial commitment to community is the purpose of their museum: to present the heritage and culture of Native peoples, especially as they make an effort to focus on the native peoples in their direct

geographic region. A sampling of programs they offer (which are extensive), include: student art exhibitions, contemporary local Native artist exhibitions, art markets, festivals, critical exhibits about relevant issues (i.e., *Remembering Our Indian School Days: The Boarding School Experience*), outreach lectures, teacher workshops, native basketry and food conference, and curriculum sharing. Gina Laczko (2005), Educational Services Manager at the Heard, considers their “Celebration of Basketry and Native Food” to be a successful program within their other programming. She believes that the event offers contemporary basket weavers the opportunity to see and learn about older baskets, but also for curators to learn about basket weaving from contemporary weavers. She describes the event as an open forum where roundtable discussions and workshops take place all over the grounds, and that staff and visitors are welcome to join in those events. Finally, she comments that “having 200+ Native weavers take over all our public spaces is just a great experience” (Laczko, 2005).

The Heard provides a fine example of an arts organization that is grounded in community through its collections, exhibitions, educational programming, mission, and outreach programming. They are responsive to contemporary artists and relevant current topics, but also focused on providing an historical look at Native artmaking. They provide many programs that support community outreach initiatives in a variety of ways, committing resources and staff from all areas of their museum to the community cause. Finally, the description Laczko gives of the interactions between staff, artists, and visitors describes a space in which dialogue is welcome, and forming relationships is encouraged.

It is worth noting that proportionally, there appears to be a greater focus on community in arts centers than in art museums. Artists' communities are also focused on community, but this vacillates between the community of resident artists and the outside community. A brief look at reasons behind this trend reveals several possibilities. Jacqueline Terrassa (2005) of the Smart Museum noted that the missions of arts centers tend to be more community focused and the structure of arts centers more community driven. Alongside collections or exhibitions that reflect more contemporary and/ or more local artists, these two reasons seem to drive the greater focus on community. In addition, arts centers are more likely to rely on local arts funding (such as state arts commissions, state or city funding, or local foundations) than museums. This results in accountability to local community. Finally, Joel Tan (2005) of the Yerba Buena Arts Center notes that arts institutions, primarily museums, have historically been separated from the general populous, resulting in distrust between community and arts organizations. Arts centers seem to be working more actively in programming to break down these barriers, but as museums are steeped within this tradition, they are harder pressed to erase this distrust.

Reasons behind Dialogical and Relational Space and CCD in Arts Organizations

Why have arts organizations moved towards an open dialogical and relational space that follows CCD principles? Through my research, I have not found exhaustive answers, but have uncovered leads on what is driving this organizational change. These reasons include economic, demographic, and programmatic change. I look more closely at literature and survey responses that attend to these areas.

The lack of funding for the arts is a well-worn theme in the discussions of arts organizations. Stephen Weil (1997) explains how “forty to fifty years into [the 20th century] - the relative positions of the museum and the public will have revolved by a full 180 degrees, [in which] ...the public, not the museum ...occupies the superior position” (p. 257). This change of relationship, from the museum in the superior role to the public in a superior role, was caused in part by money. He mentions that as museums are highly dependent on governmental funding, this also makes them dependent on the public which pays for these lines of funding through taxes. He continues by observing that museums have undertaken the search for varied sources of funding in the event that governmental funds dry up even further. He states that “In its pursuit of earned income, the museum has inevitably ...through increased admissions revenue, and/or the net proceeds from such auxiliary activities as on-site and off-site gift shops, mail order catalogues, restaurants, facilities rental, foreign travel tours, and more ...put themselves into a marketing mode” (Weil, 1997, p.261).

Gaither (1992) seconds this notion by stating that “there exists an implied contract between museums, as tax-exempt entities, and the public, which directly or indirectly supports them. Museums have obligations as both educational and social institutions to participate in and contribute toward the restoration of wholeness in the communities of our country” (p. 58). Speaking of artists’ communities, Wilkerson (2003) mentions that “for self-serving reasons alone,” such as the dependency on a municipality to support their tax-exempt status, “community engagement makes sense” (p. 38). His primary reason for promoting community engagement between artists’ communities and local,

geographic communities are that by acting as a community partner, it makes the sense of community that much stronger. If part of the partnership involves financial dependency and/ or sharing of economic resources, then that is simply part of the community partnership contract.

As funding was a major factor mentioned by survey participants (nine of twenty-eight respondents mentioned that cost was a factor they considered in developing a program, and eleven of twenty-eight respondents mentioned that funding was a barrier to more community programs), in community outreach programming, it stands to reason that economics drive community programming. If a major source of funding is community based, then the community will need to be served as a reciprocal relationship of funder and beneficiary is developed.

A second reason for change is the demographic shift that has occurred in the United States. Gaither (1992) notes this demographic change and its consequences. He states that “As more formerly invisible social groups exercise political expression, public support by virtue of our tax laws will have to become more accountable to and reflective of a broader segment of the public” (p. 57). He goes on to state that “museums can more accurately and sensitively balance the programs they offer so that those programs not only would delight and educate but also would enhance understanding of humanistic and pluralistic values” (p. 58). Ellis (1995) seconds this notion by strongly asserting that “We cannot afford another monument to a small cultural elite that is in no way reflective of the people and times in which they live” (p. 16). *Excellence and Equity* (1992) is the American Association of Museum’s proposal that education and pluralism enter into the

museum world. The second of their three key ideas in this report is that “Museums must become more inclusive places that welcome diverse audiences, but first they should reflect our society’s pluralism in every aspect of their operations and programs” (p. 3). Finally, as has previously been mentioned, a review of mission statements reflects the notion that arts organizations are focusing on opening doors to all audiences, as well as reflecting the pluralist communities of which they are a part.

Each of these areas suggests that the demographic changes that are quickly shifting the United States from a Caucasian majority to a majority of once silenced cultural and ethnic minorities is garnering a response from arts organizations. Whether because of a perceived notion that “We have to do this to save our funding” or because of a true commitment to pluralism, arts organizations are developing programming that is responsive to and reflective of all populations.

Programmatic change, mostly driven by the previously discussed economic and demographic change, alongside ideological developments, is leading to the dialogical, relational and CCD-friendly space in arts organizations. In artists’ communities, the shift, as Wilkerson (2003) puts it, “from insularity, to outreach, to engagement” marks programmatic and ideological change in that field. While artists’ communities are still debating how much can be asked of a resident artist that participates in the community in order to receive precious creative time, there is a strong belief in partaking in the local, geographic community. Wilkerson notes that many responses to a recent survey on artists’ communities and outreach insisted that “being part of the local community was essential to the character of a residency program” (p. 39). He goes on to state that “most

[artists' communities] are trying to utilize outreach programs as they should be - for the mutual benefit of the organization itself and for those in the community who partake of programmed events" (ibid.). Of these mutual benefits, it is seen that the local community receives access to the arts, art education, and interaction with real artists. In addition, the local attraction of artists' communities and the residents that stay there, alongside taxes paid by the artists' community, provide economic benefits. For the artists' community, they are able to act as an advocate for the arts, promoting the understanding of their purpose (supporting artmaking) through outreach programs. They are also able to facilitate community artmaking when a resident requests such an activity. Finally, the sustainability of the local community benefits the artists' community so that they have a geographic space in which to thrive and interact (Atlas, Brunner, and deNobriga, 2004).

Many museums have made a shift in educational programming. Specifically, education has become a fundamental element in the functioning of an art museum. This is seen most clearly in *Excellence and Equity* (1992), in which the authors list their first key idea as "The commitment to education as central to museum's public service must be clearly expressed in every museum's mission and pivotal to every museum's activities" (AAM, p. 3). Ellis (1995) states that "Museum staff are forming new relationships with their communities. Education is receiving a new look. No longer the orphan child in countless museums, education is increasingly regarded as a natural part of the museum's mission" (p. 14). Survey responses also suggested that education is of foremost importance in programming. Fourteen of the twenty-eight respondents cited that the reason for the success of a specific outreach program was that it provides art education to

the community. In addition, in mentioning the benefits to community, seventeen responses stated that art education was a major benefit to the community through the presence of the arts organization. As education is the home base for most outreach programming in museums, it stands to reason that a focus on education, especially to underserved populations, would result in community outreach programming.

Designing Programs, Barriers to Programming, and Reasons for Success

The information provided in the survey responses regarding the elements considered when designing an outreach program, barriers to outreach programming, and the reasons for success of outreach programs are significant. While I have outlined a listing of these responses, I feel it is important to look more closely at these responses.

What is Considered When Designing an Outreach Program?

Many elements are considered by arts organizations when designing outreach programs. These elements most often mentioned include staff, timing, cost, purpose, compatibility with mission, content, target audience, input from collaborators, and serving community needs.

Staff, timing, cost, purpose or content, target audience and compatibility with mission seem to form a core base of considerations for several organizations. Patricia Price (2004) mentions the core considerations at the Museum of Spanish Colonial Art's are "content of materials, target audience, age of group, time allotment, cost of program, available staff and volunteers." Gina Laczko (2005) at the Heard states their core considerations as "'fit' with museum mission, budget, and staff." Marjorie Williams (2005) of the Cleveland Art Museum, mentions target audience, serving the museum's

mission, type of financial support, and the type of partnerships that will be utilized and developed through the program. Finally, Amy Goicochea (2004), reports that the National Museum of Wildlife Art considers time of year, mission statement, exhibition content, and other programs being offered to the community. These six elements fit into place in many organizations (along with other considerations of course) to form a base of ideas from which to spring in program development.

Collaboration and partnerships are of great importance to nine of the respondents in designing programs. Aurelia Gomez (2005) of the Museum of International Folk Art, mentions that “input from all of the organizing components” is foremost in developing a community outreach program. Linda Jane Austen (2004) of the Scottsdale Center for the Arts, states that “Developing a solid working relationship with partners, building trust and confidence from the outset. ...Determine partner’s needs through consultation and collaboration and design programs to fit those needs.” Heather Nielsen (2004) describes an “emphasis on collaboration” in designing programs at the Denver Art Museum. She states that:

We are striving for the qualities of partnership in all our programs. Currently the Education department refers to all our outreach programs as “community partnerships.” We try and [sic.] have several brainstorm meetings with potential partners to discuss both our needs.

Majia McNight (2005) of the Tacoma Art Museum offers that “consideration of potential partners that you can work together although your missions may be different” is

important. She continues by stating that “sustaining the relationship beyond the program” is also important in designing a program.

Finally, serving community needs is seen by thirteen respondents as fundamental to designing an outreach program. Lisa Hastreiter-Lamb (2004) at the University of Arizona Art Museum lists several questions she poses about a program while it is being developed. These include: “Who is our audience? What are their needs? What can we do to meet those needs?” Susan Casebeer (2004) also poses questions about her programs at the Anderson Ranch Arts Center. She includes: “What audience will be served? ...What is the benefit to the community?” Susan Badder (2005) echoes this theme by stating that “response to an expressed need (Listen!)” is an element that she considers at the Corcoran in her programming. Jacqueline Terrassa (2005) also considers community needs in programming. She and her staff at the Smart Museum of Art utilize community and student advisory groups in order to gauge the needs of those populations before designing programs. Finally Katherine Carpenter (2004) states that “the needs of the community, the interests of the community, the benefits our program will provide for the community” are all elements she considers in programming at the George Ohr O’Keefe Museum.

Barriers to Outreach

Barriers to programming include inability to offer off-site programs, lack of organization, lack of communication, lack of funding, lack of staff time, program sustainability, museum intimidation, visitor distrust, visitor perception of cost to attend programs, visitor conflicts, transportation, visitors’ misconceptions of organization,

unfamiliarity with community organizations, lack of community interest, differing community interests, lack of visitor diversity, lack of collaboration, trying to serve a “unique” need, competing with other local activities, planning with teachers, need for audience research, high turnover of university population, and lack of publicity. Of these, lack of funding (eleven respondents), visitors’ misconceptions (5 respondents), visitors’ conflicts (five respondents), and visitor mistrust or museum intimidation (8 respondents) were the most often cited barriers to creating community outreach programs.

The lack of funding for outreach programs reflects the lack of funding in the arts and education in general, and is not a surprising barrier to the formation of community outreach programming. Lack of funding and lack of staff time go hand in hand as a barrier to creating outreach. Respondents cited the difficulties of working in a “one-person department” (Fey, 2004), or handling the lack of funding given “government cuts and economic climate” (Ben-Haim, 2004). Linda Jane Austen (2004) mentions that “funding and manpower are always at the top of the barrier list.” Additionally, one respondent (2004) mentions that “funding is always a crucial part of any program and it is always challenging to secure funding in the current economic environment.” Through these responses, it is evident that the lack of funding to staff these programs, as well as the current economic environment in the arts, are negatively affecting community outreach programming.

Visitors’ misconceptions indicate that some organizations are in need of bettering their communication with community members about what their organization is and what

they offer. Cass Fey (2004) of the Center for Creative Photography mentions that she finds it “necessary to educate students about what a museum does and what the museum experience is like.” Similarly, Jacqueline Terrassa (2005) of the Smart Museum states that they need to “communicat[e] what we do and who we are” to potential visitors. Ted Lind of the Cincinnati Art Museum (2005) has observed that “the community often doesn’t know about the varied ways that the museum’s resources are used for learning.” Finally, Sandra Ben-Haim (2004) of the Plains Art Museum corroborates these ideas in her observation that there are “misunderstandings about the value of viewing, discussing, and producing original works of art” as well as “misunderstandings about the function of a museum.” These responses reflect the importance of communicating the purpose of the organization to potential visitors and community participants in order to give a clearer idea of what they will be involved in if taking part in community outreach. The responses also point out that arts organizations are finding that lack of understanding about the functioning and purpose of their organization gets in the way of bringing in new populations.

Visitor conflicts indicate that further research is necessary to understand how organizations can fit in with the needs of the community in a way that is complementary to community members’ lives. Mary Erbach (2004) of the Art Institute of Chicago mentions that visitor conflicts are considered when planning family programming. In addition, as much of their community base they are seeking to serve relies on public transportation, she sees the cuts in transportation as causing problems for those that want to commute to the museum. Amy Goicoechea(2004) at the National Museum of

Wildlife Art reports that since they are in a major tourist location (Jackson Hole, Wyoming), they often find that “the numbers of exciting programs offered in Jackson Hole provides ample competition” and creates a conflict for visitors who must choose between a hike, a day spent skiing, or a day at the museum. In these cases, understanding the potential conflicts, or competing activities as Goicoechea puts it, helps the organizations better serve community needs.

Finally, visitor mistrust or intimidation is seen by several organizations as a barrier to outreach programming. Joel Tan of Yerba Buena Center for the Arts sees a primary barrier in the “distrust that historically arts organizations have rightfully earned” (2005). He observes that many arts organizations are “detached from community” so there is a lack of trust between community members and the organization (2005). Laura Christensen (2004), of MASS MoCA, states that “some people, especially adults, seem to have preconceived negative notions about contemporary art and therefore do not like to come. We work hard to overcome this problem.” Alicia Vogl Saenz (2004) of LACMA, comments that:

Our biggest obstacle is that museums are an intimidating place to many people.

People that have never been don't know what to expect, think that they have to have prior knowledge to come, and think it won't be 'fun.' For some adults, they might have had a negative experience at a museum as a child and are intimidated.

Another respondent mentioned that they have observed that “people are ‘shy’ to participate because they do not think they are capable” (2005). Finally, Susan Casebeer (2004) of the Anderson Ranch Arts Center states that a barrier for their organization is

the “intimidation factor: students can be ‘scared’ of the Ranch [because of] its national reputation.” Each of these elements of fear, intimidation, and ingrained distrust results in a barrier to opening the doors of outreach to new groups. Strategies are being employed to overcome this barrier, as mentioned previously, but this barrier remains prevalent in arts organizations.

Success Stories

Why do some programs succeed while others fall to the wayside? This question was addressed thoughtfully by the responding organizations. While it is important to note that the context of one organization will not translate to the context of another, meaning that what works for one may not work for the next, there are some general themes of what functions well that are worth mentioning. Frequently cited reasons for success include that the program is designed to collaborate with the community, the program repeats, the program has a specific audience, and the program offers art education - especially to underserved schools.

Sixteen of twenty-eight respondents replied that a major reason for their successful programs is that they are able to collaborate with other organizations. When discussing the success of sequential programs in the Smart Museum, Jacqueline Terrassa (2005) mentions that “the good working partnership” keeps the program thriving. Aurelia Gomez (2005), of the Museum of International Folk Art, mentions that their *Día de los Muertos* “collaborative program has a solid structure, which is open and flexible, allowing both individuals and organizations to participate in any way they feel is appropriate.” Susan Badder (2004) of the Corcoran mentions that their Public Art

Apprenticeship program works because “Not only has this evolved over the past seven years through an increasingly sophisticated number of public art collaborations... but the students are truly learning, and the program is now thoroughly endorsed by the community.” Collaboration within the organization, meaning that several departments are working together to create a program, also has been cited as a reason for success in programming. Heather Nielsen (2004) of the Denver Art Museum states that their annual powwow and Dia de los Niños programs are successful because they “have become institutionalized. ...the Education department is no longer in charge of the project, but has made sure that other departments are involved in the outreach effort.” Each of these responses highlights the importance of collaboration in outreach programming success.

Repeating programs several times is either explicitly stated as a reason for success, or implicit in discussion of programs by ten respondents. Aurelia Gomez (2005) mentions the success of a program in its “3rd collaborative year.” Linda Jane Austen (2004) cites the success of a program that has been running for fourteen seasons. Susan Casebeer (2005) discusses an artist residency in the schools program that has evolved enough to allow for stronger connections with the school district and to prove the importance of art in the schools to the point where the Anderson Ranch is lessening its involvement as a full-time art specialist will be hired by the district. Each of these examples, alongside others, display the importance of testing a program, solving details, and deepening collaboration, activities which can only develop fully over the long-term.

Designating a specific audience was seen by eight of the respondents as being a help in creating a successful program. Patricia Price (2004) explained how their outreach

program to the Santa Fe schools is successful because it is “an important complement to New Mexico history taught in 4th and 7th grade.” Designing outreach or educational programs around the standards and curriculum mandated by the state is one way that arts organizations make their educational programming more relevant to specific age levels. Cass Fey (2004) describes a successful program that she developed specifically for high school photo students. She states the annual photo day and high school photo exhibit “is particularly successful because it is packed with incentive for the students/instructors and it works nicely into sharing of the Center’s collections and resources.” Janet Lo (2004), in explaining the success of the student docent program at the American Museum of Folk Art, states that they look specifically for “students [that] are at high risk of not graduating. Most of the students have very challenging home lives.” Whether the audience is chosen because of educational goals, because of a lack of the opportunity for art education, or in order to fill a need - these statements show that many programs succeed because of knowing exactly who is being targeted for a specific program.

Fourteen respondents thought that offering art education helps in a program’s success, and nine respondents see that through their programs they are successfully serving school needs. These two areas should be coupled, because often the offering of art education takes place in a school setting. For instance, Katherine Carpenter (2004) of the George Ohr O’Keefe Museum explains that their “Where’s George?” outreach program successfully integrates lesson plans with school subject areas. She goes on to mention that “Many elementary schools here do not have art classes because funding is so low - our program provides a way for teachers and children to learn about art and

experience it for free.” Kate Green (2005) of Artpace describes their high school art education outreach and residency program as being successful. This program partners an artwork, artists, and students to work on skills represented in the artwork. Artpace specifically looks to offer students the opportunity to “reflect on their own lives;” they look “at the artist’s purpose and [apply] it to their own lives.” The Smart Museum has a school partnership that provides sequential programming in the schools. Jacqueline Terrassa (2005) explains that 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade classes in the immediate area around the Smart are chosen to have classes within the museum and outside of the museum.

Successful art education opportunities are not limited to outreach to students.

Sandra Ben-Haim (2004) explains that The Rolling Plains Art Gallery is

The Plains Art Museum’s signature outreach program - helps fill the gap in access to arts and arts education programs in rural communities. ...Since 1993, this traveling exhibition and art education program ...[has] enrich[ed] the lives of more than 150,000 people. Feedback from the communities we have visited in the past has been overwhelmingly positive, with many return visits requested.

Though no other respondent listed their traveling collections as a successful program, the opportunity provided through traveling vans, collections, boxes, etc. certainly enhance art education in communities without much access to such prospects. In addition, the multitude of hands-on art projects, workshops, artist-residencies and classes offered through arts organizations help fill the void in art education in many communities.

Case Study of John Michael Kohler Arts Center

The John Michael Kohler Arts Center (JMKAC) in Sheboygan, WI, is an example of a community-focused organization that offers a variety of community responsive programs. Community responsiveness is found within JMKAC's structure, mission, exhibitions, community programs, and through their residency program. In order to give an overview of JMKAC, I draw on site visits, publications, their website, publicity materials, an interview, a survey response from the education curator, communication with community members, and a DVD of a dance performance that took place on their site.

JMKAC is organized to invite participation from community members. Their collections and exhibitions focus on the areas of "contemporary art, with particular consideration of craft-related forms, installation works, photography, new genres, ongoing cultural traditions, and the work of self-taught artists" (www.jmkac.org, JMKAC). Within their mission, an emphasis on community is present. They state that their "mission is to encourage and support innovative explorations in the arts and to foster an exchange between a national community of artists and a broad public that will help realize the power of the arts to inspire and transform our world" (*ibid.*). In listing the roles that they see themselves in, an emphasis on the contemporary art community ("laboratory for the creation of new works") and an emphasis on geographic community ("community builder") are evident (*ibid.*). This emphasis on community is also present in the specific educational goals and goals for their Connecting Communities and Arts/

Industry programs. From the foundation of the organization - the mission statement - the focus on several communities is present.

In the area of exhibitions, efforts are made to include community. For instance, JMKAC includes a community gallery. This gallery is reserved for twice yearly call-for-entries exhibitions that allow for artists of all levels from local community, international artists, members, students, and the general public to participate in an exhibition centered on a core idea (Vihos, 2004). During a site visit in 2004, I was able to view an exhibit of homemade games. People from the local community created board games, trivia games, and aesthetic games or loaned vintage games for the exhibition titled "It's Your Move." This exhibition was located in the community gallery, which is run by the education department. Lisa Vihos mentioned that "one of our big ways of connecting with community is through the community gallery" (2004). Vihos added that "those shows bring in a lot of people who wouldn't normally come to the art center" because either they, their friends, or their family have made artwork that is included in the exhibit. Other themes for exhibitions have been shoes, birthday cakes, and double self-portraits (JMKAC pamphlets). In addition, there is an annual Youth Art Month exhibition held in the gallery to showcase student artwork, an annual pre-school art show from the work made in the on-site school, and an annual show of a local collector's artwork (ibid.; Vihos, 2004). Laurie Stensland (2004) mentioned that the local collector shows are "another way of reaching the community" as Sheboygan is a small town, so it is likely that many people will know the collector who is highlighted in the exhibition. She continued, saying the exhibits "showcas[e] something special in the community" (ibid).

Within the rest of the exhibition space, exhibits are created that reflect the artistic population of the local area. In 2000, an exhibition was on display called “Our Wisconsin Home,” which highlighted artwork by self-taught artists in Wisconsin. Part of the purpose of this exhibit was to highlight the region’s artists, as well as to help create a reflection of the population of Wisconsin. At the time of writing this thesis an exhibit titled “Eight Counties: The Eleventh Triennial Exhibition” was on display. The exhibition information stated that “as the name suggests, the exhibition is comprised of works by artists from the region – Sheboygan, Brown, Calumet, Fond du Lac, Manitowoc, Milwaukee, Ozaukee, and Washington Counties” (www.jmkac.org; JMKAC). Through the community galleries and community-focused exhibitions, a sense of comfort and accessibility is created in the space of JMKAC (Stensland, 2004; Vihos, 2004).

There are two programs that are a major focus for JMKAC that are community driven. The first is their on-site preschool. The pre school is open to the community, though members’ children do receive priority in signing up for the program (Vihos, 2004, www.jmkac.org). Vihos mentioned that the pre-school, since it is part of an arts center, has an arts-based curriculum (ibid.). The website information states that “The program integrates language, math, science, and social studies under the umbrella of the arts and gives children opportunities to explore a concept from many perspectives—building students’ critical thinking and problem-solving skills and providing a solid foundation for future learning” (www.jmkac.org). Opening the doors of the center to the public through serving the educational needs of children offers an opportunity for relationships to form

between family members and staff, as well as for dialogue to begin at an early age about artwork through being on-site at the center.

The highlight of JMKAC's community programming is the Connecting Communities program. According to one JMKAC pamphlet the Connecting Communities program:

Evolved because cultural communities in the Sheboygan area felt isolated from each other, the mainstream, and from generations in history. These communities came to JMKAC with the hope that it could help in providing a place for people to come together.

The goal of Connecting Communities is to build a community through the arts. The program gives people an opportunity to work with outstanding artists to create original work, to reach out to people who would not otherwise have access to artists, to bring communities together socially through the arts, and to give artists a new experience - such as interdisciplinary and community-based work.

(JMKAC)

An example of this program is the Chair City project that occurred in 2001. This project invited the public of Sheboygan to participate in workshops with artists Tom Uebelherr and Kristin Thielking. During the workshops, JMKAC staff, the artists, and community members worked together to decorate and create one-of-a-kind chairs. Additionally, special partnerships with the Hmong Mutual Assistance Association, the Hispanic Advancement Council, Project Youth, St. Andrew Lutheran Church, and other partners worked more closely during special workshops. The project culminated with

community-wide exhibitions of the chairs. Participants were invited to submit their chair for selection for an exhibition (indoors and outdoors) at JMKAC. Organizations in Sheboygan offered to place chairs in front of public buildings, stores, or private organizations. Finally, individuals were invited to place their chairs at their residence, either on the lawn, on the roof, or in another public location.

Connecting Communities is designed to make connections, both with other community members, but also with a nationally known practicing artist or arts group, and with artmaking itself. A local columnist, Sherri Byrand (2002), saw Connecting Communities as “Art for Community’s Sake.” She continued, observing that “boy can we use this approach to help us find a way to communicate what is in our hearts, to expand our horizons, and to connect with others” (ibid.). Stensland mentioned that in organizing Connecting Communities activities “we try to keep as many ways as possible to get people involved” (2004). As they are offering an entry into artmaking in a communal setting, Stensland and Vihos (2004) noted that it is important to keep the setting comfortable. Vihos mentioned that they find it important to have the community members be the experts, and not just the visiting artist or arts group in order to facilitate a level of comfort in a an area that is possibly far removed from everyday activity.

Some projects are designed to incorporate the lived experiences of community members, not just through informal conversation, but more formally through inclusion of stories in the final art product. In the April 2004 dance performance “Raising the Roof,” “some of what forms the sound collage were interviews with German, Hmong, and Hispanic people who had come to Sheboygan at very different times” (Vihos, 2004). The

use of personal stories as the soundtrack behind the dance gives greater importance to the community members' personal experiences, especially because the piece was "about building community in Sheboygan" (Stensland, 2004; Vihos, 2004).

Response to this program has been very hopeful. One of the participants in the "Raising the Roof" program (a local carpenter) stated that:

I want to thank you for what has been one of the most rewarding experiences of my life. I have become more aware and appreciative of all the arts have to offer. Having the opportunity to "perform" on stage with the professional dancers and the many other talented diverse casts from our community is something I will never forget. Even though I am quite an amateur. My life seems more fulfilled and purposeful because of what you have done for me. My family also will be a regular patron of the Arts Center, and will take part in many of the excellent classes you offer. (JMKAC, unpublished)

This response shows that the goal of connecting with new people through the arts, at least in the "Raising the Roof" project, has been achieved.

Apart from these two programs - the pre-school and Connecting Communities - JMKAC offers more traditional community programs. They offer artists' lectures, panel discussions, symposia, conferences, family days, and opening celebrations for new exhibitions. In addition, JMKAC staff takes part in local festivals, setting up workshop stands at the local bratfest, or other festivals (Vihos, 2004). Stensland (2004) noted that even within these more traditional activities, the education department "is all about making everything more accessible ...[and] allowing people to interact with the work."

The final program, located off-site from JMKAC, that offers interaction for another community, is the Arts/Industry residency program. According to JMKAC's website,

Arts/Industry is undoubtedly the most unusual ongoing collaboration between art and industry in the United States. Conceived and administered by the John Michael Kohler Arts Center of Sheboygan, Wisconsin, the program makes industrial technologies and facilities available to artists through long-term residencies, short-term workshops, tours, and other programming so that they may further their artistic explorations. (www.jmkac.org)

JMKAC provides an opportunity to about 16 artists annually to work in the Kohler Company's factory space (designed to create plumbingware), and create iron, brass, or clay artwork using the industrial space and equipment available. All participants in the program are asked to give one day of their two to six month long residency for an educational program. This could include a slide talk, workshop, or visit to the artist's studio space (www.jmkac.org).

The residency is designed to offer an exchange of information between factory workers and the artist in residence. Lynne Shumow (1994) states that when the artist and factory workers are side by side in the factory, "There's ...a rich exchange for both the artists and the employees" (p. 5). She continued by observing that "It's very enriching for the artist to learn from those people who have great expertise. ...some of [the workers] have been there 20 or 30 years. So the artist can get a lot of insight and

knowledge about these particular processes. For the people in the factory, it's interesting to see the materials being used in a different way" (ibid).

Each of these programs and organizational elements at JMKAC highlights a focus on creating opportunity for dialogue, relationships, and community cultural development. Opportunity for dialogue is opened through the various types of programming. Connecting Communities is a good example of Morrissey's idea that "Encounters with objects [and artmaking] provide an opportunity for dialogue, inquiry, and conversation, through which individuals find deeper connections not only to the world around them, but to each other" (p. 258, 2002). Jeffers' (2003) call for "the free and open space that allows for people to construct and contextualize meanings about art through the community-building process of dialogue," is answered in JMKAC's programming, which highlights dialogue and community-building (Stensland, 2004; Vihos, 2004). Finally, the relational nature of JMKAC programming, from workshops to Connecting Communities to the Arts/Industry program is pronounced. Certainly, Gablik's (1991) vision of art "*as something we do with others*" is exemplified in these programs (p. 106, italics in original).

The foundations of community cultural development are present in JMKAC's programs as well, especially the Connecting Communities program. There is a presence of "community artists' who collaborate with others to express identity, concerns, and aspirations through the arts ...while building cultural capacity" (Adams and Goldbard, 2002, p. 8). As stated previously in the description of Connecting Communities, one of the goals is to provide the opportunity for artists to participate in "community-based

work” (JMKAC, 2004). Adams and Goldbard (2001) also state that “A tenet of community cultural development practice has been to demand public space, support and recognition for the right of excluded communities to assert their place in cultural life” (p. 20). Through public exhibitions, both on-site at JMKAC, and in public space, the use of community members’ voices through interviews, and through the focused inclusion of groups that were previously alienated from each other, JMKAC attends to the goals of allowing space and recognition for excluded communities.

Recommendations

While there are multiple programs in existence in arts organizations that are clearly supporting community needs, it is clear that more work needs to be done in order to make these organizations truly relevant and useful to a broad public. The following are recommendations for the field of areas in which development could take place. These are drawn from all of the material I have collected, alongside personal experiences with arts organizations.

First, it seems that while there is a presence of programs specifically designed for particular cultural communities, this area is lacking. If arts organizations want to open their doors to a more diverse, pluralist population that truly reflects the communities surrounding them, programming needs to take place that specifically invites these groups to participate. Examples previously discussed which can be used as models are LACMA’s offer of transportation to their Hispanic constituencies, the Getty’s ESL through art program, JMKAC’s Connecting Communities program, or the Plains Art Museum’s Rolling Plains Gallery van. Considering that a significant percentage of the

survey respondents noted that intimidation was a barrier to outreach programming, it follows logic that there needs to be an extensive effort to help excluded communities take part in arts organizations' programs. While planning these programs, it is important to keep Brown's (1992) advice in mind. She notes that while planning programming for diverse audiences, that they should not be considered in a generic way, but as members of larger community groups (such as family groups, peer groups, educational communities, and neighborhood and workplace groups). She says there is "no validity in programming for the homogeneous Latino community or a singular African-American community, because no such animals exist" (1992, p. 8). She also cautions against the "flavor-of-the-month syndrome" in which one community is targeted for one event, or one month of the year (p. 5). Instead, she recommends considering outreach that is year-round and more inclusive of broader groupings of individuals.

Second, while it is important for students to be provided with art education opportunities, it appears that many organizations are serving only school aged groups. As arts organizations are not fundamentally tied to schools, they should consider their public more broadly. Workshops, classes, lectures, and symposia allow for adult learning and interaction, but what about more frequent outreach activities? Speaker's bureaus, which offer outreach to adult organizations similar to school outreach, artmaking activities that are designed for all ages, mentoring projects such as the Corcoran's Artreach program, or cross-generational programs like the Tacoma Art Museum's Life Experiences would allow for cross-generational projects that don't leave adult learners out of the opportunity for new experiences through the arts.

Finally, it seems that there is a lack of programs that focus on critical or current issues. Most often, the content of the programming available is focused on neutral areas such as formal study of art, acquiring new skills, or looking through an uncritical art historical lens. As arts organizations move toward further inclusion of community members, it will become a more pressing need to address deeper topics of importance. Models of this type of critical inclusion include the Yerba Buena Center for the Arts Young Artists art and activism program, the American Folk Art Museum's student docent program, or the Heard Museum's multiple programs involving community and addressing community issues.

Implications for Further Study

There are several ways that this project could benefit from continued or expanded study. First, in order to gain a more comprehensive representative sample of if and how community outreach is taking place in arts organizations, more organizations need to be reviewed and surveyed. The information given by the twenty-eight survey respondents is very beneficial, but to gain a broader view of community outreach through the arts, further input is needed.

Second, in order to gain an idea of what the benefits of outreach programming are, participants need to be surveyed, preferably several times during a 5-10 year period to gauge impact of the programs. Lisa Vihos and others echo this sentiment in their response to question nine of the survey ("What are the benefits to the community from the presence and participation of your art institution (economic, cultural, social, educational, etc.?)."). Vihos states that "I think the best answer would come from the

community partners” (2004). I agree. In order to measure benefits, those who take part in programming are the best judges of the impact of an outreach program.

Third, it would be beneficial to have the opportunity to engage in more site visits. During site visits, programs that may not be listed on either the website or in survey responses could be discovered. In addition, programs that are listed as having significant impact on the community could be observed for signs of their real impact. While public information may list the extent of a program, or the diverse group of participants, reality may differ. In addition, a program that was listed peripherally may be found to have a truly representative sample of community members, or may have impact in its process that can't be portrayed through written information.

Fourth, conducting further interviews to follow up on survey responses would allow me the opportunity to clarify questions or gain further information about intriguing responses. The interviews that I conducted to complete surveys were helpful as I was able to probe further about successful programs, barriers, or other topics covered in the survey. With more interviews, I would be able to offer more information about successful programs or barriers that could benefit the arts community interested in outreach programming.

Conclusion

Relational and dialogical space in arts organizations' outreach programs have created an opportunity for models envisioned for the future to take their place in the artworld of today. Bastos' (1998) vision of a change-oriented community-based art education as “an educational project committed to raising students' critical consciousness

through the study of locally-produced art” is present in the JMKAC, SPARC, Museum of Fine Arts in Houston, and other arts organizations (p. 73). Weil’s (1997) describes a “museum of the near future [which] ...would make available *to* the community, and *for* the community’s purposes, its profound expertise at telling stories, at eliciting emotion, at triggering memories, at stirring imagination, [and] at prompting discovery” (p.260, italics in original). Through the programs discussed above, and others still unmentioned, it appears that Weil’s vision for the future museum has arrived. Trend’s (1997) support of more “interdisciplinary” and “postmodern hybrid organizations [which] offer great promise for the development of democratic activism” are apparent in programs such as Yerba Buena Center for the Arts’ Young Artists program and the Corcoran’s Artreach program. While these successful models exist, the larger goal of creating democratization and serving community needs through the arts is still on rising to its feet in community outreach programs. Though not all organizations have reached the democratic goals outlined in community cultural development practice, the move toward such opportunities has begun. While these changes continue, it is worthwhile for arts organizations to aim for outreach programming that “respects specificity without erasing global considerations, and provides new spaces for collaborative work engaged in productive social change” (Giroux, 1995, p. 13).

WEBSITE SPREADSHEETS

APPENDIX A

School Programs

	<i>Geographic Location</i>	<i>Survey received? (email, paper, phone)</i>	<i>Type of organization</i>
ABC Museum (pseudonym)		Yes, email	Museum
American Folk Art Museum	New York	Yes, email	Museum
American Visionary Art Museum	Maryland		Museum
Anchorage Museum of History and Art	Alaska		Museum
Anderson Ranch Arts Center	Colorado	Yes, paper	Arts Center/ Artist's Community
Appalachian Center for Craft	Tennessee		Arts Center
Arkansas Arts Center	Arkansas		Arts Center
Arna Bontemps Museum	Louisiana		Museum
Arrowmont School of Arts & Crafts	Tennessee		Craft School/ Artist's Community
Art Museum of Missoula	Montana		Museum
Artpace	Texas	Yes, phone	Arts Center/ Artist's Community
AS220	Rhode Island		Arts Center
Asheville Art Museum	North Carolina		Museum
ASU Art Museum	Arizona		Museum
Birmingham Museum of Art	Alabama		Museum
Blanton Museum of Art	Texas		Museum
Boise Art Museum	Idaho	Yes, paper	Museum
Center for Creative Photography	Arizona	Yes, email	Arts Center
Cincinnati Art Museum	Ohio	Yes, paper	Museum
Cleveland Museum of Art	Ohio		Museum
Contemporary Art Center of Virginia	Virginia		Arts Center
Denver Art Museum	Colorado	Yes, email	Museum
Des Moines Art Center	Iowa		Arts Center
Detroit Institute of Art	Michigan		Museum
Eric Carle Museum of Picture Book Art	Massachusetts		Museum
Frist Center for the Arts	Tennessee		Arts Center
Galeria de la Raza	California		Arts Center
GRACE	Vermont		Arts Center
Haystack Mountain School of Crafts	Maine		Craft School/ Artist's Community
Heard Museum	Arizona	Yes, paper	Museum
High Museum of Art	Georgia		Museum
Honolulu Academy for the Arts	Hawaii	Yes, paper	Museum
Hood Museum of Art	New Hampshire		Museum
Indianapolis Museum of Art	Indiana		Museum
Intermedia Arts	Minnesota		Arts Center
J. Paul Getty Museum	California	Yes, paper	Museum
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	Wisconsin	Yes, paper	Arts Center
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	California	Yes, paper	Museum
MASS MoCA	Massachusetts	Yes, paper	Museum
McKissick Museum	South Carolina		Museum
Memphis Brooks Museum of Art	Tennessee		Museum
Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum	Illinois		Museum
Mexic-Arte Museum	Texas		Museum
Milwaukee Art Museum	Wisconsin		Museum
Minneapolis Institute of Art	Minnesota		Museum
Montalvo	California		Arts Center
Monterey Museum of Art	California		Museum
Museo del Barrio	New York		Museum

	Mission Statement	Education Mission Statement	School tours on site	School visits	Distance Learning	Financial assistance (buses, subs, etc.)
ABC Museum (pseudonym)	x	x		x		
American Folk Art Museum						
American Visionary Art Museum	x	x	x			
Anchorage Museum of History and Art	x		x			
Anderson Ranch Arts Center	x					
Appalachian Center for Craft	x		x	x		
Arkansas Arts Center	x	x	x	x		
Ama Bontemps Museum	x					
Arrowmont School of Arts & Crafts				x		
Art Museum of Missoula	x		x	x		
Artpace	x		x	x		
AS220	x			x		
Asheville Art Museum			x			x
ASU Art Museum	x		x	x		x
Birmingham Museum of Art			x	x		
Blanton Museum of Art	x		x			
Boise Art Museum	x		x	x		x
Center for Creative Photography			x	x		x
Cincinnati Art Museum			x			
Cleveland Museum of Art	x		x	x	x	
Contemporary Art Center of Virginia	x		x			x
Denver Art Museum						
Des Moines Art Center		x		x		
Detroit Institute of Art	x		x	x		
Eric Carle Museum of Picture Book Art	x		x	x		
Frist Center for the Arts	x	x				x
Galeria de la Raza	x					
GRACE	x					
Haystack Mountain School of Crafts	x		x	x		
Heard Museum	x	x	x	x		x
High Museum of Art			x			x
Honolulu Academy for the Arts	x		x	x		
Hood Museum of Art	x		x			
Indianapolis Museum of Art	x		x	x	x	x
Intermedia Arts	x	x	x	x		
J. Paul Getty Museum	x		x			
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	x		x	x		x
Los Angeles County Museum of Art		x	x	x		x
MASS MoCA	x		x	x		
McKissick Museum	x		x			
Memphis Brooks Museum of Art	x		x	x		x
Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum						
Mexic-Arte Museum	x	x	x	x		
Milwaukee Art Museum			x			
Minneapolis Institute of Art	x		x	x		
Montalvo	x	x	x			
Monterey Museum of Art	x	x				
Museo del Barrio	x		x	x		

	<i>Pre-service teacher training</i>	<i>In-service teacher training</i>	<i>Online curricula</i>	<i>In-ho use curricula</i>	<i>Teacher resources multimedia</i>
ABC Museum (pseudonym)		x			
American Folk Art Museum					
American Visionary Art Museum			x		
Anchorage Museum of History and Art					x
Anderson Ranch Arts Center					
Appalachian Center for Craft					
Arkansas Arts Center		x	x		x
Arna Bontemps Museum					
Arrowmont School of Arts & Crafts					
Art Museum of Missoula					
Artpace		x		x	
AS220					
Asheville Art Museum				x	x
ASU Art Museum		x	x		
Birmingham Museum of Art		x	x	x	
Blanton Museum of Art		x	x		x
Boise Art Museum		x	x	x	x
Center for Creative Photography		x	x		x
Cincinnati Art Museum			x		
Cleveland Museum of Art		x	x	x	x
Contemporary Art Center of Virginia		x		x	
Denver Art Museum					
Des Moines Art Center		x			
Detroit Institute of Art		x	x		x
Eric Carle Museum of Picture Book Art		x			
Frist Center for the Arts		x	x	x	x
Galeria de la Raza					
GRACE					
Haystack Mountain School of Crafts					
Heard Museum		x	x	x	x
High Museum of Art		x	x	x	x
Honolulu Academy for the Arts		x		x	x
Hood Museum of Art		x		x	x
Indianapolis Museum of Art					
Intermedia Arts					
J. Paul Getty Museum		x	x	x	x
John Michael Kohler Arts Center		x			x
Los Angeles County Museum of Art		x	x	x	x
MASS MoCA		x	x	x	
McKissick Museum				x	x
Memphis Brooks Museum of Art				x	x
Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum					
Mexic-Arte Museum					
Milwaukee Art Museum		x	x	x	x
Minneapolis Institute of Art		x	x	x	x
Montalvo		x			
Monterey Museum of Art					
Museo del Barrio		x		x	x

	<i>Teacher resource books</i>	<i>Teacher resource boxes/ trunks</i>	<i>After-school program</i>	<i>On-site school</i>	<i>Student docents</i>
ABC Museum (pseudonym)					
American Folk Art Museum					
American Visionary Art Museum					
Anchorage Museum of History and Art					
Anderson Ranch Arts Center					
Appalachian Center for Craft				x	
Arkansas Arts Center				x	
Arna Bontemps Museum			x		
Arrowmont School of Arts & Crafts				x	
Art Museum of Missoula					
Artpace			x		
AS220					
Asheville Art Museum	x		x		
ASU Art Museum					
Birmingham Museum of Art				x	
Blanton Museum of Art	x				x
Boise Art Museum	x				
Center for Creative Photography					
Cincinnati Art Museum					
Cleveland Museum of Art	x				
Contemporary Art Center of Virginia				x	
Denver Art Museum			x		
Des Moines Art Center			x		
Detroit Institute of Art					
Eric Carle Museum of Picture Book Art					
Frist Center for the Arts	x				
Galería de la Raza			x		
GRACE					
Haystack Mountain School of Crafts				x	
Heard Museum		x			
High Museum of Art					
Honolulu Academy for the Arts	x	x		x	
Hood Museum of Art					x
Indianapolis Museum of Art					x
Intermedia Arts			x		
J. Paul Getty Museum					
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	x		x	x	
Los Angeles County Museum of Art			x		
MASS MoCA			x		
McKissick Museum	x				
Memphis Brooks Museum of Art			x		
Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum					
Mexic-Arte Museum			x		x
Milwaukee Art Museum	x				
Minneapolis Institute of Art					
Montalvo					
Monterey Museum of Art					
Museo del Barrio					

	<i>Career training/ Student workers</i>	<i>Student art exhibitions</i>	<i>Teacher advisory group</i>	<i>Collaborative Exhibition</i>
ABC Museum (pseudonym)		x		
American Folk Art Museum				
American Visionary Art Museum				
Anchorage Museum of History and Art				
Anderson Ranch Arts Center				
Appalachian Center for Craft		x		
Arkansas Arts Center				
Arna Bontemps Museum				
Arrowmont School of Arts & Crafts		x		
Art Museum of Missoula				
Artpace	x	x		
AS220	x	x		
Asheville Art Museum		x		
ASU Art Museum		x		x
Birmingham Museum of Art	x	x		
Blanton Museum of Art	x			
Boise Art Museum			x	
Center for Creative Photography		x		
Cincinnati Art Museum				
Cleveland Museum of Art			x	
Contemporary Art Center of Virginia		x		
Denver Art Museum	x			
Des Moines Art Center				
Detroit Institute of Art				
Eric Carle Museum of Picture Book Art				
Frist Center for the Arts		x		
Galeria de la Raza	x	x		
GRACE				
Haystack Mountain School of Crafts		x		
Heard Museum		x		
High Museum of Art				
Honolulu Academy of Art				
Hood Museum of Art	x	x		x
Indianapolis Museum of Art	x			
Intermedia Arts		x		
J. Paul Getty Museum				
John Michael Kohler Arts Center		x		
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	x	x		
MASS MoCA				
McKissick Museum				
Memphis Brooks Museum of Art		x		
Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum				
Mexic-Arte Museum	x	x		
Milwaukee Art Museum				
Minneapolis Institute of Art				
Montalvo				
Monterey Museum of Art				
Museo del Barrio				

	Geographic Location	Survey received? (email, paper, phone)	Type of organization
Museum in the Community	West Virginia		Museum
Museum of Chinese in the Americas	New York		Museum
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	Texas	Yes, email	Museum
Museum of Indian Arts and Culture	New Mexico		Museum
Museum of International Folk Art	New Mexico	Yes, paper	Museum
Museum of Nebraska Art	Nebraska		Museum
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art	New Mexico	Yes, paper	Museum
National Museum of Wildlife Art	Wyoming	Yes, paper	Museum
Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art	Kansas		Museum
Nevada Museum of Art	Nevada		Museum
New Orleans Museum of Art	Louisiana		Museum
North Carolina Museum of Art	North Carolina		Museum
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art	Mississippi	Yes, email	Museum
P.S. 1 Contemporary Arts Center	New York		Arts Center
Penland School of Crafts	North Carolina		Craft School/ Artist's Community
Philbrook Museum of Art	Oklahoma		Museum
Plains Art Museum*	North Dakota	Yes, paper	Museum
Portland Art Museum, Maine	Maine		Museum
Portland Art Museum, OR	Oregon		Museum
Ringling Museum of Art	Florida		Museum
Santa Fe Art Institute	New Mexico		Artist's Community
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	Arizona	Yes, paper	Arts Center
Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art	Arizona		Museum
Seattle Art Museum	Washington		Museum
Site Santa Fe	New Mexico		Arts Center
Sitka Center for Art and Ecology	Oregon		Artist's Community
Smart Museum of Art	Illinois	Yes, phone	Museum
South Dakota Art Museum	South Dakota		Museum
SPARC	California		Arts Center
Speed Art Museum	Kentucky		Museum
Studio Museum of Harlem	New York		Museum
Tacoma Art Museum	Washington	Yes, email	Museum
The Art Institute of Chicago	Illinois	Yes, paper	Museum
The Corcoran Museum of Art	Washington, D.C.	Yes, email and paper	Museum
The Mattress Factory	Pennsylvania		Arts Center/ Artist's Community
The Metropolitan Museum of Art	New York		Museum
The Montana Artists Refuge	Montana		Artist's Community
The Noyes Museum of Art	New Jersey		Museum
The RISD Museum	Rhode Island		Museum
UCLA Fowler Museum	California		Museum
University of Arizona Museum of Art	Arizona	Yes, paper	Museum
University of Wyoming Art Museum	Wyoming		Museum
Utah Arts Council Folk Arts Program	Utah		Arts Council
Vermont Folklife Center	Vermont		Arts Center
Vermont Studio Center	Vermont		Artist's Community
Virginia Museum of Fine Arts	Virginia		Museum
Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art	Connecticut	Yes, paper	Museum
Walker Art Center	Minnesota		Arts Center
Wexner Center for the Arts	Ohio		Arts Center
Wichita Art Museum	Kansas		Museum
Women's Studio Workshop	New York		Artist's Community
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts	California	Yes, phone	Arts Center
Grand Totals			

	Mission Statement	Mission Education Statement	School tours on site	School visits	Distance Learning	Financial assistance (buses, subs, etc.)
Museum in the Community	x					
Museum of Chinese in the Americas	x		x			
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	x		x	x		
Museum of Indian Arts and Culture	x		x	x		x
Museum of International Folk Art	x		x	x		x
Museum of Nebraska Art			x			
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art	x		x	x		
National Museum of Wildlife Art	x	x	x	x		
Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art			x	x		
Nevada Museum of Art	x		x			x
New Orleans Museum of Art	x		x	x		
North Carolina Museum of Art			x			
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art	x		x	x		
P.S. 1 Contemporary Arts Center	x	x	x			x
Penland School of Crafts	x			x		
Philbrook Museum of Art			x			x
Plains Art Museum*	x		x	x		
Portland Art Museum, Maine	x		x			
Portland Art Museum, OR	x		x	x		
Ringling Museum of Art			x			
Santa Fe Art Institute	x		x	x		
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	x	x	x			
Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art	x		x	x		
Seattle Art Museum			x			x
Site Santa Fe	x		x	x		
Sitka Center for Art and Ecology	x					
Smart Museum of Art	x		x	x		
South Dakota Art Museum	x		x		x	
SPARC			x	x		
Speed Art Museum	x		x			x
Studio Museum of Harlem	x		x			
Tacoma Art Museum	x		x	x		
The Art Institute of Chicago			x			
The Corcoran Museum of Art	x		x			
The Mattress Factory	x	x	x	x		
The Metropolitan Museum of Art			x	x		x
The Montana Artists Refuge	x	x				
The Noyes Museum of Art	x		x	x		
The RISD Museum	x		x	x		
UCLA Fowler Museum	x	x	x			x
University of Arizona Museum of Art			x	x		
University of Wyoming Art Museum	x		x	x		x
Utah Arts Council Folk Arts Program	x		x			
Vermont Folklife Center	x					
Vermont Studio Center	x			x		
Virginia Museum of Fine Arts			x	x		
Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art			x			
Walker Art Center	x					
Wexner Center for the Arts	x		x	x		x
Wichita Art Museum	x		x			
Women's Studio Workshop	x		x			
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts			x			x
Grand Totals	75	17	80	53	3	24

	<i>Pre-service teacher training</i>	<i>In-service teacher training</i>	<i>Online curricula</i>	<i>In-house curricula</i>	<i>Teacher resources multimedia</i>
Museum in the Community					
Museum of Chinese in the Americas			x		x
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston		x	x	x	x
Museum of Indian Arts and Culture		x		x	
Museum of International Folk Art		x	x	x	
Museum of Nebraska Art			x		
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art					
National Museum of Wildlife Art		x	x		
Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art		x		x	x
Nevada Museum of Art		x			
New Orleans Museum of Art		x			
North Carolina Museum of Art		x	x	x	x
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art		x	x	x	
P.S. 1 Contemporary Arts Center					
Penland School of Crafts		x			
Philbrook Museum of Art			x		x
Plains Art Museum*		x			
Portland Art Museum, Maine		x		x	x
Portland Art Museum, OR					x
Ringling Museum of Art		x	x		x
Santa Fe Art Institute					x
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	x			x	
Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art		x	x		
Seattle Art Museum		x	x	x	x
Site Santa Fe					
Sitka Center for Art and Ecology		x			
Smart Museum of Art		x	x	x	
South Dakota Art Museum				x	x
SPARC		x	x	x	x
Speed Art Museum		x	x	x	x
Studio Museum of Harlem		x		x	
Tacoma Art Museum			x	x	x
The Art Institute of Chicago		x			x
The Corcoran Museum of Art		x		x	x
The Mattress Factory		x		x	x
The Metropolitan Museum of Art		x		x	x
The Montana Artists Refuge					
The Noyes Museum of Art		x		x	x
The RISD Museum		x	x	x	x
UCLA Fowler Museum		x		x	x
University of Arizona Museum of Art					
University of Wyoming Art Museum					
Utah Arts Council Folk Arts Program			x		
Vermont Folklife Center		x		x	x
Vermont Studio Center					
Virginia Museum of Fine Arts		x	x	x	x
Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art		x		x	x
Walker Art Center					
Wexner Center for the Arts		x		x	x
Wichita Art Museum			x	x	x
Women's Studio Workshop				x	
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts		x			
Grand Totals	1	58	37	46	47

	Teacher resource books	Teacher resource boxes/ trunks	After-school program	On site school	Student docents
Museum in the Community					
Museum of Chinese in the Americas		x			
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	x			x	
Museum of Indian Arts and Culture					
Museum of International Folk Art	x		x		
Museum of Nebraska Art					
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art					
National Museum of Wildlife Art		x			
Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art	x				
Nevada Museum of Art			x	x	
New Orleans Museum of Art					
North Carolina Museum of Art	x				
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art					
P.S. 1 Contemporary Arts Center					
Penland School of Crafts				x	
Philbrook Museum of Art	x				
Plains Art Museum*		x	x		
Portland Art Museum, Maine					
Portland Art Museum, OR		x			
Ringling Museum of Art					
Santa Fe Art Institute			x		
Scottsdale Center for the Arts			x		
Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art					
Seattle Art Museum	x	x			
Site Santa Fe			x		
Sitka Center for Art and Ecology					
Smart Museum of Art					x
South Dakota Art Museum					
SPARC				x	
Speed Art Museum		x			
Studio Museum of Harlem			x		x
Tacoma Art Museum	x				
The Art Institute of Chicago	x		x	x	
The Corcoran Museum of Art				x	
The Mattress Factory	x				
The Metropolitan Museum of Art	x				
The Montana Artists Refuge					
The Noyes Museum of Art					
The RISD Museum					
UCLA Fowler Museum					
University of Arizona Museum of Art					
University of Wyoming Art Museum					
Utah Arts Council Folk Arts Program					
Vermont Folklife Center				x	
Vermont Studio Center					
Virginia Museum of Fine Arts	x		x	x	
Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art					
Walker Art Center					
Wexner Center for the Arts	x				
Wichita Art Museum	x				
Women's Studio Workshop				x	
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts					
Grand Totals	22	8	21	17	6

	<i>Student workers</i>	<i>Student art exhibitions</i>	<i>Teacher advisory group</i>	<i>Collaborative Exhibition</i>
Museum in the Community		x		x
Museum of Chinese in the Americas				x
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston				
Museum of Indian Arts and Culture				
Museum of International Folk Art	x	x		
Museum of Nebraska Art				
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art				
National Museum of Wildlife Art		x		
Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art				
Nevada Museum of Art				
New Orleans Museum of Art		x		
North Carolina Museum of Art		x		
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art		x		
P.S. 1 Contemporary Arts Center				
Penland School of Crafts				
Philbrook Museum of Art				
Plains Art Museum*		x		
Portland Art Museum, Maine		x		
Portland Art Museum, OR				
Ringling Museum of Art				
Santa Fe Art Institute		x		
Scottsdale Center for the Arts				
Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art				
Seattle Art Museum				
Site Santa Fe		x		x
Sitka Center for Art and Ecology				
Smart Museum of Art	x	x	x	x
South Dakota Art Museum				
SPARC	x			
Speed Art Museum				
Studio Museum of Harlem				
Tacoma Art Museum				
The Art Institute of Chicago				
The Corcoran Museum of Art	x	x		
The Mattress Factory	x			
The Metropolitan Museum of Art				
The Montana Artists Refuge				
The Noyes Museum of Art		x		
The RISD Museum				
UCLA Fowler Museum				
University of Arizona Museum of Art				
University of Wyoming Art Museum		x		
Utah Arts Council Folk Arts Program				
Vermont Folklife Center				
Vermont Studio Center				
Virginia Museum of Fine Arts			x	
Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art				
Walker Art Center				
Wexner Center for the Arts			x	
Wichita Art Museum				
Women's Studio Workshop				
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts	x			
Grand Totals	15	34	5	6

WEBSITE SPREADSHEETS

Community Programs

	Family Day	ESL program	Art/ craft fair, festival, or market	Bureau/ Site visits	Speaker's	Lectures	Art classes/ workshops	CaTP
ABC Museum (pseudonym)	x			x			x	x
American Folk Art Museum	x					x	x	
American Visionary Art Museum	x		x				x	
Anchorage Museum of History and Art			x			x	x	
Anderson Ranch Arts Center						x	x	
Appalachian Center for Craft	x		x				x	
Arkansas Arts Center	x			x		x	x	
Arna Bontemps Museum			x					
Arrowmont School of Arts & Crafts							x	x
Art Museum of Missoula	x		x	x			x	
Artpace	x		x			x	x	
AS220				x			x	
Asheville Art Museum	x					x	x	x
ASU Art Museum	x		x			x	x	
Birmingham Museum of Art	x		x	x		x	x	x
Blanton Museum of Art	x					x	x	
Boise Art Museum	x		x			x	x	
Center for Creative Photography				x		x	x	
Cincinnati Art Museum	x					x	x	
Cleveland Museum of Art	x		x	x		x	x	
Contemporary Art Center of Virginia	x		x				x	x
Denver Art Museum	x					x	x	x
Des Moines Art Center	x					x	x	
Detroit Institute of Art	x		x	x		x	x	
Eric Carle Museum of Picture Book Art				x		x	x	
Frist Center for the Arts	x	x		x		x	x	x
Galería de la Raza	x						x	
GRACE							x	
Haystack Mountain School of Crafts			x			x	x	
Heard Museum	x		x	x		x	x	
High Museum of Art	x					x	x	
Honolulu Academy of Art	x					x	x	
Hood Museum of Art	x					x	x	
Indianapolis Museum of Art	x		x	x			x	
Intermedia Arts						x	x	x
J. Paul Getty Museum	x	x	x			x	x	
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	x		x			x	x	
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	x					x	x	x
MASS MoCA	x		x			x	x	
McKissick Museum						x		
Memphis Brooks Museum of Art	x			x		x	x	
Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum								
Mexic-Arte Museum			x			x	x	
Milwaukee Art Museum	x					x	x	
Minneapolis Institute of Art	x					x	x	
Montalvo						x	x	x
Monterey Museum of Art								
Museo del Barrio	x		x	x		x	x	

	Parent workshops/ Programs	Cross- community connections	Symposial conferences/ Panel	Senior Programs	Organized arts tours off-site
ABC Museum (pseudonym)		x			x
American Folk Art Museum	x				
American Visionary Art Museum					
Anchorage Museum of History and Art			x		
Anderson Ranch Arts Center					
Appalachian Center for Craft					
Arkansas Arts Center			x		
Arna Bontemps Museum			x		
Arrowmont School of Arts & Crafts					
Art Museum of Missoula			x		
Artpace			x		
AS220		x			
Asheville Art Museum					
ASU Art Museum			x		x
Birmingham Museum of Art					x
Blanton Museum of Art					
Boise Art Museum	x			x	
Center for Creative Photography			x		
Cincinnati Art Museum					
Cleveland Museum of Art	x		x		
Contemporary Art Center of Virginia					
Denver Art Museum	x		x		
Des Moines Art Center					
Detroit Institute of Art					x
Eric Carle Museum of Picture Book Art					
Frist Center for the Arts		x	x		
Galeria de la Raza					
GRACE				x	
Haystack Mountain School of Crafts			x		
Heard Museum			x		
High Museum of Art	x				
Honolulu Academy of Art				x	
Hood Museum of Art			x		
Indianapolis Museum of Art					
Intermedia Arts			x		
J. Paul Getty Museum					
John Michael Kohler Arts Center		x	x		x
Los Angeles County Museum of Art			x		x
MASS MoCA					
McKissick Museum			x		
Memphis Brooks Museum of Art		x	x	x	x
Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum					
Mexic-Arte Museum		x			
Milwaukee Art Museum					
Minneapolis Institute of Art					
Montalvo			x		
Monterey Museum of Art					
Museo del Barrio		x			

	Space available for rental/ use	Commercial space within site	Non/morning lectures	Research/ Restructuring on Community Needs	Media resource loans	Community farm for materials	Historic Preservation
ABC Museum (pseudonym)	x						
American Folk Art Museum							
American Visionary Art Museum	x						
Anchorage Museum of History and Art			x				
Anderson Ranch Arts Center							
Appalachian Center for Craft							
Arkansas Arts Center							
Arna Bontemps Museum							
Arrowmont School of Arts & Crafts							
Art Museum of Missoula			x				
Artpace			x				
AS220							
Asheville Art Museum							
ASU Art Museum							
Birmingham Museum of Art	x		x				
Blanton Museum of Art	x		x				
Boise Art Museum	x		x				
Center for Creative Photography	x						
Cincinnati Art Museum	x						
Cleveland Museum of Art				x			
Contemporary Art Center of Virginia	x						
Denver Art Museum			x	x			
Des Moines Art Center							
Detroit Institute of Art	x						
Eric Carle Museum of Picture Book Art							
Frist Center for the Arts							
Galeria de la Raza							
GRACE							
Haystack Mountain School of Crafts							
Heard Museum	x						
High Museum of Art							
Honolulu Academy of Art							
Hood Museum of Art	x		x				
Indianapolis Museum of Art							
Intermedia Arts	x						
J. Paul Getty Museum							
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	x						
Los Angeles County Museum of Art							
MASS MoCA	x	x					
McKissick Museum							
Memphis Brooks Museum of Art							
Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum							
Mexic-Arte Museum							
Milwaukee Art Museum	x						
Minneapolis Institute of Art	x						
Montalvo	x						
Monterey Museum of Art							
Museo del Barrio							

	Family Day	ESL program	Art/craft fair, festival, or market	Bureau/ Site visits	Speaker's	Lectures	Art classes/ workshops	Camp
Museum in the Community	x		x			x	x	x
Museum of Chinese in the Americas			x			x		
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	x				x	x		
Museum of Indian Arts and Culture			x			x	x	
Museum of International Folk Art	x		x		x	x		
Museum of Nebraska Art	x		x				x	
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art	x		x			x	x	
National Museum of Wildlife Art	x		x			x	x	
Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art	x		x		x	x	x	
Nevada Museum of Art	x					x	x	
New Orleans Museum of Art	x				x	x	x	
North Carolina Museum of Art	x		x			x	x	x
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art	x		x			x	x	x
P.S. 1 Contemporary Arts Center	x		x				x	
Penland School of Crafts	x						x	
Philbrook Museum of Art	x		x			x	x	x
Plains Art Museum	x				x	x	x	x
Portland Art Museum	x					x	x	
Portland Art Museum	x		x			x	x	x
Ringling Museum of Art	x		x			x		
Santa Fe Art Institute						x	x	
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	x		x				x	x
Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art	x					x	x	
Seattle Art Museum	x		x			x	x	x
Site Santa Fe						x		
Sitka Center for Art and Ecology						x	x	
Smart Museum of Art	x					x	x	
South Dakota Art Museum	x					x	x	
SPARC					x		x	
Speed Art Museum	x		x		x	x	x	x
Studio Museum of Harlem	x					x	x	
Tacoma Art Museum	x					x	x	
The Art Institute of Chicago	x		x		x	x	x	
The Corcoran Museum of Art	x					x		
The Mattress Factory	x		x			x	x	x
The Metropolitan Museum of Art	x				x	x	x	
The Montana Artists Refuge	x		x			x	x	
The Noyes Museum of Art			x			x	x	
The RISD Museum	x					x	x	
UCLA Fowler Museum	x		x			x	x	
University of Arizona Museum of Art	x					x	x	
University of Wyoming Art Museum					x	x	x	
Utah Arts Council Folk Arts Program	x		x				x	
Vermont Folklife Center							x	
Vermont Studio Center	x					x	x	
Virginia Museum of Fine Arts	x		x		x	x	x	
Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art	x		x			x	x	
Walker Art Center								
Wexner Center for the Arts	x		x		x		x	x
Wichita Art Museum	x					x	x	
Women's Studio Workshop						x	x	
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts							x	
Grand Totals	73	2	46	26	77	91	21	

	Parent workshops/ programs	Cross- community connections	Symposial conferences/ Panel	Senior Programs	Organized arts tours off-site	Space available for rental/ use
Museum in the Community						
Museum of Chinese in the Americas					x	
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	x	x	x			
Museum of Indian Arts and Culture				x	x	x
Museum of International Folk Art	x				x	x
Museum of Nebraska Art						
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art	x					
National Museum of Wildlife Art	x		x			
Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art						x
Nevada Museum of Art				x		x
New Orleans Museum of Art						x
North Carolina Museum of Art			x			
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art			x			x
P.S. 1 Contemporary Arts Center	x					
Penland School of Crafts						
Philbrook Museum of Art						
Plains Art Museum					x	
Portland Art Museum				x		
Portland Art Museum			x			
Ringling Museum of Art						
Santa Fe Art Institute		x				
Scottsdale Center for the Arts		x				x
Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art	x				x	x
Seattle Art Museum			x			
Site Santa Fe			x			
Sitka Center for Art and Ecology						
Smart Museum of Art			x		x	x
South Dakota Art Museum						
SPARC		x				
Speed Art Museum						
Studio Museum of Harlem	x	x		x	x	x
Tacoma Art Museum	x	x	x	x		
The Art Institute of Chicago			x			
The Corcoran Museum of Art					x	x
The Mattress Factory						x
The Metropolitan Museum of Art	x		x		x	
The Montana Artists Refuge			x			x
The Noyes Museum of Art			x		x	x
The RISD Museum						
UCLA Fowler Museum	x		x		x	
University of Arizona Museum of Art			x			
University of Wyoming Art Museum						
Utah Arts Council Folk Arts Program		x				
Vermont Folklife Center						
Vermont Studio Center						
Virginia Museum of Fine Arts			x			
Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art						
Walker Art Center						
Wexner Center for the Arts						
Wichita Art Museum				x		
Women's Studio Workshop						
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts						x
Grand Totals	15	14	35	10	18	32

	<i>Commercial space with site</i>	<i>Noon/morning lectures</i>	<i>Research/ Community Needs</i>	<i>Research/ Community Needs</i>	<i>Media resource loans</i>	<i>Community farm for materials</i>	<i>Historic Preservation</i>
Museum in the Community							
Museum of Chinese in the Americas							
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston			x				
Museum of Indian Arts and Culture		x		x			
Museum of International Folk Art				x			
Museum of Nebraska Art							
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art							
National Museum of Wildlife Art		x					
Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art		x					
Nevada Museum of Art		x					
New Orleans Museum of Art							
North Carolina Museum of Art							
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art							
P.S. 1 Contemporary Arts Center							
Penland School of Crafts							
Philbrook Museum of Art							
Plains Art Museum							
Portland Art Museum		x					
Portland Art Museum							
Ringling Museum of Art							
Santa Fe Art Institute							
Scottsdale Center for the Arts							
Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art		x					
Seattle Art Museum				x			
Site Santa Fe							
Sitka Center for Art and Ecology							
Smart Museum of Art		x					
South Dakota Art Museum				x			
SPARC				x			
Speed Art Museum							
Studio Museum of Harlem				x			
Tacoma Art Museum							
The Art Institute of Chicago							
The Corcoran Museum of Art							
The Mattress Factory							
The Metropolitan Museum of Art		x		x			
The Montana Artists Refuge							
The Noyes Museum of Art							
The RISD Museum							
UCLA Fowler Museum							
University of Arizona Museum of Art		x					
University of Wyoming Art Museum							
Utah Arts Council Folk Arts Program							
Vermont Folklife Center					x		
Vermont Studio Center							x
Virginia Museum of Fine Arts		x					
Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art		x					
Walker Art Center							
Wexner Center for the Arts							
Wichita Art Museum							
Women's Studio Workshop						x	
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts							
Grand Totals	1	19	10		1	1	1

WEBSITE SPREADSHEETS
School/ Community Programs

	<i>Internships</i>	<i>Bilingual programs</i>	<i>Bilingual materials</i>	<i>Free events, admission, or day</i>	<i>Community Art Exhibitions</i>
ABC Museum (pseudonym)				x	x
American Folk Art Museum	x				
American Visionary Art Museum	x				x
Anchorage Museum of History and Art				x	x
Anderson Ranch Arts Center					x
Appalachian Center for Craft					x
Arkansas Arts Center				x	
Arna Bontemps Museum					
Arrowmont School of Arts & Crafts					x
Art Museum of Missoula				x	x
Artpace	x	x	x	x	
AS220	x			x	x
Asheville Art Museum					x
ASU Art Museum	x			x	x
Birmingham Museum of Art	x			x	x
Blanton Museum of Art	x			x	
Boise Art Museum	x			x	
Center for Creative Photography	x			x	x
Cincinnati Art Museum					
Cleveland Museum of Art	x			x	
Contemporary Art Center of Virginia					x
Denver Art Museum	x	x	x	x	
Des Moines Art Center				x	
Detroit Institute of Art					
Eric Carle Museum of Picture Book Art					
Frist Center for the Arts			x	x	x
Galeria de la Raza	x	x	x	x	x
GRACE					x
Haystack Mountain School of Crafts					x
Heard Museum				x	x
High Museum of Art	x				
Honolulu Academy of Art				x	
Hood Museum of Art	x			x	
Indianapolis Museum of Art	x			x	
Intermedia Arts	x			x	x
J. Paul Getty Museum	x	x	x	x	
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	x			x	x
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	x	x	x	x	
MASS MoCA	x			x	
McKissick Museum				x	
Memphis Brooks Museum of Art				x	x
Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum					
Mexic-Arte Museum	x	x	x	x	x
Milwaukee Art Museum	x			x	
Minneapolis Institute of Art	x			x	
Montalvo				x	
Monterey Museum of Art					
Museo del Barrio	x	x	x	x	

	Mentorship	Traveling collections (Van, box, exhibits)	Artists in residency	Arts performances	Programs for at-risk youth	Programs for special needs visitors
ABC Museum (pseudonym)			x	x		
American Folk Art Museum	x	x		x	x	
American Visionary Art Museum						
Anchorage Museum of History and Art				x		
Anderson Ranch Arts Center			x			
Appalachian Center for Craft			x			
Arkansas Arts Center		x		x	x	
Arna Bontemps Museum						
Arrowmont School of Arts & Crafts			x			
Art Museum of Missoula			x	x	x	
Artpace	x		x	x		
AS220	x	x	x	x	x	
Asheville Art Museum				x		
ASU Art Museum	x		x	x	x	
Birmingham Museum of Art	x	x		x		x
Blanton Museum of Art						
Boise Art Museum						
Center for Creative Photography		x		x		
Cincinnati Art Museum				x		
Cleveland Museum of Art				x		x
Contemporary Art Center of Virginia				x		
Denver Art Museum				x		
Des Moines Art Center			x	x		
Detroit Institute of Art		x		x		
Eric Carle Museum of Picture Book Art				x		
Frist Center for the Arts				x		x
Galeria de la Raza	x		x			
GRACE		x	x			
Haystack Mountain School of Crafts			x	x		
Heard Museum		x	x	x		
High Museum of Art			x	x		
Honolulu Academy of Art				x		x
Hood Museum of Art			x			
Indianapolis Museum of Art	x	x		x		
Intermedia Arts			x	x		
J. Paul Getty Museum				x		
John Michael Kohler Arts Center			x	x		
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	x	x		x		x
MASS MoCA			x	x		
McKissick Museum				x		
Memphis Brooks Museum of Art					x	
Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum						
Mexic-Arte Museum	x		x		x	
Milwaukee Art Museum						
Minneapolis Institute of Art						
Montalvo			x	x		
Monterey Museum of Art						
Museo del Barrio				x		

	<i>Programs in community space</i>	<i>Community advisory group</i>	<i>Scholarships/ Awards</i>	<i>Programs to respond to comm. Problems</i>	<i>Mural Projects</i>
ABC Museum (pseudonym)	x				
American Folk Art Museum					
American Visionary Art Museum	x				
Anchorage Museum of History and Art				x	
Anderson Ranch Arts Center					
Appalachian Center for Craft					
Arkansas Arts Center	x				
Arna Bontemps Museum			x		
Arrowmont School of Arts & Crafts	x		x		
Art Museum of Missoula	x			x	
Artpace					x
AS220	x			x	x
Asheville Art Museum					
ASU Art Museum	x				
Birmingham Museum of Art	x				x
Blanton Museum of Art		x			
Boise Art Museum	x				
Center for Creative Photography	x		x		
Cincinnati Art Museum					
Cleveland Museum of Art	x				
Contemporary Art Center of Virginia					
Denver Art Museum		x			
Des Moines Art Center					
Detroit Institute of Art	x	x			
Eric Carle Museum of Picture Book Art					
Frist Center for the Arts	x				x
Galeria de la Raza					x
GRACE	x				
Haystack Mountain School of Crafts			x		
Heard Museum	x			x	
High Museum of Art					
Honolulu Academy of Art					
Hood Museum of Art			x		
Indianapolis Museum of Art	x				
Intermedia Arts	x		x	x	
J. Paul Getty Museum					
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	x				
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	x				
MASS MoCA					
McKissick Museum					
Memphis Brooks Museum of Art	x				
Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum					
Mexic-Arte Museum	x				x
Milwaukee Art Museum	x				
Minneapolis Institute of Art	x				
Montalvo					
Monterey Museum of Art					
Museo del Barrio	x				

	Internships	Bilingual programs	Bilingual materials	Free events, admission, or day	Community Art Exhibitions
Museum in the Community				x	x
Museum of Chinese in the Americas	x	x	x	x	x
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	x			x	
Museum of Indian Arts and Culture				x	x
Museum of International Folk Art	x	x	x	x	
Museum of Nebraska Art				x	
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art		x		x	x
National Museum of Wildlife Art	x			x	x
Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art				x	
Nevada Museum of Art		x		x	
New Orleans Museum of Art	x			x	
North Carolina Museum of Art	x	x		x	x
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art				x	x
P.S. 1 Contemporary Arts Center	x				
Penland School of Crafts				x	x
Philbrook Museum of Art					
Plains Art Museum				x	x
Portland Art Museum	x				x
Portland Art Museum				x	x
Ringling Museum of Art				x	
Santa Fe Art Institute					x
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	x	x		x	
Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art	x			x	x
Seattle Art Museum		x	x	x	
Site Santa Fe	x			x	x
Sitka Center for Art and Ecology	x				x
Smart Museum of Art	x			x	x
South Dakota Art Museum					x
SPARC	x				x
Speed Art Museum				x	
Studio Museum of Harlem	x			x	x
Tacoma Art Museum				x	
The Art Institute of Chicago	x			x	
The Corcoran Museum of Art	x			x	
The Mattress Factory	x	x		x	
The Metropolitan Museum of Art	x	x	x	x	
The Montana Artists Refuge				x	x
The Noyes Museum of Art	x			x	x
The RISD Museum		x	x	x	
UCLA Fowler Museum		x		x	
University of Arizona Museum of Art	x			x	x
University of Wyoming Art Museum				x	x
Utah Arts Council Folk Arts Program				x	x
Vermont Folklife Center					x
Vermont Studio Center				x	x
Virginia Museum of Fine Arts	x		x	x	x
Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art	x	x		x	
Walker Art Center					
Wexner Center for the Arts	x			x	
Wichita Art Museum				x	
Women's Studio Workshop	x			x	x
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts	x			x	x
Grand Totals	50	19	14	75	51

	Mentorship	Traveling collections (Van, box, exhibits)	Artists in residency	Arts performances	Programs for at-risk youth	Programs for special needs visitors
Museum in the Community				x		
Museum of Chinese in the Americas				x		
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston		x	x			
Museum of Indian Arts and Culture		x		x		
Museum of International Folk Art	x	x		x		x
Museum of Nebraska Art		x				
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art		x		x		
National Museum of Wildlife Art		x		x		
Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art				x		
Nevada Museum of Art				x		
New Orleans Museum of Art		x		x		
North Carolina Museum of Art			x	x		
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art						
P.S. 1 Contemporary Arts Center			x	x		
Penland School of Crafts			x			
Philbrook Museum of Art						
Plains Art Museum		x	x	x		
Portland Art Museum	x					
Portland Art Museum				x		
Ringling Museum of Art						
Santa Fe Art Institute	x		x	x	x	
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	x		x	x	x	x
Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art			x	x	x	
Seattle Art Museum			x	x	x	
Site Santa Fe	x		x	x		
Sitka Center for Art and Ecology			x			
Smart Museum of Art				x		
South Dakota Art Museum				x		
SPARC	x	x	x			
Speed Art Museum				x		
Studio Museum of Harlem	x		x	x		
Tacoma Art Museum				x		
The Art Institute of Chicago				x		
The Corcoran Museum of Art	x		x	x	x	
The Mattress Factory	x		x	x		x
The Metropolitan Museum of Art		x		x		x
The Montana Artists Refuge			x	x		
The Noyes Museum of Art			x	x		
The RISD Museum				x		
UCLA Fowler Museum				x		
University of Arizona Museum of Art				x		
University of Wyoming Art Museum		x				
Utah Arts Council Folk Arts Program	x			x		
Vermont Folklife Center						
Vermont Studio Center			x	x		
Virginia Museum of Fine Arts		x		x		
Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art				x		x
Walker Art Center						
Wexner Center for the Arts			x	x		
Wichita Art Museum				x		
Women's Studio Workshop		x	x			
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts	x			x		
Grand Totals	20	23	40	71	12	10

	Programs in community space	Community advisory group	Scholarships/ Awards	Programs to respond to comm. Problems	Mural Projects	After-hours social event
Museum in the Community						
Museum of Chinese in the Americas	x	x				x
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	x				x	x
Museum of Indian Arts and Culture	x					
Museum of International Folk Art	x					x
Museum of Nebraska Art	x					
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art	x					
National Museum of Wildlife Art						
Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art						x
Nevada Museum of Art						x
New Orleans Museum of Art						x
North Carolina Museum of Art					x	
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art	x					
P.S. 1 Contemporary Arts Center						
Penland School of Crafts	x		x			
Philbrook Museum of Art						
Plains Art Museum	x			x		
Portland Art Museum						x
Portland Art Museum						
Ringling Museum of Art						
Santa Fe Art Institute	x			x		
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	x			x		
Scottsdale Museum of Contemporary Art						x
Seattle Art Museum						x
Site Santa Fe	x					x
Sitka Center for Art and Ecology	x			x		
Smart Museum of Art	x	x				x
South Dakota Art Museum						
SPARC	x			x	x	
Speed Art Museum	x					x
Studio Museum of Harlem	x			x		x
Tacoma Art Museum	x					x
The Art Institute of Chicago	x	x				x
The Corcoran Museum of Art	x				x	
The Mattress Factory						
The Metropolitan Museum of Art	x	x				
The Montana Artists Refuge	x		x			
The Noyes Museum of Art						
The RISD Museum						
UCLA Fowler Museum	x		x		x	x
University of Arizona Museum of Art	x					
University of Wyoming Art Museum	x					
Utah Arts Council Folk Arts Program	x					
Vermont Folklife Center	x		x			
Vermont Studio Center	x		x			
Virginia Museum of Fine Arts	x	x	x			x
Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art						x
Walker Art Center						
Wexner Center for the Arts						
Wichita Art Museum						
Women's Studio Workshop			x			
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts		x		x		x
Grand Totals	53	9	13	12	11	42

SURVEY

APPENDIX B

Community Connections through Art Museums and Art Centers
Thesis research for Elsa Lenz, M.A. candidate, University of Arizona

Name	Position
Phone	Email

Please note that you may participate without disclosing your name, position, or institution name. If you disclose the above information it may be used in written and oral reports. Please use the opposite side of the paper to expand on answers.

Please briefly give an overview of the programs your institution has offered in the past 1-3 years that involved community outreach.

Please describe one of your successful community outreach projects, including why it was successful.

What are some of the elements you consider when designing a community outreach program?

What are some of the barriers you have come across in reaching out to the community?

What groups do you serve in terms of age, interest group, ethnicity, nationality, gender, etc.?

How many people do you serve annually?

What current issues and/ or community needs do you address in your programming, exhibitions, and/ or community outreach programs?

What kinds of collaborations have been created between your institution and community groups?

What are the benefits to the community from the presence and participation of your art institution (economic, cultural, social, educational, etc.)?

Are you willing to be contacted for further information Yes No
If you are able to send pamphlets outlining the programs you described above, publicity flyers, or general museum pamphlets, these would be greatly appreciated in understanding the connections between your institution and your community. Thank you!

SURVEY RESPONSES SPREADSHEET

APPENDIX C

QUESTION 4

“What are some of the barriers you have come across in reaching out to the community?”

	Inability to offer offsite programs	Lack of organization
Museum of International Folk Art	1	0
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	0	1
MASS MoCA	0	0
Heard Museum	0	0
Denver Art Museum	0	0
Artpace	0	0
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	0	0
The Art Institute of Chicago	0	1
Boise Art Museum	0	0
Cincinnati Art Museum	0	0
Plains Art Museum	0	0
Ohr O’Keefe Museum of Art	0	0
ABC Museum (pseudonym)	0	0
Honolulu Academy for the Arts	0	0
J. Paul Getty Museum	0	0
The Corcoran Museum of Art	0	0
Tacoma Art Museum	0	0
National Museum of Wildlife Art	0	0
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	0	0
Smart Museum of Art	0	0
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts	0	1
Anderson Ranch Arts Center	0	0
Center for Creative Photography	0	0
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	0	0
American Folk Art Museum	0	0
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art	0	0
University of Arizona Museum of Art	0	0
Cleveland Museum of Art	0	0
Grand Total	1	3

	Lack of communication	Lack of funding	Program sustainability
Museum of International Folk Art	0	0	0
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	1	0	0
MASS MoCA	0	0	0
Heard Museum	0	1	0
Denver Art Museum	0	1	1
Artpace	0	0	0
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	0	0	0
The Art Institute of Chicago	0	0	0
Boise Art Museum	0	0	0
Cincinnati Art Museum	0	0	0
Plains Art Museum	0	1	0
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art	0	0	0
ABC Museum (pseudonym)	0	1	0
Honolulu Academy for the Arts	0	0	0
J. Paul Getty Museum	0	0	0
The Corcoran Museum of Art	0	1	0
Tacoma Art Museum	0	0	0
National Museum of Wildlife Art	0	0	0
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	0	0	0
Smart Museum of Art	1	0	0
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts	0	0	0
Anderson Ranch Arts Center	0	1	0
Center for Creative Photography	0	1	0
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	0	1	0
American Folk Art Museum	0	0	0
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art	1	1	0
University of Arizona Museum of Art	0	1	0
Cleveland Museum of Art	0	1	1
Grand Total	3	11	2

	Museum intimidation	Perception of cost to attend	Visitor conflicts
Museum of International Folk Art	0	0	0
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	0	0	0
MASS MoCA	1	0	0
Heard Museum	0	0	0
Denver Art Museum	0	0	0
Artpace	0	0	0
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	1	1	0
The Art Institute of Chicago	0	0	1
Boise Art Museum	0	0	0
Cincinnati Art Museum	1	0	1
Plains Art Museum	1	0	0
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art	0	1	1
ABC Museum (pseudonym)	1	0	0
Honolulu Academy for the Arts	0	0	0
J. Paul Getty Museum	0	0	0
The Corcoran Museum of Art	0	0	0
Tacoma Art Museum	0	0	0
National Museum of Wildlife Art	0	0	1
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	0	0	0
Smart Museum of Art	0	0	0
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts	1	0	0
Anderson Ranch Arts Center	1	1	0
Center for Creative Photography	0	0	0
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	1	0	0
American Folk Art Museum	0	0	0
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art	0	0	0
University of Arizona Museum of Art	0	0	1
Cleveland Museum of Art	0	0	0
Grand Total	8	3	5

	Transportation	Misconceptions about organization	Unfamiliar w/ community org's
Museum of International Folk Art	0	0	0
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	0	0	0
MASS MoCA	0	0	0
Heard Museum	0	0	0
Denver Art Museum	0	0	0
Artpace	0	0	0
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	0	0	0
The Art Institute of Chicago	1	0	0
Boise Art Museum	0	0	0
Cincinnati Art Museum	0	1	1
Plains Art Museum	0	1	0
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art	0	0	0
ABC Museum (pseudonym)	0	0	0
Honolulu Academy for the Arts	0	0	0
J. Paul Getty Museum	0	0	0
The Corcoran Museum of Art	0	0	0
Tacoma Art Museum	0	0	0
National Museum of Wildlife Art	0	0	0
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	0	0	0
Smart Museum of Art	0	1	0
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts	0	1	0
Anderson Ranch Arts Center	1	0	0
Center for Creative Photography	0	1	0
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	0	0	0
American Folk Art Museum	0	0	0
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art	0	0	0
University of Arizona Museum of Art	1	0	0
Cleveland Museum of Art	0	0	0
Grand Total	3	5	1

	Lack of staff time	Lack of community interest	Differing community interests
Museum of International Folk Art	0	0	0
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	0	0	0
MASS MoCA	0	0	0
Heard Museum	0	0	0
Denver Art Museum	0	0	0
Artpace	0	0	0
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	0	0	0
The Art Institute of Chicago	0	0	0
Boise Art Museum	0	0	0
Cincinnati Art Museum	0	0	0
Plains Art Museum	1	1	0
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art	0	1	1
ABC Museum (pseudonym)	0	0	0
Honolulu Academy for the Arts	0	0	0
J. Paul Getty Museum	0	0	0
The Corcoran Museum of Art	0	0	0
Tacoma Art Museum	0	0	0
National Museum of Wildlife Art	0	1	1
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	0	0	0
Smart Museum of Art	0	0	0
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts	0	0	0
Anderson Ranch Arts Center	0	0	0
Center for Creative Photography	1	0	0
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	1	0	1
American Folk Art Museum	0	0	0
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art	1	0	0
University of Arizona Museum of Art	0	0	0
Cleveland Museum of Art	0	0	0
Grand Total	4	3	3

	Lack of visitor diversity	Lack of collaboration	Serving a "unique" need
Museum of International Folk Art	0	0	0
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	0	0	0
MASS MoCA	0	0	0
Heard Museum	0	0	0
Denver Art Museum	0	0	0
Artpace	0	0	0
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	0	0	0
The Art Institute of Chicago	0	0	0
Boise Art Museum	0	0	0
Cincinnati Art Museum	0	0	0
Plains Art Museum	0	0	0
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art	1	0	0
ABC Museum (pseudonym)	0	1	0
Honolulu Academy for the Arts	0	0	0
J. Paul Getty Museum	0	0	0
The Corcoran Museum of Art	0	0	1
Tacoma Art Museum	0	1	0
National Museum of Wildlife Art	1	0	1
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	0	0	0
Smart Museum of Art	1	0	0
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts	0	0	0
Anderson Ranch Arts Center	0	0	0
Center for Creative Photography	0	0	0
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	0	0	0
American Folk Art Museum	0	0	0
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art	0	0	0
University of Arizona Museum of Art	0	0	0
Cleveland Museum of Art	0	1	0
Grand Total	3	3	2

	Competing local activities	Planning with teachers	Need for audience research
Museum of International Folk Art	0	0	0
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	0	0	0
MASS MoCA	0	0	0
Heard Museum	0	0	0
Denver Art Museum	0	0	0
Artpace	0	0	0
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	0	0	0
The Art Institute of Chicago	0	0	0
Boise Art Museum	0	0	0
Cincinnati Art Museum	0	0	0
Plains Art Museum	0	0	0
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art	0	0	0
ABC Museum (pseudonym)	0	0	0
Honolulu Academy for the Arts	0	0	0
J. Paul Getty Museum	0	0	0
The Corcoran Museum of Art	0	0	0
Tacoma Art Museum	0	0	0
National Museum of Wildlife Art	1	0	0
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	0	0	0
Smart Museum of Art	0	1	1
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts	0	0	0
Anderson Ranch Arts Center	0	0	0
Center for Creative Photography	0	0	0
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	0	0	0
American Folk Art Museum	0	0	0
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art	0	0	0
University of Arizona Museum of Art	0	0	0
Cleveland Museum of Art	0	0	0
Grand Total	1	1	1

	High turnover of university population	Lack of publicity
Museum of International Folk Art	0	0
John Michael Kohler Arts Center	0	0
MASS MoCA	0	0
Heard Museum	0	0
Denver Art Museum	0	0
Artpace	0	0
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	0	0
The Art Institute of Chicago	0	0
Boise Art Museum	0	0
Cincinnati Art Museum	0	0
Plains Art Museum	0	0
Ohr O'Keefe Museum of Art	0	0
ABC Museum (pseudonym)	0	0
Honolulu Academy for the Arts	0	0
J. Paul Getty Museum	0	0
The Corcoran Museum of Art	0	0
Tacoma Art Museum	0	0
National Museum of Wildlife Art	0	0
Museum of Fine Arts, Houston	0	0
Smart Museum of Art	1	0
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts	0	0
Anderson Ranch Arts Center	0	0
Center for Creative Photography	0	0
Scottsdale Center for the Arts	0	0
American Folk Art Museum	0	0
Museum of Spanish Colonial Art	0	1
University of Arizona Museum of Art	0	0
Cleveland Museum of Art	0	0
Grand Total	1	1

REFERENCES

- Adams, D. & A. Goldbard (Eds.). (2002). *Community, culture and globalization*. New York, NY: The Rockefeller Foundation.
- Adejumo, C. (2000). Community-based art. *School Arts*, 99 (6), 12-13.
- American Association of Museums (1992). *Excellence and Equity*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums.
- Atlas, C., Brunner, H., and deNobriga, K. (2004). Community engagement- stories from the field. In Alliance of Artists Communities, *Lessons learned: Engaging communities* (pp. 6-16). Providence, RI: Alliance of Artists Communities.
- Baca, J. (2002). Birth of a movement. In D. Adams and A. Goldbard (Eds.) *Community, culture, and globalization* (pp. 108-125). New York, NY: The Rockefeller Foundation.
- Ballengée Morris (2002). From a town to a community. *School Arts 101* (7), 44-45.
- Bastos, F. (2002) Making the familiar strange. In Y. Gaudelius & P. Spiers (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in art education* (pp. 70-83). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Blandy, D. and Bolin, P. (2003). Beyond visual culture: Seven statements of support for material culture studies in art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 44 (3), 246-263.
- Blandy, D. and Congdon, K. (1988). Community based aesthetics as exhibition catalyst and a foundation for community involvement in art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 29 (4), 243-249.
- Bolin, P. (2004, April). *Teaching art through material culture*. Presentation at the National Art Education Association National Conference in Denver, Colorado.
- Bolin, P. (2005, March). *Art education through objects and stories*. Presentation at the National Art Education Association National Conference in Boston, MA.
- Bourriaud, N. (1998/2002). Relational form, chapter in *Relational aesthetics*. France: Les presses du réel.
- Brown, C. (1992). The museum's role in a multicultural society. In *Patterns in Practice: Selections from the Journal of Museum Education*. Washington, D.C.: Museum Education Roundtable.

- Byrand, S. (July 21, 2002). Arts center challenges community to show artistic side. *The Sheboygan Press*, A6.
- Chalmers, F.G. (1987). Culturally based versus universally based understanding of art. In D. Blandy & K. Congdon (Eds.), *Art in a democracy* (pp. 4-11). New York, NY: Teacher's College.
- Clark, G. and Zimmerman, E. (2000). Greater understanding of the local community: A community-based art education program for rural schools. *Art Education*, 53 (2), 32-39.
- Cohen-Cruz, J. (2004). Introduction to community art and activism. *Community Arts Network*, retrieved from <http://www.communityarts.net/readingroom/archive/intro-activism.php>
- Eisner, E. and Dobbs, S. (1988). Silent pedagogy: How museums help visitors experience exhibitions. *Art Education*, 41 (4), 6-15.
- Ellis, R. (1995). Museums as change agents. *Journal of Museum Education*, Spring/Summer, 14-17.
- Gablik, S. (1991). Making art as if the world mattered. Ch. in *The reenchantment of art*, (pp. 96-114). New York, NY: Thames & Hudson.
- Gaither, E. B. (1992). "Hey! That's mine": Thoughts on pluralism and American museums. In Karp, I., Kreamer, C.M., & Lavine, S.D. (Eds.), *Museums and communities: The politics of public culture* (pp. 56-64). Washington, D.C. and London: Smithsonian Institution.
- Garber, E. and Pearson, R. (1998). Building community. *School Arts*, 97 (5), 22.
- Garoian, C. (2001). Performing the museum. *Studies in art education*, 42 (3), 234-248.
- Getty Museum. (2004). *Publicity pamphlets*. Los Angeles, CA: Author.
- Giroux, H. (1995). Borderline artists, cultural workers, and the crisis of democracy. In C. Becker & A. Wiens (Eds.). *The artist in society: Rights, roles, and responsibilities*. Chicago, IL: New Art Examiner Press.
- Green, Kate. (January 18, 2005). Personal communication.
- Healy, K. (2003). Mobilizing community museum networks in Mexico- and beyond. *Grassroots Development*, 24 (1), 15-24.

- Hein, G. E. and Alexander, M. (1998) *Museums: Places of Learning*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Museums.
- Hicks, L. (1994). Social reconstruction and community. *Studies in Art Education*, 35 (3), 149-156.
- Irwin, R. and Kindler, A. (1999). *Beyond the school: Community and institutional partnerships in art education*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Jeffers, C.S. (2003). Museum as Process. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 37 (1), 107-119.
- JMKAC (John Michael Kohler Arts Center). (2004). *Publicity pamphlets*. Sheboygan, WI: Author.
- Karp, I. (1992). Introduction. Museums and communities: The politics of public culture. In Karp, I., Kreamer, C.M., & Lavine, S.D. (Eds.) *Museums and communities: The politics of public culture* (pp. 1-17). Washington, D.C. and London: Smithsonian Institution.
- Kempers, M. (2002). *Community matters: An exploration of theory and practice*. Chicago, IL: Burnham, Inc.
- Krensky, B. (2001). Going on beyond zebra: A middle school and community-based arts organization collaborate for change. *Education and Urban Society*, 33(4), 427-444.
- Laabs, J. (1994). Visiting artists influence work at Kohler Co. *Personnel Journal*, 73 (11), 28-33.
- Lacy, S. (1995). Introduction. Cultural pilgrimages and metaphoric journeys. In Suzanne Lacy (Ed.), *Mapping the terrain: New genre public art* (pp. 19-47). Seattle, WA: Bay.
- Lankford, E.L. (1992). *Aesthetics: Issues and inquiry*. Reston, VA: NAEA.
- Lavine, S. (1992). Audience, ownership, and authority: Designing relations between museums and communities. In Karp, I., Kreamer, C.M., Lavine, S.D. (Eds.) *Museums and communities: The politics of public culture* (pp. 137-157). Washington, D.C. and London: Smithsonian Institution.
- Maggi, M. (2000). Innovation in Italy: The a.muse project. *Museum International* 52 (2), 50-53.

- Mancillas, A. (1998). The citizen artist. In L. F. Burnham & S. Durland (Eds.), *The citizen artist: 20 years of art in the public arena* (pp. 335- 340). Gardiner, NY: Critical.
- MASS MoCA (2004). *Publicity pamphlets*. North Adams, MA: Author.
- Mayer, M. (Unpublished). A postmodern puzzle: Art museum education and the new art histories.
- Mayer, M. (1998). Can philosophical change take hold in the American art museum? *Art Education*, 51 (2), 15-19.
- Mayer, M. (2005). Bridging the theory-practice divide. *Art Education*, 58 (2), 13-17.
- McKay, S.W. & Monteverde, S.R. (2003). Dialogic looking: Beyond the mediated experience. *Art Education*, 56 (1), 40-45.
- Miller, J. (1998). "That's art, all right." The changing face of museum education. *Art Papers*, 22 (4), 10-15.
- Morrissey, K. A. (2002) Pathways among objects and museum visitors. In S. G. Paris (Ed.), *Perspectives on object-centered learning in museums* (pp. 285-299). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Patterson, B. (2002). Community outreach through art. *School Arts*, 101 (7), 37.
- Plains Art Museum (2004). *Publicity pamphlets*. Fargo, ND: Author.
- Popson, C. (2004). Native voices. *Archaeology*, 57 (5), 62-68.
- Sandell, R. (2002). Museums and the combating of social inequality: Roles, responsibilities, resistance. In R. Sandell (Ed.), *Museums, Society, Inequality* (pp. 3-23). London and New York: Routledge.
- Scott, C. (2002). Measuring social value. In R. Sandell (Ed.), *Museums, Society, Inequality* (pps. 41-55). London and New York: Routledge.
- Stensland, Laurie (2004). Personal communication.
- Tacoma Art Museum. (2004). *Publicity pamphlets*. Tacoma, WA: Author.
- Tan, Joel. (January 21, 2005). Personal communication.
- Terrassa, Jacqueline. (January 26, 2005). Personal communication.

- Trend, D. (1997). From victim aesthetics to postmodern citizenship. In H. Giroux (Ed.), *Cultural democracy: Politics, media, new technology*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Ulbricht, J. (2005). What is community-based art education? *Art Education*, 58 (2), 6-11.
- Vihos, Lisa. (2004). Personal communication.
- Weil, S. (1997). The museum and the public. *Museum Management and Curatorship* 16 (3), 257-271.
- Wilkerson, M. (2000). Overview of the field of artists' communities. In T. Snell (Ed.), *Artists communities: A directory of residencies in the United States that offer time and space for creativity* (pp. 19-28). New York, NY: Allworth .
- Wilkerson, M. (2003). Long journey in a short time: From insularity, to outreach, to engagement. In Alliance of Artists Communities, *Artists' Communities at Work: Lessons Learned* (pp. 38-43). Providence, RI: Alliance for Artists Communities.
- Williams, B.L. (1996). An examination of art museum education practices since 1984. *Studies in Art Education* 38 (1), 34-39.
- Zeller, T. (1989) The historical and philosophical foundations of art museum education in America. In N. Berry & S. Mayer (Eds.), *Museum education: History, theory, and practice* (pp. 10-89). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.