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Preface

When beginning graduate school, I was unaware of just how far-reaching and complex design could be. My undergraduate study was in Art History, through which I tirelessly perfected the art of comparing and contrasting, identifying differences, similarities and the significance that these had on the overarching purpose and importance of an object. This skill also carries into the design process and, although non-traditional, it has proved an adequate precursor to my study of design at the graduate level. It also fostered my love for art museums. They can be a place of sanctuary in a frenetic world, and a reminder of life’s intrinsic beauty and curiosity that can so easily be forgotten.

I also hold an innate interest in people and relationships, a desire to establish meaningful, open, honest, fulfilling interactions in the ways in which individuals experience one another. Upon discovering that the closure of the Corcoran Gallery of Art, the oldest private art museum in Washington D.C., resulted from the board’s dysfunctional relations, I was absolutely stunned. How could they have allowed their conflicts to generate such a divide that efficiency, problem-solving, and the museum’s well-being became secondary? What were the underlying interactional and interpersonal issues? How might design make this less likely to happen in the future?

An observation I made during my research is that developing or maintaining a business really is like developing a person—honesty, responsibility, communication, empathy, courage and the ability to work together, relate, and be vulnerable are equally important in humanity as they are in business and management practices. When these are absent, internal and external dysfunctions arise and the innovative ability of a business is negatively impacted.
While it may seem inconsequential to consider self-growth or emotion as integral components to management systems, I assert that such foundational aspects of humanity cannot be downplayed if we are to strengthen our businesses and deepen the relationships with the audience they serve. This thesis is merely the beginning of my study into how emotion impacts innovation, the factors of ‘emotionally’ designed management, and how to create a framework integrating this human dimension. It is my intent with future research to consider this not only for museums but for non-profits and for-profits alike, seeking to understand how the ‘heart’ of business could be restored.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Over the course of the last thirty years, museum professionals and researchers have recognized the need to instill changes in the perspectives of museum management. Due to the continued budget cuts and challenges in funding paralleled with ever-changing audience needs, and the continuous desire to engage a broader visitor base, museums are faced with more complex and life-threatening problems. It is well-supported that museums annually attract greater visitor numbers than all major-league sporting events combined—over 850 million visitors (Mondello, 2008). Why then, even with soaring visitor numbers, are museums still struggling to stay financially viable?

In February 2014, The Washington Post reported that the Corcoran Gallery of Art, the first and oldest private museum in Washington, D.C., would be closing its doors. Most of the collection was taken in by The National Gallery of Art, and the Corcoran School of Art was absorbed by George Washington University. As unfortunate as this situation was, it was apparently no surprise: “Everything that was darkly whispered about the Corcoran’s board over the past few years has come to pass: After decades of erratic and often incompetent leadership, it has seen the institution through to its demise” (Kennicott, 2014)

A need for change in museums was publicly declared as far back as 1984. A report issued by the Committee on Museums for a New Century, stated that it was time to examine and reevaluate the governing and managing models of museums and establish how they can be improved for “more effective leadership for museums in the future” (Ames and Spaulding, 1988). With struggling to uphold steady funding, closing doors continuing, and sustained internal tensions, it is imperative that museum administrators
and professionals collectively consider changing their mission. How could management in museums change for the betterment of museum livelihood? How can museums position themselves to be greater innovators, handlers of change, and through that, masters of navigating rough financial waters?

Museum budgets are continually being cut, structures are being reorganized, and operating costs are constantly reevaluated to help save money. Additionally, advancements in technology are changing what visitors want from museums, and philanthropic changes are beginning to emerge as the traditional donor thins out and a new, young professional rises. But because of the tendency for museums to maintain their primary focus on the art object, their relationships with the audience and donor are becoming increasingly disconnected. Their academically-minded methods are no longer working; everyone wants to be an expert, collaboration remains minimal, and traditional leadership and conservative management trends are keeping them trapped.

What museums need is a change in process and mindset. They need to foster a better connection with their audience and understand how to create their wealth. This is all possible with the adoption of design thinking. Through design, a reflective, creative mindset is used to imagine new possibilities, and greater balance is achieved with user-centered research. Through design, collaboration and workplace interactions are made more meaningful with increased empathy, positively influencing work quality and organizational skill set. And design promotes a change-oriented organization, using agility to stay connected to the impactful, external changes. Through design, all change is possible. And when organized as a process, or method of inquiry, design can bring forward powerful innovation and meaningful value.
Methodology

The secondary research in this thesis presents the traditional roles and internal perspectives of the common museum, as well as the changing external dynamics; their relationship with the donor, visitor, and their significant correlational effect. The role of the director and board, as well as traditional museum management practices will be explored, leading into a discussion of the current imbalance of the internal and external perspectives.

Thorough literature review of design will also be presented, explaining the multifaceted dimension of the practice, the statistical evidence of its positive contribution to business, and the ways in which it can add concrete value. In this investigation, design is ultimately presented as both a process and a mindset, and the defining qualities of both are outlined and situated into the context of organizational management.

Primary research garnered from several museum professionals will shed light on the condition of design in two museums in the Northern Ohio region, and support the problematic perspective of conservatism; but also show how one museum is using design (and toughing the waters of organizational change) to reestablish a strong sense of relevancy within their community.

Extensive research and evidence can be found for ways that design can help for-profit business, but very little pertains to its presence in non-profits, and even less on the adoption of design thinking in museums. While considering the bold actions that have been taken, this investigation furthers these efforts by looking at how museums trap themselves, not only in their professional, art-focused perspective, but implications of the human condition; a lack of empathy and courage in the realm of museum management.

Now is the time for museums to become leaders of change instead of merely
reactionary participants of crisis: “With no single philosophy or tool kit of techniques with which to fully understand our organizations and fulfill our ambitions, [museums] are left with the need to investigate, learn, discriminate and act” (Peacock, 324). The need is clear, and the answer lies in becoming designful.
CHAPTER II

Museums

The Basics

The word “museum” was first used in the English language in the late 1600’s (Ambrose and Paine, 1993, p. 6) and since then, museums have concerned themselves with the education of society. Whether they were some of the early private collections or a collection that was intended for the general public, museums have specialized in the acquisition, study, preservation, curation, interpretation, and exhibition of objects. The American Association of Museums expands this by further defining museums as being “administered in the public interest,” and for their education and enjoyment, as the objects within them hold great value (p. 8). This notion can be extended to claim that museums are definers of value and intrinsically allow for a deepening of life quality.

There are many different types of museums determined by the many different ways they are classified: by collection (art, archaeology, geology, science, history, etc.), audience served (educational, specialist, general public), by who runs them (government, municipal, university, army, private, corporate), or even by the way they exhibit their collections (traditional, open-air, historic house). Consequently, their greater cultural function and value can vary just as greatly (Ambrose and Paine, 1993, p. 6-7).

The value of museums also range: culturally, economically, and socially (Ambrose and Paine, 1993, p. 9). As houses of expert preservation, they instill protection of a community’s heritage and, through volunteerism, create opportunities for involvement in the generation of community building. Museums provide support for educational institutions by their alignment in values and making the establishment available for events. For political or corporate institutions that engage in support of the museum, the
relationship naturally instills a sense of pride for and belonging within the community (p. 9).

Economically, in areas where tourism plays greatly into the local revenue generation, museums can be focal points which attract visitors to the area and their spending extends into the local restaurants, hotels, shops, etc. But museums can also be looked at to positively contribute to urban regeneration or community development (Ambrose and Paine, 1993, p. 9). Take Cleveland, Ohio for example, a city where manufacturing and service was once primary. Since the dissolution of much of this industrial sector, the tourism generated by the presence of a world-renowned art museum (and the additional cultural institutions, concert hall, and university in close proximity), establishes a cultural powerhouse that is a wealthy source of revenue for the area. In turn, this draw influences businesses to invest in the institutions, in turn building a cyclical relationship of supply and demand.

Even with the numerous means of categorization, one function that all museums have in common is the act of displaying objects, whether it be the actual object or a digital or replicated version of an object. With education being the most recent addition to the core roles of the museums (Malaro, 1994, p. 81), it is potentially deemed as having a lower priority. As collecting and preservation are inherently educational, what is specifically meant by education is the intentionally structured and organized audience-focused programs built to appeal to a broader group, and any of which is secondary to the study and housing of the object.

Stephen Weil, a regarded museum administrator and art law expert, has claimed, “The curatorial role is central; the rest—no matter how important—is still peripheral… To whatever extent the public would not readily accept this position, then to the same
extent have museums thus far failed in clearly communicating their basic importance” (1983, p. 53). While the care of our cultural history is important, it is this archaic perspective that has put museums in the stronghold of a financial conundrum. Since the late 1980’s, museum researchers have been proclaiming the need for museums to shift their perspective. Many have tried, or begun, to bring education, programming, and social interaction to the same level as curatorial. However, not without great resistance, evidenced by both secondary and primary research.

In light of these claims, it becomes clear that the role of museums is changing, and many museum administrators (and even stakeholders) are slow to accept this. Even more so, due to technology, the ways in which museums relate to their audience are also changing. While acknowledging that permanent, institutional-wide change takes time, there needs to be a profession-wide acceptance and strategization if an efficient move forward is to be made and museums are to remain viable (Anderson, 2004, p. 3). To begin, understanding the connection between two primary and individual audience groups and the traditional roles of museum managers and management styles, will provide a thorough foundation.

**The Audience: Two Sides of the Same Coin**

There is a great broadness within this group, thinking of the visitor that comes once every year or so, to those that come every month or more to see a special exhibit, or participate in a unique cultural event or special program. It is for these ‘viewers’ that museums exist, for the general public’s education and cultural enjoyment. However, another audience group that must not be overlooked is the donor. Using that term loosely, it refers to the trustees, private philanthropists, corporate, cultural, and also
the government institutions that benefit from the museum while also providing for the majority of the museum's financial health.

Museums operate with a variety of sources for revenue, including earned income and contributions from the public and private sectors, and they each impact the overall well being of museums proportionately (Lindqvist, 2012, p. 2). Luckily, it is this broad sourcing of funds that has enabled museums to stay afloat in economic crises. Simply placing the monetary eggs in a variety of baskets is not enough. There needs to be quality attention and conscious research put toward those connections, as their needs are individualized and continually changing.

For example, consider the complexity of grants. Both privately and publicly, they are a major source of funding for museums and the foundations that donate each have their very own set of guidelines and giving ideologies, those which are often tied to the needs of individuals or an entire corporation or community (Genoways and Ireland, 2003, p. 143). Appealing to this variety can be “a complex kind of matchmaking” (p. 139) and often requires a unique approach. Museums can also seek grants from institutions that may not initially seem like a logical match. But through further research and creative innovation, an untapped, financially sound relationship could be established (Genoways and Ireland, 2003, p. 142).

Breaking the financial sourcing into two distinct groups—donor and visitor—helps provide a simple, clear understanding of their differences, as well as the positive correlational relationship to one another. It is these connections and their quality that have an impact on the financial health and overall livelihood of a museum. Identifying their points of connection and their individual significance can help pinpoint where changes can be made in these financially trying times.
The Donor and Beyond

Donors exist in numerous forms: governments, corporations, foundations, and private individuals, to name a few; They are among the major financial supporters of museums in the form of sponsorships, grants, endowments, and donations. A museum’s source of income is primarily and directly tied to the donations and sponsorship of trustees, local governments, and private philanthropists (Schmidt, 1992, p. 261).

It is undeniable that economic downturns do affect the financial stability of museums, both directly and indirectly. However, it is argued that the degree of the negative effects are only marginal, based on the broad financial sourcing (Lindqvist, 2012, pp. 1-2). For example, grants from private endowments are affected more severely than grants coming from public sources, as the latter is supplied from tax collections versus reliant upon stock market investments (p. 5).

Additionally, it is common for donations to come from assets or capital that has been built over an extended period of time, and not based on economic fluctuations. On the contrary, sponsorship of special programming and events is commonly a short-term investment, provided by corporations and therefore more directly affected tied to economic fluctuations than other types of contributions (Lindqvist, 2012, p. 5).

There are two factors that contribute to fluctuations in funding. First, are the rising number of cultural institutions and increasing initiatives to preserve various types of cultural institutions (Lindqvist, 2012, p. 6). The funding sources begin to become spread thin as competition increases, but the number of funding sources have not increased proportionately. This rise in competition rests on the activities of donors establishing new museums, instead of supporting current museums and their activities
Second is the inherent rotation of leading administrators within museums, such as board members, directors, and other higher departmental heads (Lindqvist, 2012, p. 6). The effects have proven to be occasionally negative, as new, incoming managerial figures can have different perspectives and agendas in regard to a museum’s mission, and in turn, can potentially cause inconsistency and instability in long-term planning and established donor relationships.

In light of these challenges, it is suggested by scholars to invest quality time into nurturing the donor relationships that already exist: “On a short-term basis, marketing efforts may improve museums finances, but for a sustainable financial strategy, museums need to strengthen stakeholder relationships to secure legitimacy and thereby insure their social and economic stability” (Lindqvist, 2012, p. 6). For museums, taking a stakeholder perspective means not only developing a well thought-out strategy to balance costs with revenue, but also developing a better understanding of the wider context of the organisation” (p. 6).

This suggests that a quality relationship and understanding of the visitor positively correlates with the donor relationships. It is proposed that while expending energy would be more economical to improve the donors already established by the museum, market research would also be beneficial so that the organization can better understand their actual audience (Schmidt, 1992, p. 264). Here it becomes clear that the relationship with the visitor is just as important as that with the donor, since success with the visitor affects the philanthropic generosity. Uncontrollable external factors coupled with economic fluctuations point to the significant need of a strategic approach in maintaining donor relationships, and considering deeper user research on all levels;
very little of which has been identified in the plethora of literature about museum management and financial planning.

**The Changing Relationship With the Visitor**

Clearly museums center around people. They house objects for visitors to experience and exist on a foundation of education for individuals to see and learn more about the rare, valuable art objects that they hold. But considering the vast advancements in technology and growing generational differences, the visitors themselves are changing. The effect of technology on the visitor is evident by the increased adoption of tech-savvy exhibitions in museums. An example of this, on a grand scale, Cleveland Museum of Art’s installation of Gallery One. This is a highly interactive exhibit situated upon entry into the museum that houses paintings, sculptures, and small artifacts spanning a broad time period and representing a variety of cultures. It is designed for the user to walk through with an iPad using their ArtLens app. Visitors can scan an icon to open an educational walkthrough that shares details about how and why it was made, the story it tells, and details about the artist—information that is more than what a typical wall plaque could contain.

The last room in Gallery One contains a one-of-a-kind, 40-foot touchscreen showcasing the museum’s entire collection. One can search based on time period, artist, or everything at once to create a personalized tour that can be loaded onto an iPad, and then used as a guide to explore the museum’s permanent collection. This innovative example of museum technology seems sustainable and all-encompassing, as it is designed to speak to first-timers as well as frequent visitors, and keep the permanent collection experience repeatedly new. While this example is revolutionary, its novel and grand
appeal is unreachable for many other museums to adopt due to the immense financial investment. [Photos of Gallery One can be found in Appendix A]

But considering these changes within the audience and the attempts at maintaining a connection with them through technology, it is still proposed that a museum’s greatest investment for long-term success is a nurturing of the relationship between the museum and the visitor: “Given the importance of repeat visits in any local marketplace, there is a need to establish long-term commitment with visitors. Therefore, it is important for a museum to undertake activities that will encourage long-term relationships with visitors…” (Gilmore and Rentschler, 2002, pp. 751-752) Are tech-savvy exhibits what visitors want? Given that technology rapidly changes, is that the most economical avenue for museums to take? What about those museums that cannot afford grand technological upgrades?

Instead, there is value to be sourced from the humanistic quality of the visitors, and the interactions and participatory experiences that they desire. More recently, visitors have grown from a highly passive observer to an active participant, where their needs and emotional experiences have become a high priority (Silvers, Wilson & Rogers, 2013). Unfortunately, most museums have been slow to recognize the significance of this shift due to the collections-centric perspective. With this mindset, user research remains greatly limited the typical and superficial results of visitor surveys and focus groups—both of which rarely challenge routine methods (Silvers, Wilson & Rogers, 2013).

In spite of museums’ “devotion” to the visitor, what really happens is an over-preoccupation with the object (explained further in the Current State of Affairs section) and their deepest needs get set aside. As a result, museums are feeling the effect of visitors how are less than satisfied with the services, experiences, and interactions that
deserve a well designed approach (Silvers, Wilson & Rogers, 2013). What remains is a serious gap and growing question of relevancy in a world that is constantly changing. There is a strong need for an internally unified museum to delve into exploring the vast opportunity backed by user-centered research in order to better understand and respond to visitors’ needs.

Management Trends in Museums

One must look at the administrative practices and perspectives in museums, since it is the defining source for the overall operational quality, as it is with any organizational body. From here, all things are conceived and carried out, whether it is how to work with others, how to resolve conflicts, or how to carry out one’s departmental responsibility. But museums have a unique circumstance, in that their internal goals are almost directly contradictory: curators aim to preserve and protect, while programming
strives for accessibility (Genoways and Ireland, 2003, p. 57). Moreover, with the evolving visitor-museum relationship, there is growing urgency for leaders to become more market-oriented, but without compromising the skillful custodial mission (Gilmore and Rentschler, 2002, 757). These complex and inherently conflicting ideals make the challenges in museums unique in comparison to typical for-profit businesses and fellow non-profit bodies. Therefore, we must focus on management practices and relationships if there is to be greater holistic balance and sustainable change.

Most often museums are hierarchically organized and “… seldom function as unified organizations…” (Griffin, 1987, p. 387). The board of trustees is positioned at the top with overarching governing authority, while the director resides next in line and remaining departments are structured in a branched system, each carrying the same top-down structure. [See Figure 1.] All departmental managers report to the director, or department head, who acts as the liaison between the staff and trustees (Genoways and Ireland, 2003, p. 40). This traditional organizational structure is frequently scrutinized for fostering territorial decision-making and promoting departmental segregation, as branches operate as distinct, independent bodies (p. 40). With this top-down structure, pockets of professional bureaucracies tend to form, allowing individuals to gain “considerable control over their work” and eventually begin seeking control over the work of neighboring departments, ultimately becoming a point of tension and difficult to manage (Griffin and Abraham, 2000, p. 350).

In 1992, a definition of management within museums was published in a prominent museum management journal, defining it as: “the process of performing the activities of planning, organizing, staffing, leadership, and control so at to achieve goals effectively and efficiently…” (Schmidt, 1992, p. 261). This supports the common issue of
control and micro-management and distrust of individual choices and standards that situates a fog of dividedness.

Furthermore: “Many studies have shown how politics and power are used in organizations. ... whilst Chief Executives espoused particular behaviors—such as risk-taking and trustworthiness and competitiveness—in their immediate subordinates, they in fact forced conformity amongst their subordinates and discouraged others from taking risks; nor were they prepared to involved themselves in groups session to resolve the resulting credibility gap” (Griffin, 1988, p. 15).

While museums divide, attempts to move forward will continue to be hindered. Time will be used to out-do or control another groups and “interactions will be principally of the win-lose rather than the win-win type” (Griffin, 1987, p. 387). Instead, successful leadership in museums prioritize collaboration and teamwork, as interdepartmental cooperation is a prerequisite for a museum, or any organization, in developing successful services in terms of education, accessibility and communication (Gilmore and Rentschler, 2002, p. 751).

There have been attempts to side-step the stymied operations. One proposed solution is to flatten the vertical categorization of authority, known as the horizontal approach (Genoways and Ireland, 2003, p. 40). This flattening is done by removing the middle managers and placing decision making in the hands of the “lower-level” staff, empowering them with responsibility of progress and outcomes. A common problem with this solution is what to do with the professionals who commonly reside as middle managers (curators are often appointed here). Not only does this limit the foundational knowledge and expertise of museums, but this kind of downsizing is also not common practice within non-profits, as it is with for-profits (p. 40).
In *Museum Administration: An Introduction*, Genoways and Ireland explain another possible solution that is instead built around the tasks and functions of a museum, versus the individuals tasked to complete them. It is known as the matrix model, defined by the a combination of the hierarchical and horizontal structures, where the overlap of tasks bring departments together, with teams managed hierarchically. While this model supports decentralization and greater collaboration, the dissolution of departmental boundaries usually inhibits forward progress and clear communication. With more managers involved in the development of a specific task, staff find themselves having to report to more than one “boss” (2003, p. 43).

While these suggestions attempt to help the problems of hierarchical management, surprisingly very little efforts have focused on a core issue—quality interactions. Designing a management structure that allows for collaboration is important, but would come second to the redesigning of communications and interactions between employees. Just as the internal division begins with the rigid perspectives and defensive communications, the heart of the issue is the quality of interactions; the management structure is the petri dish that enables its growth.

Instead, there needs to be a shift in perspective:

Effective [administrations] contribute to the goals rather than intervene in executive management issues. In particular they see that change is managed so as to enhance the organizations effectiveness rather than strengthen the power of certain managers. These issues are far more important than matters such as structure—organizational design—which receives such a lot of attention in some places. (Griffin, p. 352)

With this quote having been published in 2000, it seems that even with all the research,
the real problem continues to be unattended.

The problem with traditional, hierarchical directorship is that with it stifles individuality, creativity, and innovation, establishing a breeding ground for tension and conflict through widespread micro-management. It would seem that administrators are told what to do and exactly how to do it. Policies are written so thoroughly that there is rigidity and unspoken expectations to follow them. There is a great amount of control and personal choice and direction is close to obliterated.

The breeding and feeding of conflict, competition, defensiveness, is what leads to the segregation. With conflict inevitable and the poor, misguided handling of conflict continues, what results is greater attention put on dissolving the fires, versus managing change, remaining adaptable, and creating new opportunities. The conclusion seems to be that innovation is static in bureaucracies, and “… the more institutionalized the power is within an organization, the more likely it is… that the organization will be out of phase with the realities it faces” (Griffin, 1988, p. 15).

The Director and The Board

Directors of museums are like train conductors. They power, steer, and define the mission and morale of an institution, as well as lay and uphold the quality of the track that the museum follows. Their roles are integral and complex, as they are the fulcrum of a productive, successful (or not so) organization. Oftentimes, directors ascend from the curatorial ranks and are selected by Board members or recruited through search committees (Griffin, 1988, p. 18) and it is deemed highly integral for museum administrators to carry appropriate academic training. This wealth of knowledge assists them in their operational and conservational responsibilities (Ambrose and Paine, 1993,
p. 299). But given the recent changes in the external condition, “…directors’ roles need to be extended to balance the development and preservation of creative art works with the creative management of the museum as a market-oriented organizations.” (Gilmore and Rentschler, 2002, p. 757).

According to Des Griffin in his article “Managing in the Museum Organization: Leadership and Communication,” a new perspective on the role of museum directors has emerged:

The manager is the coach or cheerleader or facilitator, not the boss, policeman or controller. He or she retains control only over those few things that have to be controlled (‘simultaneous loose/tight properties’), and people are given a sense of ownership of their future. (1987, p. 393)

Based on this new perspective, there are five distinct roles of a museum manager (p. 392):

1. **Setting objectives.** This could be (re)writing a mission statement or setting basic, foundational benchmarks that help others work in accordance with the mission statement. Without this clearly communicated, it would seem that quality and clarity would struggle.

2. **Organizing.** Analyzing activities, identifying manageable jobs and grouping them into a structure (i.e., partnering different people and departments to collaborate in creating new programming).

3. **Motivating and establishing morale.** Building a working environment around open communication, honest and respectful working practices. Reminding them of the value of what they do and keeping everyone excited about their job.

4. ‘**Measurement**’ by setting targets for performance. For example, maybe asking “how well did a special event/program do? What do we need a special event/
program to do? What were our objectives and how well did it fulfill them? Why or why not?” to define basic benchmarks to measure the success of outreach.

5. Developing people. Seemingly the most important. The happier people are, the better they are to work with, as is their work quality. Without personal [internal] development and developing the organization as a whole, it would seem logical that there can be little or no external development.

With a director who motivates and facilitates, versus hovers and dictates, underlying professionals are given the room to be themselves. They are trusted to make decisions that are in the best interest for the museum’s well-being, work toward common goals, set aside their egos, and work cooperatively with fellow professionals in seeing solutions through from beginning to end. It is the element of trust that is integral to collaboration (Davies, Paton & O’Sullivan, 2013, p. 355). With this in place, people are encouraged to do their best work because they feel free to work in a way that is theirs. During the hiring stage, ensuring that their personality and work habits are in line with the working mission of the museum are vital.

In 2000, there was a call for enlisting more care when it came to choosing managers, (Griffin and Abraham, 2000, p. 352). During the secondary research phase for this investigation, very few resources were found that stated the significance of personality requirements of a director. There tended to be greater discussion of the common conflicts and better strategies for resolving and preventing them. But this all overlooks the fact, and rather important one, that the person in charge is sufficiently self-aware, and emotionally intelligent to handle that conflict and manage it in a way that is beneficial for the individuals, and the museum as a whole.

A museum director needs to inherently possess certain characteristics if they
are to promote an innovative perspective within a museum. It seems appropriate that in order to recognize the need and ability of being self-aware, change-oriented, responsive, fluid, and collaborative (qualities of a successfully adaptive business), the individual running the organization must exhibit those qualities internally, as well as manage the humanness of relationships (fear, defensiveness, entitlement, etc.). Currently there seems to be little acknowledgement and research of human nature and its effects on museum management.

If the director is the conductor, the board members are the front-train passengers. “Boards have the responsibility for the long-term future of the organization” (Griffin, 1987, p. 393) and “…they can assist with advice and act as a sounding board for ideas from the organization’s executive. They may assist in increasing influence and, through that or separately, increase the resources available to the organization, further promoting its prestige and wealth” (Griffin, 1991, p. 294).

The board carries many responsibilities that are written in a museum’s bylaws. Here are some examples (Genoways and Ireland, 2003, pp. 27-8):

1. Evaluate the museum’s efforts and guarantee that they align with their stated mission and purpose
2. Advocate for community involvement with the museum
3. Oversee the security of the collection in the present and long-term
4. See that the museum serves as broad an audience as possible
5. Support the research efforts undertaken by the museum in order to establish and maintain accurate and unbiased knowledge, relating to the collection
6. Review and monitor the corporate planning efforts and goals
7. Protect the financial stability of the museum; oversee budgets, regular audits,
invest in the museum, and engage in fundraising efforts

8. Evaluate and monitor the performance of the director; exercise removal of the director if deemed necessary

9. Maintain that the museum is adequately staffed in order to carry out all museum functions

Overall, it is the duty of the board to uphold legal, professional, and ethical standards (Anderson, 2004, p. 4) and they are “crucial” in their financial investment and fundraising efforts (Betzler and Gmür, 2012, p. 276). Trustees are commonly appointed or elected, occasionally from the membership community, and individual recruitment and selection criteria are defined within a given museum’s bylaws (Lord and Lord, 2009, p. 17). In the wealth of literature regarding museum governance and the complexity of board performance, very little information exists concerning the value of content knowledge or academic training and its role in the selection of board members.

Ideally the board-director relationship functions best when the board is removed from managing the administration and staff that reside under the director. Success weighs on the interactions between the director and board, as their disconnection can have a negative consequence: “‘Boards are supposed to hoot when the organization heads into the wrong part of the forest. Unfortunately many boards don’t even know where the forest is’” (Griffin, 1991, p. 295). Board members “usually have difficulty understanding what is being done and yet think that they are there to tell the staff what to do” (Griffin, 1987, p. 393).

While it is important for the director to involve the board and illicit effective support of the organization (Griffin, 1987, p. 394), board members must work foremost in support of the museums’ mission and not intervene in executive management issues
(Griffin and Abraham, 2000, p. 352). Overall, their duty is best fulfilled when managing the change within an organization, rather than bolster the power of particular staff members. These interpersonal dynamics, according to Griffin and Abraham, are far more important than organizational structure.

**The Current State of Affairs: Internal vs. External**

In discussing the relationships of museums with their audience, it is helpful to view them from two distinct vantage points—internal and external; the former includes museum administrators, professionals, and staff of all levels and departments, the latter includes any individual not employed at a museum, i.e., members of the general public in which the museum aims to serve. Understanding where they overlap and actually affect one another is valuable in discerning where the negative impact manifests and pinpoints where change could potentially aid museums.

First and foremost, an important connection between two external sources must be outlined. Visitors are the reason why museums exist, and donors are a huge reason museums are able to exist, and without one the other would not exist. Moreover, the two are seen as being positively correlated. Resources on museum governance point to the increasing pressure from governments and individual, private donors, for greater financial accountability and resource transparency (O’Neill, 1991; Lindqvist, 2012). With this demand of measurable success, in order for a museum to be successful, it needs to know how to best answer to its visitors.

Essentially, museums must become user-centered if they are to improve their relevancy, appease the ever-changing needs of visitors, and meet the increasing demands of donors—two groups whose relationships they so greatly rely upon. To
become responsive, time and resources must be used efficiently, calling for designed inquiry, interpretation, and implementation. However it is this very perspective that museums are intrinsically hard-wired against.

The authenticity and esteem of a museum is grounded in the expertise of its curators. Curation is a historically academic practice and requires a strong commitment to research: “To be really good at understanding collections, you have to be immersed in them for a long time” (O’Neill, 1991, p. 29). With this immersion, there can exist a natural inattention and exclusion of the ‘outside’ world, and at times, the object is seen as being most important. In this case, the methodology becomes internally-focused, the curators develop a tunneled vision and the public becomes easily dismissible (pp. 29-31). “The public often comes a poor second in competing for attention with these titanic struggles between museum disciplines” (p. 30).

Adding to this conundrum is a lack of evaluation or exploration regarding and quality of visitors’ intended experience, a frequent parallel to traditional, bureaucratic management systems (O’Neill, 1991, p. 28). Instead, the blame of not “getting” something, or being unable to “connect” is placed on the audience, and they are deemed as having a lack of taste, intelligence, or being “non-believers” (pp. 20-31). Consequently, the pairing of this perspective is only propelled by the hierarchical, conservative, rigid management tendencies, where conflict abounds and recognition of the individual is lowered to how well they follow directions.

Furthermore, it is common practice for directors and assistant directors to come from the curatorial departments (Griffin, 1988, p. 18). And while this custom seems advantageous, since knowledge of the museum’s focus and accuracy are vital to the legitimacy of a museum, curatorial experts are potentially narrow-minded when it
comes to marketing, design, education, and leadership. Until now, there has been little push for them to be otherwise (p. 18).

Underneath this fault-finding and indifference toward the visitor is a lack of responsibility and denial of the depth and complexity of human nature. Rather than putting more attention on getting to know the audience, and understanding what they want and being able to deliver successfully, content and information is ignorantly defined. Rather than admitting an error or when something has missed its mark, the blame is directed outwardly instead of being resolved internally and making changes based on the less-successful outcomes. With this blind, reactionary tendency as the status quo, museums walk farther down a narrowed tunnel, foster a disparity both internally and externally, jeopardize visitor and donor relationships, and ultimately negate adaptability and stifle innovation.

With a primary focus on curatorial study, accuracy, information dissemination, and preservation, the mindset that surrounds this practice corners itself to narrow-mindedness and a preoccupation with status. There is a void of curiosity, creative problem solving, collaboration. The quality of internal relationships directly correlates with the quality of external relationships, and where there is more division, mistrust, devaluation of the individual, visitors and donors indirectly receive divided, devalued attention. Instead, if the administration and staff were unified in carrying out a new mission, with the value of the visitors and donors experience and connection on the same level as the quality and authenticity of curation, the road to innovation would not be so steep.
**Conclusion**

To conclude, it is clear that the original role of museums is changing. While they remain institutions of value, education, and historical preservation, the external changes occurring within the audiences are undeniable. As the visitor is changing, what they want from the museum is changing. This ultimately also affects the quality of the relationship with the donor. Clearly a change in perspective and process is needed, from an overly internalized mindset to one that is more user-centered. But with the traditional and hierarchical management trends commonly utilized in museums, substantial change will be significantly challenging, even unlikely.

“Change by itself is so uncomfortable that institutions do not do it voluntarily or for noble reasons alone. They change because they fear the consequences of not doing so, and only they are they willing to override the cries of anguish from the discomforted” (Peacock, 2008, p. 341). However, museums cannot continue to ignore the visitors’ degree of satisfaction and are encouraged to accept the need to change, deepening their value and expanding their traditional ideas concerning interaction and design. “If museums can transform themselves more and more into socially interactive institutions and at the same time hold on to what is of lasting value, people can keep in touch with these values while adapting to change…. Accepting responsibility for the human dimension… is the main challenge facing museums...” (O’Neill, 1991, p. 35).

The role of the director and board are vital to the success of these changes. “Successful organizational reform generally emphasizes transformational leadership, attention to communication about the nature of the change organisation, and the shaping of its culture and climate, not to cost-cutting, downsizing, or restructuring” (Griffin, 2001, p. 352). And in this rebuilding of the culture, a designful leader will leave no room
left for the tunneled, change-avoidant mindsets, as a museum’s ability to innovate and change is directly connected with the degree of open conversation and “how permeable its boundaries are to a diversity of external ideas and perspectives” (Peacock, 2008, p. 347). It is time for museums to proactively redesign their future.
CHAPTER III

Design

Design is everywhere. It is in our shoes, furniture, cars, books, web sites, and favorite apps. If one reflects long enough, it is even visible in the natural world. But there is a difference between design as an artifact, or something tangible, versus design as a process, idea, or something intangible. Even more philosophical and abstract is the notion that design is change, the act of making something better: “Everyone designs who devises courses of action aimed at changing existing situations into preferred ones,” Herbert Simon, a Nobel Laureate and leading social scientist, once wrote (Neumeier, 2009, p. 32).

For many, the word ‘design’ can trigger specific ideas. The layout of books, magazines, the design of a chair or electronic device. Even the design of retail space or restaurants. The common ideas of design have been changing rapidly with the progression of technology, but also with changes in how those seek to improve the connections between people. Factors like ‘sustainability’ and ‘innovation’ grow and morph with the consumers’ needs and desires, but so must the human vehicle through which the information is developed and delivered. The opportunity for design is no longer limited to “posters and toasters” (Neumeier, 2009, p. 13; R. Buchanan, personal communication, September 10, 2014), but expanding into social constructs, information systems, and human experiences. Recognizing these differing levels of design aids in understanding how and where it can help museums.

In the article “Wicked Problems in Design Thinking,” written by Dr. Richard Buchanan, a scholar of design and innovation at Case Western Reserve University, are four outlined overarching areas in which design manifests. The first tier of design is that
of the graphic and symbolic nature; a communication of content and ideas with the use of visual, two-dimensional forms. This kind of design can be found in books, magazines, and a multitude of printed formats in the form of advertisements and typographic construction (1992, p. 9). An expansion of this level of design can been seen in other areas such as photography, motion graphics (film and graphic animations), as well as website design. The growing complexity of visual communication design is changing the way people relate to two-dimensional material, as well as the role of the designer and the material itself, thoroughly repositioning communication problems (p. 9), and the significant power of simple representation and conceptual acuity.

A second and grander extension of design is the non-structural and visual nature of material objects, i.e. three-dimensional design (Buchanan, 1992, p. 9) and include household objects, clothing, furniture, cars, tools, machinery, to name a few. The progression of this area of design has broadened greatly with a deepening of psychological, social, and cultural considerations with a more thorough look at the interactions between these objects and the people who use them. It has evolved by further investigation into the constructional problems, acknowledging and providing a more integrative force. It is here that aesthetics, functionality, and physicality, as well as human and natural sciences, must come together in order to achieve this (1992, p. 9).

A third tier of design is more systematic in nature, concerned with organizational structure and management, i.e. organized services and actives. More specifically, it is focused on obtaining the highest degree of efficiency through the strategic organization of people, physical resources, schedules and logistics to arrive at a specified goal. The evolution of this concentration centers on deepening logic and strategy, as well as how asserting a designful attitude can illicit a more organic rhythm to the human experiences
in these concrete situations, heightening “connections and consequences” through greater meaningful interactions. “Designers are exploring a progressively wider range of connections in everyday experiences and how different types of connections affect the structure of action” (Buchanan, 1992, p. 10).

A fourth and final tier is the design of environments, or the spaces and/or systems in which people work, play, live, and learn. Traditionally this includes architecture, urban planning, and systems design, but translates to more of an abstract investigation of complex wholes, the parts that constitute them, and their structural hierarchy. The significant change in this area broadens the focus to reflect on cultural and ecological environments in their entirety; the sustainability, development, and integration of human beings into broader groups, and the role design plays in the adaptation of the environments in which these changes take place. Evolution of fourth-tier design pinpoints balance of a functioning whole, identifying and enriching the values and ideas that create the balance (Buchanan, 1992, p. 10).

Looking at these seemingly separate areas of design, it is easy and inviting to think of them as individual areas of specialization under an overarching professional identity (Buchanan, 1992, p. 10). But to remain in this perspective severely limits the understanding of just how powerful design, and a designful mindset, really is. “In fact, signs, things, actions, and thoughts are not only interconnected, they also interpenetrate and merge in contemporary design thinking with surprising consequences for innovation.” When “Properly understood and used, they are also places of invention… places where one discovers the dimensions of design thinking by a reconsideration of problems and solutions” (Buchanan, 1992, p. 10).
The Impact of Design On Business

A great deal of research has been conducted on the ways in which design can improve business, both nationally and internationally. Many case studies and statistical evidence illustrate this correlation. A group that has led a series of significant investigations on this topic is The Design Council [DC], a British organization founded during the second world war that has studied the application and benefits of design in various sectors (e.g., finance, business services, manufacturing, technology, retail, leisure services) in numerous regions across the United Kingdom. They’ve gathered, organized, and analyzed tangible evidence that design makes a direct impact on sales, profits, turnover, and growth. “Using and valuing design brings bottom line benefits, and those who understand and act on this insight have a competitive edge over the rest” (DC, 2007a, p. 4).

In their research they interviewed 1,500 businesses throughout the country, and of those businesses, identified 250 companies where design had a direct impact on various performance measures (p. 6). They coined these groups as “design alert businesses” and funneled detailed questions to uncover exactly how design correlated to 7 key areas of performance; increased market share, increased turnover, development of new markets, increased profit, competitiveness, new products/services, and increased employment (DC, 2007a, p. 12). A few of their key findings showed that for every £100 a design alert business spends on design it increases net sales by £225 and profit by £83 (p. 4). Those in the retail, wholesale and leisure services saw one of the biggest increases in market share (p. 12). In these design alert businesses, the top motivators for using design was to develop innovative and higher quality services and products, as well as provide greater value to customers (p. 20).
In their study of 61 design-led companies, which included names like British Airways, Barclays, Rolls-Royce, and BP, they found these companies outperformed the top 100 companies in the London Stock Exchange with the highest market capitalization (FTSE 100) by more than 200% over the past decade. “This proves that businesses using design effectively do better than their peers, by a long way and over a long time. And it’s clear evidence of a relationship between design investment, business performance and long-term stock market value” (DC, 2007a, 14). Furthermore, it was three times more likely that design was held as an integral business ingredient by rapidly growing businesses compared to others who held design as significantly important, marginally important, or not important at all to their business operations (pp. 23-4). Businesses that lead with design early in the process and in all stages of development were two times more likely to see design contributing to their growth (p. 11).

Looking further at value and its relationship with design, The Design Council found that businesses consider adding value to products and services much more significantly (77%) than “innovating in the abstract” (16%) when it came to competition. Also, adding value was often achieved through a design process that understood and met user needs and was, of course, a key means of delivering innovation. (p. 16) It was noted that simply adding value to core services and products was integral to a business’s success (p. 36). Of the eight key areas of added value identified, the top three were customer relationships, the design of a product or service, and developing a valued and trusted brand (p. 37). But even more significantly, it was shown that adding value through design was even better: 34% of businesses that add value through design say this has had a great impact on turnover compared to only 21% of businesses who don’t appreciate design’s role. The Design Council concludes, “Businesses get even more benefit
from adding value when they use design or a designer” (p. 38). [See Figure 2]

What does this value through design look like? A study by Brigitte Borja de Mozota, a professor of Management Science at the University Paris X in France, outlines a relationship between design and value (2009, pp. 66-70). Through her findings, she has established four core powers of design:

1. **Design as differentiator**: establishing a unique, equitable brand that extends through the prioritizing of consumer research and value, generating customer loyalty.

2. **Design as coordinator**: looking to design as a process of visualization and collaboration, improving products and/or services using design as the innovation process.

3. **Design as transformer**: using design as a way to remain agile through the establishment of greater knowledge and business opportunities, as well as strengthening the organization’s capacity to change.
4. **Design as good business**: generating an increase in sales, greater profit margins, and brand value.

Through these studies, the proof is in the pudding—design clearly makes a significantly positive contribution a business’s performance, internally and externally, innovatively and financially, and adds qualitative evidence supporting the higher-tiered capacity of design. Fearful of change, the risk-averse, inflexible, routine-preferring and conservatively driven art museums have inhibited their value creation and innovation. A change is needed, and that change is working and thinking like designers.

**How Design Is the Sharpest Tool in the Shed**

Traditional, design-less management isn’t cutting it anymore and according to management guru Tom Peters, this fact was unveiled as early as 1980. In the article ‘Managing Our Way to Economic Decline’ written by Bob Hayes and Bill Abernathy, two Harvard Business professors, they declared “that dispassionate analysis had driven out passionate attachment to the product itself” and that the American management system needed to hit the reset button. By the mid 80’s, Hayes was pursuing the idea of a meaningfully designed advantage and its integral role in the management revolution (1997, p. 430).

Designer and researcher Marty Neumeier builds on this idea in his book *The Designful Company*. He states a number of problems with traditionally managed, design-void companies, where innovation is emotionless and disengaging, products are aesthetically uncompelling, brands carry little depth and desirability, and irresponsible businesses are signing their wills with doubtful customers, withdrawn employees, and distrustful communities (2009, pp. 4-5).
Instead, businesses need to define their brand and deliver it to the fullest. “Brand means nothing more (and nothing less!) than creating a distinct personality... and telling the world about it... by hook or by crook,” claims Peters (1997, p. 339). All other aspects of the business, i.e. marketing, finance, communications, sales, investor relations, are secondary to the life force of the brand (Neumeier, 2009, p. 16). In order for a business to develop a brand that creates and sustains loyal customers, organizations need to bring a bold idea to life. To do this, they must identify and develop the right idea, get everyone (either several, hundreds, or thousands) on board to communicate it together, and then be ready to change or replace that idea depending on the changes in the market.

Add to that two significant external variables: extreme competition and constant change (Neumeier, 2009, p. 19). As cited from secondary literature on museum, this overpopulation and competition is a harsh reality. But more significant is the factor of change; an uncontrollable constant that many do not like to accept. But there are two remedies: differentiation and agility (p. 19). In a world of clutter and competition, organizations must identify and campaign their differences—what makes them valuable, unique from those that offer the same thing? Furthermore, they must be fluid, malleable, flexible; adjusting to the market’s fluctuating needs and desires that changes at an unyielding rate. Neumeier proposes, “You have to encourage an enterprise-wide appetite for radical ideas. You have to keep the company in a constant state of inventiveness” (p. 21).

But to reap the benefits of these radical ideas and inventiveness requires that certain overarching qualities be in place, and that they exist organization-wide. To be inventive and agile, an organization must posses the right mindset, the right skills, and collaboration, which enables the organization’s skill set to multiply and grow (Neumeier,
2009, p. 21) and according to Peters, this designful way of working needs to be a part of every new service or product, embedded in all major processes, like marketing and R&D, a part of the organizational structure, i.e., rewards systems, human resources, and even play a role in the choosing of board members (1997, p. 438-9).

In the words of well-known designer Paul Rand, design is a way of life (Heller, Ballance and Garland, 1998, p. 9). and museum leaders must make design their new tool for success. In considering the importance of what it means to be designful, a closer look at what the process and mindset looks like is necessary.

A Designful Process

There are as many different kinds of processes and defining characteristics as there are designers using them. But looking at the phrase as a whole as well as the parts which define it, design can be boiled down into the marriage of a process and perspective—a series of steps coupled with a designful mindset. These steps that make up the process are cooperative and build on one another through research, curiosity, analysis, and creation. But there is also a particular mindset in which is necessary to operate from in order to generate an innovative solution. It is not enough to merely follow the steps, but also genuinely carry a mental disposition that allows for adaptability, empathy, curiosity, realness and depth. Design Thinking is both a process and a perspective, and at the risk of sounding overly simplistic, it means how it reads: working and thinking like a designer. Here is one design company’s personal and unadulterated take on their process:

We don’t have any icons or diagrams that explain our creative process. Nor do we have clever names for the stages of each project. But we do have curiosity. And
we believe that to solve a problem, you need to talk about it. You need to look at it from every angle. To discuss and debate it. To pull it apart, and then put it back together again. And we believe in doing all of these things together. Conversation, consideration and collaboration. That’s our process. (Christopher Doyle & Co., 2014)

Based on the inherent vagueness and flexibility from this example, there could also be as many defining parameters of design thinking as there are businesses to adopt it. This can be tallied as a positive characteristic, but also can make adopting it confusing, challenging, and likely an abandoned endeavor when presented to a large organization of people who operate in a starkly different world. However, in the sources scoured for answers, there were conditions that appeared often enough to become almost general knowledge.

In conducting secondary research on the concept of ‘design thinking,’ even the premier sources on the topic seemed to remain unclear about exactly what design thinking is (one resource did not introduce a clear, concise definition of Design Thinking until page 62). Granted, it can be a rather deep and complex idea and broadly defined concept, but in order for organizations to change their ways and integrate a new methodology, it would be advantageous to present the practice simply, clearly, and concretely. All researchers and writers of the design process cited in this thesis (Neumeier, 2009; Design Council, 2007; and Kelley and Kelley, 2013) made the same observation, that there are indeed as many kinds of processes are there are designer’s designing. But in looking at the various findings and the differing names each author prescribed for each stage, essentially the same activities were noted.

In the findings given by Neumeier (2009, p. 48), he identified four overarching
stages: (1) Discovery; (2) Ideation; (3) Refinement; (4) Production. The Design Council (2007b), in “their most in-depth study ever,” derived a four-step, quadratic (diamond-shaped) process as follows:

1. **Discover**: includes market research, user research, managing information, design research groups.
2. **Define**: includes project development, project management, project sign-off, and potentially other actions like concepting, storyboarding, prototyping.
3. **Develop**: includes multi-disciplinary working, visual management, development methods, testing, potentially personas.
4. **Deliver**: includes final testing, approval, launch; targets, evaluation, feedback.

Another similar design-thinking process presented by design and innovation firm IDEO (Kelley and Kelly, 2013, pp. 22-4):

1. **Inspiration**: includes taking an empathetic approach to research and discovery, observation, interviews, and comparative research with other industries.
2. **Synthesis**: referred to the “sense-making stage,” identifying patterns and themes to discover significant meaning, reframing the problem into actionable frameworks in order to decide where to focus.
3. **Ideation and Experimentation**: a “quick and dirty” phase that combines the brainstorming of potential solutions with an immediate testing and revision process, so as to arrive at a more user-centered, interesting, and practical conclusion faster.
4. **Implementation**: processing feedback, making changes, and finalizing the design of selected solution; the newly imagined solution is put into place.

In comparing these processes, a similar quality of linearity can be identified.
Initially this might seem appropriate, useful, and particularly comfortable to the analytical-thinking, business-minded individual. Unfortunately, “… [a linear] sequence no more describes the creative process than a wedding describes sex” (Neumeier, 2009, p. 48). But the exploration of newness and possibility through a rigid, fixed lens will only limit the results. Intuition and unpredictability play greatly into the creative process. These playful, open qualities are at the heart of what illicit new ideas, and strong linearity will strangle this freedom.

Buchanan has furthered an analysis and debunking of this linear quality. He asserts that design is not a linear process of two distinct phases (a problem-defining, or analytic, phase and a problem-solving, or synthetic, phase) as previously cherished by linear-favoring business professionals. “The linear model of design thinking is based on determinate problems which have definite conditions…. The designer’s task [when following this process] is to identify those conditions precisely and then calculate a solution” (Buchanan, 1992, p. 15). However, in looking at the most “wicked” problems, they are not shaped with linear conditions. Instead they are wickedly chaotic, messy, and are strongly indeterminate—meaning there are no defining circumstances or limitations—and attempting to align a non-linear problem to linear process will only produce an out-of-touch solution (p. 16).

Instead, what does happen in the unstructured process is the creation of a “particular subject out of the problems” and a jumping between the specific and general set of conditions that define a space for the designer to play, inquire, understand, imagine, and test possible solutions (Buchanan, 1992, pp. 16-7). These conditions are established when a “designer intuitively or deliberately… identifies the views of all participants, the issues which concern them, and the invention that will serve as a working hypothesis
for exploration and development” (p. 17). The key activity for designers, as stated by Buchanan, is to realize and create what does not yet exist.

Overall, this tendency to force this sometimes messy and chaotic approach into a straight line doesn’t support the spontaneity and intuition that contributes to a design’s success. Moreover, it is integral to note that even with these established processes mentioned, they themselves are constantly changing. In their study, The Design Council concluded “that the design process used by these leading corporate users of design, no matter how formalised or documented at the time of this study, [was] under continuous review” (2007b, p. 40). IDEO even presents a disclaimer in connection to their process, mentioning that they change and expand their methods continuously and that if one uses their process as a model, they are encouraged to vary it according to their unique needs (Kelley and Kelley, 2013, p. 22). Understanding the process as a simple series of action—knowing, making, and doing—taken from Neumeier (2009, p. 50) is possibly the best way for non-designers to begin to understand the process. In knowing, we ask, observe, empathize, discuss, discover, organize, and arrive at understanding. In making we visualize, brainstorm, create, prototype, test, and refine. In doing we realize, synthesize, produce, and implement. [See Figure 3.] When compared to traditional business practices, a key difference in the design process is that of making (Neumeier, 2009). It is here where newness is discovered and explored; form is given to the merging of the known and unknown and then tested for feasibility, reliability, and relatability.

However stage-like these remain, these actions should be recognized as phases that can be entered, exited, and reentered until the solution has been established, constantly balancing the known with the unknown—an attempt at giving form to the chaos. Seeing the process as a constantly changing stream of guidance can be challenging
and with its inherent impermeability make it difficult for businesses to integrate. But it is here that the importance of agility becomes paramount, as well as beginning to think like a designer.

**A Designful Mindset**

“If you probe more deeply into what drives innovation, only a few will understand
that innovation comes from company culture” (Neumeier, 2009, p. 56). And if you consider what defines culture, it is the individuals who create it. In looking more at the perspective aspect of design, it is valuable to consider each quality as containing two participants: the organization and employees. The degree to which the employees have or carry out these qualities (internal), will be the same degree to which the overall company is able to carry out these qualities (external). This relationship can be seen in the context of the museum world now, as explored in a previous chapter; a common internal museum mindset is overly inward, conservative, and divided. Thereby the users are ignored, change and innovation lie dormant, the mission and brand is only marginally delivered due to interdepartmental competition and conflict. It is here, at the personal level, that culture is defined and a company is able to change.

Not surprisingly, full-fledged creative thinking is different. It does not follow a specific process, can be fleeting and, at times, frustratingly elusive. Oftentimes it takes place in an uncomfortable, messy space where there are a lot of questions but no answers. But it is in this discomfort, with the help of inquiry and experimentation, that answers become clear. It can be a scary and energizing space for one to exist, but by carrying the mindset of a designer allows one to be more adept at following the process and becoming comfortable with the discomfort. There are five distinct qualities composing the mindset of a designer: having a sense of play—creative, imaginative, reflective; collaborative; balanced; change-oriented; empathetic. They are pertinent to both the individuals that make up the organization, as well as the environment in which they work. Establishing a working culture with these qualities as a foundation enables a creative process to work organically, fluidly, innovatively and adapt that practice over time through being self-aware and responsive.
having a ‘sense of play’—curious, imaginative, reflective.

“The role of imagination is to create new meanings and to discover connections that, even if obvious, seem to escape detection. Imagination begins with intuition, not the intellect.”

—Paul Rand, From Lascaux to Brooklyn

Just as young children are happy to inquire “why” frequently, the process of design involves a very similar habit. Having a tendency toward insatiable curiosity helps in peeling away the layers of an onion, revealing a foundational issue of a given project or problem, an aspect in which all things that will be developed take into consideration.

Looking at the processes outlined by The Design Council and the Kelleys, they all begin with inquiry. Asking questions and digging deep into the situation helps carry the focus through different possibilities. Being inquisitive and creative is not so different from the free, uninhibited, imaginative qualities of young children. Use the curiosity in tandem with imagination, visualizing or intuitively directing thoughts to construct something new. Curiosity, imagination and reflection are not mutually exclusive. It is reflection that provides the space for curiosity and imagination to dance; it allows one to “embrace paradox” (Neumeier, 2009, p. 45) and balance an idea between logic and intuition.

In conjunction with this, if new ideas are valued, an environment will need to be built to support this. This doesn’t demand construction of a new, million-dollar wing, but it is as simple as the tools and methods used for meetings (post-it notes, permanent
markers, floor-to-ceiling dry erase boards), a greater focus on the act of rapid idea generation, letting loose with a free flow of ideas and providing room for the curious and imaginative parts of ourselves. An important ingredient is time. There must be time allowed for this, allowing time and space (environment) for the free flow of imagination: “Instead, the process has to ‘play’ out while the designer bounces around in the space between logic and magic” (Neumeier, 2009, p. 50).

Looking at innovation-focused companies like Google and Patagonia, they’ve adopted a corporate culture that prioritizes employee freedom and play, resulting in progressive financial success and employee loyalty. Patagonia employees set their own hours, while excessive work habits are intercepted by timely building closures. They have the option to spend their workday surfing, hiking, fly-fishing, or other outdoor activity to try out new gear and let their mind wander. Proof for the value of play is seen in the numbers: “Far from slacking off, the family-owned company has doubled in size and tripled in profits since 2008, earning $600 million in 2013. Its 2,000 employees around the globe are fiercely loyal. Turnover is minimal. The company is expanding into new global markets” (Schulte, 2014).

collaborative.

Design is inherently a group practice. Brainstorming, funneling through questions, conceptualizing, visualizing, providing and receiving feedback—these are all activities in the design process that are strengthened by working with others. But creating and managing productive team dynamics is not easy. With differing (at times conflicting) mindsets coming together, egos and an attachment to ideas have the potential to thwart even the most well-intentioned group efforts. Collaboration has been a long-
time struggle for museum professionals, noted strongly in the secondary and primary research (Griffin), perpetuated by ego-based, individualized, professional elitism (O’Neill). Internal corporate practices according to Neumeier, have also perpetuated, as management frequently rewards the independent achievement of employees, departments, and external firms (2009, p. 104).

When it comes to setting up the right environment for collaborating, hiring the right people is an important prerequisite. “Prima donnas, classroom bullies, and nervous nellies need not apply. Teamwork is an advance form of creativity, requiring players who are humble, generous, and independent-minded” (Neumeier, 2009, p. 110). When the right people are chosen based on personality, their differences don’t matter so much—in fact, they are welcomed.

IDEO has built their collaborative model on the professional differences between participants, stating that pooling individuals with varying backgrounds allows for variety and uniqueness to be brought into the brainstorming pool: “By working in diverse multidisciplinary teams, we can get to a place that would have been impossible for one of us to reach alone. Bringing together a variety of life experiences and contrasting perspectives results in a creative tension that often leads to more innovative and interesting ideas” (Kelley and Kelley, 2013, p. 186).

Getting creativity to flow in a group calls for the establishment of a two key qualities: a widespread sense of trust and an additive mindset. Provided the understanding that a clear brief has been defined and there is a strong, shared commitment to an end goal, instilling trust is as equally important. It establishes a sense of safety and creates a space in which people feel free to uninhibitedly express their ideas, however wild they might be. “Exchanging ideas within a group of people who trust
one another—without fear of judgement or failure...” “[this] exemplified what creative collaboration looks like at its best” (Kelley and Kelley, 2013, p. 185).

Designers are faced with learning collaborative practices in their schooling, and well into their work environments. Their mindsets are well-versed with creative confidence, and this, along with positive personality traits, sets the groundwork for effective collaboration. On a larger scale, the external setting must match the internal. A responsibility of the leader is to lay the foundation: “…people love to collaborate when there’s a sharp delineation of roles, an unobstructed view of the goal, and a strong commitment to quality. Conversely, they hate to collaborate if they believe their work will be mitigated by pettiness, confusion, and low expectations” (Neumeier, 2009, p. 110).

balanced.

While considering the value of flexibility and letting intuition guide the development of ideas, it is also necessary to keep this in check. The word balance was seen prolifically throughout all sources, museum-oriented and design-oriented. When it relates to the mindset of a designer, balance is necessary to keep the perspective practical, as well as the intended audience. Neumeier suggests that we are a culture of over-thinkers and arguers (2009, p. 37). This is true, but it is important to be able to analyze a situation in order to identify all causalities, allowing for the discovery of an educated, and balanced solution. This kind of perspective is referred to as “holistic thinking” by Neumeier—balancing a micro-perspective with a macro-perspective. The macro allows for the consideration of contextual constraints, or how something is differential in the grand scheme of things. The micro puts into focus the details, defining quality.

In the book The Design of Business written by Roger Martin, a professor in the
Rotman School of Management at the University of Toronto, he explains the significant value of balance and defines it as a elemental to business success, giving equal power to analysis and intuition. He also aligns this way of thinking with the design process: “A person or organization instilled with [design thinking] is constantly seeking a fruitful balance between reliability and validity, between art and science, between intuition and analytics, and between exploration and exploitation” (2009, p. 62). He identifies this equalized mode of thinking as abductive reasoning.

Martin explains that the concept of abduction was founded by American philosopher Charles Sanders Pierce. Pierce believed that new ideas did not come simply from an inductive or deductive analysis of established data, but instead an observation of information that didn’t fit. By then making “logical leaps of the mind” to an “inference to the best explanation,” the goal becomes exploring what could be true. “The true first step of reasoning, [Pierce] concluded, was not observation, but wondering” (2009, pp. 64-5). This world of wonder and uncertainty is where designers reside. They identify and challenge assumptions, existing data, and seek to establish new data and imagine new possibilities.

Culturally, a shift needs to take place from that of a primarily static, rigorously planned and concrete structure to one with more emphasis on flexibility, fluidity containing more provisional teams and projects with a clear beginning and end; budgets and planning soften to accommodate pursuits that do not have predictable outcomes (Martin, 2009, p. 27). Becoming more flexible does not mean that all structure be thwarted. Even still, abductive thinking must exist in concordance with induction and deduction, as well as with what is technologically and financially feasible. It is a balancing-upon-balancing act.
change-oriented.

In the design process, being flexible and able to easily let go are important in all stages. Early on, during a conceptualization phase when the creative flow is high, there can be a lot of jumping from one idea to another. Remaining comfortable with discarding ideas and unattached to possible solutions allows for unbiased decision making, letting the constraints and defined needs to lead the way. For example, consider logo design, or even a page layout. One approach to this is “sprinting”—or rapid ideation (Xenakis, 2011, p. 114). It involves a lot of sketching, quick visualizations, giving form to concept within a short time frame and then repeating the process. In working this way, one pushes through the expected (early ideas) to the unique (later ideas) by exploring variety and taking risks. This process helps to avoid getting stuck, letting one’s intuition guide them in choosing which ideas to explore, and which to lay aside.

Agility is also valuable during the prototyping and feedback stages. Whether there is one round of concepting or several, remaining open to others’ feedback is what allows one to explore the fullness of a design, making it engaging to a broad audience. Otherwise, a prototype could miss the mark or fail miserably. Analyzing the shortcomings of a solution and then making changes (this process of iteration strengthened by an agile mind) is what makes for good design. Also consider the factor of adaptation in a designer-client relationship, or in staying abreast with changing technology and software. A propensity for change is evident at various levels.

While these are examples of change at a micro-level, manifesting agility also greatly serves an organization on a macro-level. When it comes to listening to the market and responding to their changing interests and needs, in order to keep satisfying, an
organization would need to respond to this change. Remaining static is comfortable, relying on age-old techniques seems reliable, but this delusion is what Buchanan (personal communication, September 10, 2014) and Martin (2009, p. 23) refer to as being “trapped by success.” [An explanation of “trapped by success” is presented in the Primary Research section.]

Carrying the agile quality of designers ensures an organization’s ability to remain sustainable, but also allows them to sculpt more innovative solutions. It also must be proactively developed and nurtured—an business simply cannot act agile. Neumeier proclaims that agility is only possible when the organization carries the appropriate mindset, has the appropriate skills, and the utilizes collaboration effectively to multiply those skills. “To count agility as a core competence, you have to embed it into the culture” (Neumeier, 2009, p. 21).

**empathetic.**

The most significant element of a designful mindset is the factor of empathy. Relating with empathy means having a deep, emotional understanding of one’s feelings and problems, and its value in innovation can manifest in a couple different ways. First, relating to customers empathetically helps generate customer loyalty. “In business, empathy can be used to understand the motivations of customers, fellow employees, partners, and suppliers, and forge stronger emotional bonds with people” (Neumeier, 2009, p. 34). In this sharing of human experiences, people are shown they are understood and cared for, forging a connection that delights and nurtures on a personal and sustainable level.

Empathy also helps by focusing market research on the human qualities of the
user, which in turn leads to novel creation. According to the Kelleys, empathy is at the core of IDEO’s design process because it prompts unforeseen newness. They find that by observing users’ behavior in their natural environment helps them better connect with human desires, needs, and motivations. In turn, this helps uncover unique insights and inspire new ideas by seeing the trigger points (2013, p. 22). “[Empathy] fuels our process by ensuring we never forget we’re designing for real people” (p. 21).

A stunning example of empathy utilized in the museum world is seen in the efforts of Nina Simon, the Executive Director of the Santa Cruz Museum of Art & History, and author of The Participatory Museum. In her talk given at the TEDx Santa Cruz event in 2012, Simon presents her work directed at opening up museums, making them places of active interactions and connections, versus elite institutions preserving cultural collections. Her work, like IDEO’s, is centered around empathy. An example she illustrates is an exhibit about advice. In it were two different ways in which a visitor could give and receive advice: a wall of colorful post-it notes, or a faux, neutral-colored public bathroom stall. Someone could put up a question and then others would answer, “…people were very well meaning and trying to help each other out” (Simon, 2012). But the difference in the answers was striking.

Responses written on the bathroom door were far less meaningful—scribbled nonsense or phrases like “For a good time call Johnny!”—than those on the post-its. Simon clarifies that the same people did both actives, but they interacted differently because of the tools (and designed experience) that was given to them. “What this means is that if you give somebody a special tool, you make them feel valued. You show them that you actually care about what they’re going to do and it transforms what they do in return” (Simon). By using an empathetically-designed approach, Simon was able to illicit
an emotional connection between visitors—simultaneously defining new, innovative value and deepening the bond between the visitor and museum. Since Simon’s continued efforts with more experiences like these, between 2010-2011 the Santa Cruz Museum of Art & History saw more than a doubling of attendance, the busiest day has more than tripled, and went from a gravely tenuous financial position to one of stability and prosperity (Simon, 2012).

This power of empathy has not only proven to be change-making with its placement on external factors, but also has great importance for the internal conditions of museums. It concerns one with the growth and nurturance of the 3rd tier of design, that of organized services and actives. Strengthening empathy within an organization, generating more meaning and satisfaction internally, ultimately expands the level of innovation possible. The heightening of “connections and consequences” is done so by the inclusion of co-worker to co-worker empathy. The value of empathy is supported by IDEO when they outline how to take care of an innovative culture. Two of the six principles they use center around really knowing one another: “Get Personal” and “Put the ‘Relationship’ Back In Working Relationship” (Kelley and Kelley, 2013, p. 191).

Empathy is a key factor in building a culture that positions courage and non-judgement as the fulcrum to an openly creative and innovative dynamic. Establishing this mindset between employees (internal) helps them when they create for visitors (external). In looking at museums, it has the potential to mend the segregation that seems to frequently surround interdepartmental collaboration, as well as the constricted, conservative perspective that characterizes traditional museum management. Neumeier states that while empathy was previously deemed as a heavy, insufficient resource in business-to-market relationships, it has now become integral to today’s user-centered
standards (2009, p. 34). “If meaning is the new money, then depth is king” (Neumeier, 2009, p. 80).

**Conclusion**

Overall, it may seem that adopting the inherently non-linear process and opposing mindset of design in museums would be like mixing oil and water. The topic of organizational change is inherently rich and far too great to discuss at length in this investigation; to put it simply, these changes are possible and sustainable if the appropriate steps are taken. In looking at another study conducted by The Design Council about the design process, they identified key organizational behaviors in eleven design-led businesses that allowed for the sustainable integration of design, considering the management challenges that already exist within an organization, as well as those that arise with the introduction of change.

In The Design Council’s report, “Eleven Lessons: Managing Design in Eleven Global Brands” (2007b, pp. 31-2), the essential managerial behaviors that supported their designful approach included: instilling a strong, visible leader of design, i.e., a design champion; creating a corporate culture that positions design at its core; seamlessly integrating design activities within the wider business processes; educating designers with general business knowledge beyond their core skill set; expanding senior management support for design; creating and using design tools and techniques; and encouraging formal, but flexible, usage of the company’s design process.

Many museums are missing good design, or worse, plainly unaware of its immense potential. Where the internal dynamic is riddled with conflict and ego-minded careers, the user becomes neglected—a relationship that does not bode well in
a customer-centered marketplace. Museums must become agile and find a new way to connect with the visitor through defining a new, bold idea. Even with the marketplace clutter and relentless speed of change, a confidently assimilated design process and mindset can lead to a world of untapped possibility.

Design is everywhere. To once more quote designer Paul Rand, “good design is a way of life.” Anyone can be a designer, but designing well requires the entire human ability, technically, mentally, and emotionally. It extends into four distinct categories that essentially build on another, making the process immensely fruitful. In the recreation of visual artifacts, tangible experiences, meaningful interactions, and valuable social change, design becomes a powerful act of change that makes existing conditions better. The positive and significant impact of design in business has been statistically proven, and the more and earlier that a company utilizes design, the more benefits they will reap. Looking to the value it can add as differentiator, coordinator, transformer, and to good business practices, design is clearly the solution museums need.
CHAPTER IV

Primary Research

For this investigation semi-structured interviews were conducted to garner a real-world perspective of the internal mindset of museums. Six professionals were interviewed at two different museums, the identities of such that will be kept anonymous and referenced as Museum 1 and Museum 2. To encourage greater openness in the discussion of potentially sensitive subject matter, each interviewee has been kept anonymous and a system consisting of a number and letter is used to identify them; the number refers to the museum in which they are employed (ex. Participant 1A, 1B, or 2A, 2B, etc.). [A list of interview questions can be found in Appendix B]

The State of Design in Museums

The museums where interviews were conducted focus solely on art, while there are clear differences in their scale and content. Museum 1 was originally founded in 1922 as an art school, ultimately shifting its primary mission to become a museum in 1965. It is considered to be relatively small, housing around 5,500 objects that are considered contemporary art, dating from 1850 to present. Comprised of paintings, photography, and sculpture, the collection includes works by Ansel Adams, René Magritte, Chuck Close, Marcel Duchamp, and Donald Judd, among others. Currently, there are 26 staff members, not including docents and volunteers, retail store and café employees. The museum also has an internal library comprised of 11,000 books, and numerous periodicals and artist biographies.

Museum 2 is much grander in scale. Founded in 1913, it houses approximately 45,000 objects and is considered much more traditional in their collection. With works
spanning over 6,000 years, their exhibits include Egyptian, Ancient Greek and Roman, Chinese, Japanese, and Islamic Art, as well as European Painting and Sculpture, and American and Contemporary Art. These include works by Caravaggio, Goya, Renoir, Monet, Van Gogh, Picasso, Dalí, for example. This museum employs around 300 full-time and part-time employees and is also home to a prestigious library of archives containing 450,000 volumes. Since their inception “for the benefit of all the people forever,” it has been their mission to “strive to help the broadest possible audience understand and engage with the world’s great art while honoring the highest aesthetic, intellectual, and professional standards.”

To further understand the effects of the changing role of museums, a join interview with the External Affairs Officer (Participant 1B) and Development Officer (Participant 1C) at Museum 1 allowed for a realistic view of the transition and challenges with the museum world that have inspired the need for change. “One of the major problems that we’re having is maintaining the relevancy of the organization given… that the world has been revolutionized by particularly technology,” Participant 1B explains. She continues by outlining the previous role of the museum, how their response to customer need was to take the product, conserve it, collect it, and display it; and that this was a successful strategy in the past. But considering the social changes at hand, the question remains: “Where do we fit it? There’s clearly the importance of experience with the original object. But there’s got to be more than that because people just experience the world in such a different way.”

In another effort to respond to external changes, in 2007 Museum 1 underwent a significant architectural face lift, adding a 63,000 square foot asymmetrically open glass-panelled structure, carrying a highly angular and contemporary presence in the city in
which it resides. [Photo in Appendix C]. Designed by a reputable Austrian architectural firm, Coop Himmelb(l)au, the space serves as a connecting bridge between the original 1899 building and exhibition space, while also providing the city with an indoor piazza. Transparency and permeability are primary qualities intended by the new structure, communicating an openness to the people of the community and establishing itself as a communal “hub” for the city and symbolizing a confident step into the 21st century.

But even with the organization wide shift toward programming and the bold architectural addition, these changes unsurfaced another one of their other biggest challenges—interdepartmental conflict. Participant 1B explains that while they’ve made the leap to be different structurally, it is the human element of the organization that is hindering innovative progress.

Believe it or not, what’s taking so long is the cultural shift in terms of what we do now. How do we make this experience relevant? How do we make an art museum relevant to this community?… Internal organizational design is really, it’s really essential to how we move forward.

With the slow shift toward visitor-focused development in which the External Affairs and Development departments hold as their primary responsibility, much to their surprise they are not involved in the exhibition or curatorial process, particularly given the significant external changes. The External Affairs Officer (Participant 1B) explains:

But it’s a funny thing … we don’t have anything to do with the art. And we don’t have anything to do with the program. But we have a lot to do with the people when they walk in. If you think about that, that’s kind of a backwards way to [the] process… the way that things are presented, the kinds of art within the realm of what would be interesting to the public from what we know.
In further discussion about Museum 1’s quest for relevancy, both the External Affairs Officer and Development Officer (Participant 1C) made it clear that much of the resistance to change has come from the curatorial department. Participant 1B continues: So if you think about what we’re talking about, what would be really revolutionary, this is where our fighting is coming in, believe it or not, the friction. So are we really going to be revolutionary enough to change the way we do exhibitions so that the money is on the audience development and programmatic side? And what is that really saying in the organization? We haven’t yet gotten there because it’s shifting. And that’s uncomfortable for the curatorial/academic side.

Participant 1B asserts: “And that’s their problem, is they’re so academically trained. They’re trained to be speaking to the initiated and not the uninitiated.” When asked what they thought was the reason for their resistance, the Development Officer (Participant 1C) explains that it doesn’t direct the visitors’ attention to the object in a traditional way: The idea is to engage the audience with it in a different way so it’s more interesting. I think [the curators] see it as a loss of power because they see things hierarchically. In museums traditionally, you have the curator. The next step up is the executive director. I’m not quite sure that’s really inappropriate.

“And they may not feel the same about the importance of openness,” suggests Participant 1B.

[But] we want everyone to be able to enjoy this. And I think it’s the old school mentality of, ‘Why does everyone have to? It’s okay if we have a specific audience or low attendance.’...And that’s the way it’s always done. Kind of ‘For our reputation sake, we’re showing these shows. Maybe [the community] won’t get it;
About a year ago, Museum 1 welcomed a new executive director who has been actively working to change the internal structure, collaborative dynamic, and perspective of the museum. Following 26 years of a single director’s traditional leadership style and given that departmental friction exists in full force, he has nonetheless been working diligently to bring the transparency inward and promote more fluidity and inter-departmental collaboration through bettering the humanness of the organization.

In an interview with the Donor Relations Manager (Participant 1A), who works closely with the executive director in cultivating new community initiatives, as well as continuing to maintain donor and Board relations, she describes his approach:

[The new director] is trying to kind of break down those walls and get around to understand if we're doing great in one area, the whole museum is doing great; if we're not doing so great, the whole museum is not doing so great, not singling out and saying this department is failing. Right now it’s how can we all support each other and make sure we’re all moving ahead together.

I’ve been pretty impressed with the way he’s helped manage our relationships between departments. In a way it’s kind of like ‘This is just the way we’re going to work.’ It’s not strong arming. He always approaches from a very positive place, very positive. He’s not a confrontational, conflict encourager. And I do notice that will then put people together in different ways to work on other projects, where they’re becoming more comfortable in working with each other instead of working at each other.

Within the last year, the director began to loosen those walls by merging
the Marketing and Design departments, as well as repositioning all graphic design responsibilities in-house so as to more accurately communicate the experience of the museum and more deeply engage with the community. Eventually he wants to merge all staff offices on to a single floor—currently, the Development and External Affairs departments are located on the floor below the Curatorial, Exhibition, Education, and Design departments—another effort in encouraging interdepartmental collaboration. However, Participant 1A says this change is not going to happen for quite a while.

While the new director is working to structurally enliven the museum and improve the interpersonal interactions, he is also working on changing the mindset of the Board, from a “controlling, self-contained” perspective to one of more openness. According to Participant 1A, he is doing so by engaging with greater transparency to ultimately arrive at greater “ongoing, real time, open working relationships and conversations…” She further expressed her support of the changes throughout the museum, asserting that the role of the museum, or internal perspective, must change in relation to the external:

Everyone feels that what they’re doing is the most important thing in the museum. Right now that’s the culture that has kind of been cultivated here internally for years. … But you really have to kind of move forward and say, “What else is working?” You have to not be afraid to just let somebody be fluid. So I think that’s what this museum is trying to do, is just become a little more fluid, because we were very traditional for a very long time. … the more traditional, conservative you are the less geared you are towards change.

It was revealed by all Participants from Museum 1 that the new director has a different background. Instead of rising through the curatorial ranks, which is very
common practice (as seen in secondary research), he is trained as an artist. This difference has influenced his unique approach. Rather than coming from a world of collecting, his retail experience in galleries has influenced his push for a more user-centered approach. “He knows what people want. And so it’s a very different thing.” the External Affairs Officer (Participant 1B) explains. “You’re not going to sell with [a] language that’s off-putting.”

The Donor Relations Manager (Participant 1A) offered her observations about the new director’s efforts, remarking about the holistic changes occurring within the museum, as well as the significance that the problems they are working to change are not unique to them:

So trying to, again, shift the paradigm there and going to have them all working together. Everyone’s input is welcome. And he wants more people involved on projects instead of less. And some people are afraid of that because they feel like that can get muddy or messy. But he thinks ideas come from everywhere…. Everyone feels included, welcome, like they’re responsible, they matter versus ‘Why should I even voice my opinions? It’s not going to get heard.’

She states that with the previously overly-traditional management system, this was not the case, and that this dynamic is common in the museum world:

Before, [conflict] would never have been addressed. … It happens a lot in non-profit. … I used to work [in] for-profit. And coming into non-profit, it’s almost like the wild west in a weird way. Because most non-profits, they don’t have a real Human Resources Department…. My friends that work in other museums -- I mean we all have the same -- so strange; different size museum, different city -- and still the same issues.
To contrast the changes occurring at Museum 1, interviews conducted at Museum 2 painted a different picture. At the time of the interview, this museum was in the process of instating a new director, so not much was discussed concerning his particular leadership style or the degree of change arising from this transition. Yet overall, it was clearly illustrated that Museum 2 carries a much more traditional approach in their perspective of the object and the user. Two staff members were interviewed from this museum: the Senior Designer (Participant 2A) and an Exhibition Designer (Participant 2B).

In an interview with Participant 2B, the conversation started about what design means for an art museum. He explained that there is a great difference between simply displaying an art object and partnering it with a typographic explanation, or designing an experience to allow either an individual or group to engage with a piece, giving it “three sides” and a text component. He referred to this as “service to the object” and defined this as “good” design:

At least I think for museums that that’s good design for an art museum in particular. … museum, it really is about the object and having an experience with that specific object. And the design then is to do a variety of things. It could be creating a context for that experience or some level of deeper understanding about how the object should be appreciated or appreciated with other objects, or just doing the things necessary to make it look good so people will want to spend some time and look at [it].

In recognizing this service to the object, it was significant to identify where the value in the audience resided and just how far the service extended. A question was posed to Participant 2B: How much does the museum value the interactions between
That’s an interesting question. I don’t think it’s something that we don’t value. But the focus, at least for the gallery design, is primarily about -- it’s like a one-on-one interaction, or a group, [with] that piece of artwork as opposed to the community. Certainly the things like [our app] … creates a kind of collaborative community-based experience. But I would call that very second-level, second-tier goals of the museum.

Interestingly, there was a recent exhibition at Museum 2 that did offer a collaborative community experience for visitors. It was Yoga: The Art of Transformation, that ran from July to September of 2014. According to the exhibit website, it was the first exhibit of its kind to illustrate a visual history of yoga and explore the meanings and transition of the practice over time. In addition to the traditional gallery space that exhibited ancient sculptures, paintings, scrolls, as well as 19th-century photography and film, there was a floor-to-ceiling painted and decorated room adjacent to the exhibition entry/exit which was specifically designed for holding group yoga classes. [See photo in Appendix D.]

The museum brought in numerous yoga instructors from the area to offer a range of classes that were held several times a week and were frequently at max capacity. However, even with a seemingly positive public response, the Exhibition Designer (Participant 2B) explained that “this kind of approach, with a gathering space for people, is uncommon.” Even though, he continued, that this space “… would certainly qualify as something trying to bring in a broader group of people and having them interact with each other instead of art,” said Participant 2B, he revealed an overarching, defining characteristic of the mindset in Museum 2:
One of the things that makes [this museum] quite conservative in ways... is that we all really believe—this is publications, design, curatorial, conservation as well; we have all sort of drunk the same Kool Aid—in this overall philosophy of the experiences of the art object as fundamental and paramount and that anything that gets in the way of that is a problem.

The notion of empathy surfaced a few different times throughout the interviews. Participant 2B accounts for empathy in Museum 2 due to how staff move through the ranks; people who currently hold higher positions previously worked in the positions in which they now manage. He also shed light on how conflict between departments is resolved, specifically when it comes to the collaborative efforts between the exhibitions and curatorial departments, presenting that employees work to solve conflict individually, relying on the ‘goodness’ of people as a source for resolution:

I think a lot of the conflicts, if these things work well, that we manage to resolve them as really sort of just people getting along, just personalities of designer and curator managing to find ways to talk to each other. And just get it to work and compromising at the right time.

Empathy also surfaced in the interview with Participant 2A, the Senior Designer. He described a personal circumstance concerning one of the museum’s employees who grew up in a very difficult financial situation. Her experience influenced the omission of the word “free” in connection to museum events. According to Participant 2A, this employee communicated that the word “free,” carried a negative connotation because its sensitive connection to financial impoverishment. Instead, it is more positive and welcoming to present something as “bring the whole family,” or “everyone is welcome.” He explained, “You’ll see the words “free admission,” but we try not to lead with “free event for the
community” … It’s just an interesting approach.”

In talking more with Participant 2A about the museum’s approach to design and the audience, he relayed information about their understanding of the audience and how their subsequent aesthetic choices are used to illicit a particular kind of visitor response. He recalled a particular lecture event about Byzantine Greek Art and how they made deliberate design choices to make the event as scholarly as possible, “…because you wouldn’t want the Greek family bringing the kids in, because the kids would be totally lost and bored out of their mind.” Participant 2A said the event was a success and the museum was proud to nurture their relationship with this specific audience.

It appears that their approach to the audience is more about what the museum wants:

Often it’s the first thing we ask, [about] the audience, “what do you want them do to?” … the museum does a lot of that in terms of thinking of who the audience should be. And then part of that question of who’s the audience and what do you want them to do, we want them to come to an event or visit the museum or buy something. And [then] we can set the tone…

And this approach seems like a system of trial and error, and one that is not always predictable:

We’ve learned if you design something to look “family,” you get families. And if you design something to look more like a 40-year-old, you get the 20-year-old. Make it look good for a 20-year-old, you get the 30-year-old. We’re not sure why that happens. A wide range of ages in our department. So we can sort of test things out, just like is this going to look too old-school or not. And we pay attention to that.
Participant 2A explains that the design department does not “really do research.” While there is a research office to whom they look for deeper information about the audience, the design personnel will do some projecting and use the information garnered from the research office to decide on the avenue of communication: newspaper, online, social media. He stated that focus groups are the go-to tactic for the research department, particularly when they are considering the lead object for an exhibition.

In response to the involvement of a director, department organizational structure, and its impact on the work process, Participant 2A claimed that Museum 2 carries a relatively flat structure. Departmental heads report directly to the director and instead, a primary method of collaboration and group decision making occurs in committees. He said:

For the big exhibitions, lots of people are involved. And there’s multiple clients: You have the director of the exhibition, the curator who wrote the book, you have the Marketing Department, they are the ones who get in trouble when people don’t show up.

[The director is] too busy making major decisions. You have all the departmental committees and then Overhead Committee, the Websites Committee. It’s usually the people involved in the project. And we drag other people into it. …there’s lots of committees, so [a project] goes through committees, get them to approve everything and they participate and there’s no complaint…. They can’t say anything because they were there all along and involved so early that they’re actually helpful.

A notable characteristic about process and change surfaced in the conversation
with Participant 2A:

The volume of work is extremely high…. Sometimes you only have three hours from start to finish. And that’s an hour [of design], an hour is editing, and an hour is production. So having not a lot of turnover is extremely helpful. We don’t do a lot of dramatic change project to project, the reason for speed. But the audience likes familiarity. They already know without having to read what’s going; they’re just looking for the date.

Speaking of the audience and change, there was expression of a new concern from the Development Officer at Museum 1 (Participant 1C), specifically regarding the new generation of donor and their unique characteristics. She explained that their motivations for giving are different from their current donors, who are traditional in the ways they choose to fund, and this difference has proved difficult:

People our age aren’t giving. And we have to be relevant on social media and all of these things. And they don’t want letters coming to them asking for money. They want an e-mail or a Facebook [message] or a Tweet or whatever. … Another thing … is the first time in history of anything that people are paying so much in student loans. And that makes a huge difference on the way that [they] think about spending.

And even [those] young professionals that are making nice salaries still have a hard time giving to something yet…. And so it’s an interesting kind of issue for us. Because you see the incomes. And then the giving priority -- it’s not there yet. What will it take and will it happen? That’s why we need to foster those people now.

Participant 1C continued by claiming that mostly what they find with young
professionals is their interest in having a meaningful experience, and often they seek to volunteer in some capacity. But the museum does not need more efforts in volunteerism, and thus the conundrum remains. This problem was unique to Museum 1, seeing as very little to no concern about new philanthropy and nurturance of donor relationships surfaced from the interviews conducted in Museum 2. The External Affairs Officer (Participant 1B) revealed their response to this newfound challenge:

We are poised at this point to -- we're all poised to do something, a number of our organizations. And I think right now in order for us to continue on this relevancy, which includes being able to keep the doors open because of donations, you know, we have to seize our opportunity and become sort of leaders in this conversation of placemaking.

Museum 1 has discovered that the key to initiating new conversations and forging new connections with the community has been made possible by a shift in perspective; one that is less about the art object and more about process. Participant 1B continues:

We're really about the creative process. That's how we talk now. We don't talk about the objects. Now, clearly, I don't want anyone to think -- and I talk about this a lot, and people really get in my world about it. It is like, “the object is of most importance.” Well, clearly we're an art museum. And if we didn't place any even reverential emphasis on the object, we'd be out of business. So I don't mean it in that way.

However, we find where we get the most engagement is when we focus on the process. So artists, even just talking about the creative process, I've talked to beer makers, culinary artists. Gosh, entrepreneurs get it in terms of innovation. We're able to have conversations. And all of a sudden we're engaging in the
community, in talking about economic development and not just like we used to...

And in a sense, what we’re saying now is, oh, this is what I can add to the conversation; this is what I can contribute; this is what we’re willing to do to live in this community. And it’s not like just come through the doors. We want to be actively engaged in these important conversations and we can, whether that be with education, economic development, we can go on and on and on...

We have an overall vision. It’s really two things but it really encompasses one idea. We want to be more accessible and we want to be more engaged in the community. So it’s getting people in the building and getting outside the building.... So the end result obviously is a relationship. It’s all about a customer or eventually a membership or some kind of donation. And believe it or not… we don’t shy away from that, the money end of it. Just like any other business, we’re not in business unless you’re coming through the door. And somehow forming this kind of repeat touch, whether it’s you coming to the café and you may just walk around some of the free aspects of the museum, maybe you come to Downtown@Dusk, maybe you buy beers, maybe you shop in the store, or maybe you are somebody who comes to programs but doesn’t really like going to the galleries, but they are all interactions in some way with sort of an art experience.

So we like to say we’re evolving. But it’s really more of a revolution I would say. And it’s kind of a revolutionary idea for us internally. It may not seem that to the outside world. But we’re trying to really just sort of look at what it is we’re trying to do and then just forming the organization in the right way to make it happen. And that just kind of means maybe knocking down some proverbial walls of silos. And we’re just in the beginning of that.
I think [the new director has] actually heightened the friction. But that’s where you want to live right now. I don’t mean friction in fighting. It’s just uncomfortable. And I love that place, because that’s where things are happening.

To gain a richer perspective on organizational innovation and change, a semi-structured interview was conducted with Dr. Richard Buchanan of Case Western Reserve University. His written work was previously cited in the Design section, but in the interview, Buchanan provided further personal insight into ways in which design can extend far beyond “posters and toasters.” Here, he explains his definition of design:

Design is human capacity to conceive, plan, and realize all the products that serve human beings in accomplishing their purposes. “Human capacity,” so I’m looking at human ability, not looking at God or nature—that’s a separate department. But to conceive, plan, realize. That’s now our final cause; that’s what we do. We come up with ideas. We plan how to bring newer ideas forward in innovative ways. And we also think carefully about how to they’re brought out into the world.

Products, ambiguity there. What is the product? So I use the phrase “the object of design to capture broader range.” In fact, the word “product” has changed … It used to mean artifact. Today it means anything made by a human being. Tangible, intangible…. So products are all these things we make. So they are communications, artifacts, they’re interaction, services, experiences, environments, organizations, systems.

He continued by naming and defining a concept that highlights the internal struggle that museums bring upon themselves, and how that challenge clearly stems from an internally lodged perspective:

What you’re describing with organizations is what I call the problem being
“trapped by success.” All the organizations are successful and all the people within them are successful. But they’re successful in ways that sometimes keeps them from seeing the “now” possibilities. So if you’ve been making widgets for all of your life, the idea that you’re designing a service, not a widget, they can’t even contemplate that possibility. So that’s being trapped by success.

It’s the change in circumstance that means that you’re trapped by your success; because if the circumstances didn’t change, then you could keep doing what you’ve been doing: Ta-da! That’s fine. But certainly time’s ever changing. So how does a museum get to understand people? Because if you ask them, they will not tell you. They will tell you what the old solution was. But if you watch them … Watch what they do, not what they say…. The museums that are locked into the sense that they conserve and display artifacts, that’s an old notion of “museum.” A new notion is that we create experiences and areas so people can make connections and meaningful connections with their lives.

So we talk with the museum folks about this. And they’re certainly very conscious of the responsibility to educate the audience. But that’s not—it’s like faculty is vague and education is eclectic. I got this information; if I could just pour it into your ears, you’ll get it too. Well, that’s the way some museums are organized. They have these great objects and there’s little information things. And that’s not what it’s about.

The things that are the source of value creation are also the source of being trapped in an old position. You are trapped in misunderstanding resources, trapped in product forms. For organizational decision, you’re trapped in having the wrong people with not the right skills or right capabilities. Those are the
sources of entrapment as well as sources of value creation, helping them to see
that is a big part of it.

Buchanan outlined how design can help “trapped” museums begin to ‘see,’ and
ultimately become more grounded in a world of constant change:

So you think about how screwed up the world is. It’s indeterminate and confusing
and chaotic…. And if you think about being trapped by success as I mentioned
earlier, being trapped by success is you think you have a determinant situation.
One of the powers of design thinking is to turn that determinacy into an
indeterminacy. Show people how it’s not stable. And there’s great ability within
the discipline.

Because we’re successful in one circumstance and then we move into a
new circumstance, the situation changes, the world changes, and what we were
successful at is no longer a survival success. So we find lots of places are in this
tailspin… And we use design thinking to help them change at all kinds of levels.
So maybe at the tactical level, maybe at a level of processes, maybe at a level of
vision and strategy. These are all places where design thinking is.
CHAPTER V
Implications

Comparing Museum 1 and Museum 2

In looking deeper at the primary findings through the lens of the secondary research, there are several key differences in the process and mindset between Museum 1 and Museum 2 that point to larger conclusions about their overall designfulness. It is clear that Museum 1 is far more conscious of the changing role of museums, asking questions about their relevancy, where they fit in, and taking a reflective stance on both the internal and external issues. Despite the heightened conflict and friction coming from the curatorial staff members, the new Executive Director of Museum 1 has taken a positive, holistic, designful approach toward change in breaking their traditional, static patterns.

There is great effort seen at improving the workplace culture and interdepartmental collaboration through empathy. In the consideration of the humanness of their employees and organization-wide establishment of community and trust (3rd tier design), greater empathy is allowing for more people with different mindsets to work together. As messy as some fear this new process to be, their efforts speak to their agility and desire to create a new situation—one in which they are working together, not against each other. In turn, with this greater internal empathy, Museum 1 is now more capable to engage their audience in a more meaningful and useful way (3rd and 4th tier design). Now they can be more in touch with what the community wants and use it to guide their programming efforts, instead of limiting themselves in only appealing to “the initiated.”

Their transition in talking about the creative process reflects a change in their
own process, and has allowed them to reach outside the museum walls and connect with more people in ways that keeps them coming back. In recalling the highly connective efforts of Nina Simon and the need for deeper value, there is a new kind of interaction happening here. To reconnect with Neumeier, their bold idea of placing the relationship with the audience on the same level of importance as the object, has begun to position this museum in a new light of relevancy. Instead of maintaining an internalized, tunneled mindset about what is important, there is a more curious, imaginative approach, striving for more user-centeredness and letting go of concern with status and reputation, generating more meaningful interactions with the community.

In comparison, Museum 2 continues to reside in a far more traditional light, a perspective in which they appeared to be quite secure. With the supposedly widely acknowledged, changing role of the museum, the mindset in Museum 2 clings to the importance of the art object. In an environment where everyone is working toward the “service of the object,” their vision remains tunneled by the curatorial process—linear and static. There is little inclusion of the audience as a source of inquiry and newness, aside from the use of focus groups to help determine the lead object of an exhibit. Clearly, having drunk the same ‘Kool Aid,’ anything (new) that gets in the way of this service is a problem.

Museum 2 understands design of the 1st and 2nd tiers. This is evident in their active tailoring of visitors’ experience with the art and their visual design choices used to influence audience behavior, like they did for the scholarly Byzantine Greek art lecture. But they limit their definition of good design to these lower levels, asserted by the rarity of community-interactive spaces and experiences, like those in the yoga exhibit. Through this rarity it is evident that they are keeping their conversation with the audience greatly
limited. This is furthered in their sentiments about what the audience should be, what
the museum wants them to be—does this suggest that they overlook who the audience
really is? Or if they know, do they care? According to Senior Designer (Participant 2A),
“The audience likes familiarity...”—Which audience is he referring to? Who would most
like prefer repetition without variation? Perhaps the antiquated donor.

The internal occurrences of empathy are promising. In calling on their
sensitivity and understanding of humanity to direct an external condition shows
that they are aware of the effects their decisions can have. Internal empathy was
also present in intradepartmental relations, but it seemed to have yet to significantly
influence interdepartmental collaboration. The extensive use of committees, paired
with sentiments like “no complaint” and “actually helpful,” seeming to suggest that this
process is a formality, or simply in place just so other departments get their say; versus
there being open, creative conversations about possibility and new ideas, or devising an
innovative plan of action. Even in their so-called flat organization—they appear flat, but
are fat with bureaucracy.

With little change to their process and traditional perspective limiting their
relationship with the audience, the perspective of Museum 2 is overly internalized
and imbalanced. Agility is meek, balance is thwarted, empathy is contained, and
relationships and innovation are static. Consider the statement, “interact with each other
instead of art,” made by Exhibition Designer Participant 2B. Instead of art? What about
in addition to the art? There appears to be no greater reflection of, “Where do we fit in?
How can we add to the conversation? How can we be leaders in place making?” like those
found in Museum 1. Why weren’t they asking these questions? Do they not feel they need
to?
In stark comparison, Museum 1 is using design to help them “conceive, plan, and realize.” Through their inquiry, imagination, understating, collaboration, and empathy, greater balance is being achieved internally and externally and, consequently, a stronger relationship being developed with the audience. As stated from the interview, the change has been uncomfortable, but it is undeniably true—that is where things are happening. By redesigning their services, systems, interactions, and experiences, they are deepening their value, strengthening their relationships, and creating a more engaging, innovative, and sustainable organization. Instead, Museum 2 has become lodged in their traditional, conservative habits. Why change if there is no need to?

Because their bold idea is the exploitation of technology and a traditional experience. In recalling the insights revealed by Buchanan, they are stuck in their determinate condition and continue to deny the inherent indeterminacy of their audience. Seeing their unwavering service to the object, the skilled professionals’ tunneled perspective, and blindness to the “now possibilities” and looking to the audience as a source of innovation, Museum 2 is “trapped by success.” In their apparent underutilization of design, they resort to their prestige and world-renowned status to maintain their status quo instead of exploring and creating new opportunities for meaningful connections. How unfortunate, in a new world “where value is king.”

What Has This Research Uncovered?

The implications of this research suggests a path of significant change and also opens a door to many questions. First and foremost, consider the fundamentally conflicting values between the curatorial and development perspectives; with the push to become more human-centered, what happens to the role of the object? Aside from
the ego-driven resistance arising from some curators, this is still a valuable issue. Art museums cannot dismiss the object as insignificant. But these changes do not suggest that. Instead of remaining passive artifacts, they are now active ingredients in the effort to create new interactions, expand the community, and deepen the sense of value. But even in making this case, it is integral to listen to both sides and acknowledge the differences when moving forward with difficult change. What might this change look like? With numerous sizes and types of art museums, would those constraints change the way in which design is integrated?

Secondarily, in recognizing the friction brought on by the merging of traditional management practices and a designful process and mindset, the road seems long and steep; but it gives way to many interesting questions: Why is there such a strong apprehension to change? Why is there an aversion to collaborative teamwork, openness to possibility, and nurturance of creativity in museums? Why has ego overgrown the heart of management and care for a meaningful culture been ignored? What is the most effective way to initiate change? Recognizing the over preoccupation with status, fear of failure, and resistance to uncertainty, how is change possible? Does this point to a greater need for courage and vulnerability in business?

Most definitely. Even with its great potential, design is risk. In 1997, Peters wrote, “To pursue the ultimate potential of design / design mindfulness, is to routinely pursue the crazy, the surprising. Which is to routinely embrace risk… and the distinct possibility of rejection” (p. 440). The work of Brené Brown, a professor at the University of Houston, supports this. In her decade of research, she has discovered a powerful relationship between business, management, and the human capacity for emotion that relate to the problems seen in museums and the business world as a whole. “Vulnerability is the
birthplace of innovation, creativity, and change,” she stated in her widely-watched TED Talk (Brown, 2012). In order to engage in innovative, agile, value-seeking designfulness, museums must become courageously vulnerable.

From here, there are several components that have a life beyond this particular investigation. Understanding how factors of emotion correlate with innovation, how leadership and workplace culture impact progressive initiatives, ways to soften dysfunctional trends through the development of designed frameworks that are potentially adaptable to any size and type of museum. In light of the research that has been published about the value of quality workplace culture, creative flow, and the pitfalls of “addictive” organizations, these questions reveal a unique perspective. Hinting at the study of the emotional design of objects, there is room to expand that concept into the emotional design of management, interactions, and space, applicable to any kind of organization or business.
CHAPTER VI

Concluding Remarks

In the end of this study, it is clear that a case for renewed museum relevancy is growing. We know and see the problem. Now it is time to do something and a designful change is clearly necessary. One can create a good business like you create a good person. No matter what challenges an organization, the answer always lies within the heart of the problem. Where the roles of museums are changing, so are the needs of the user. Conservative and hierarchical management habits are inhibiting external awareness and promoting the inherent, internal segregation through which the disconnection between the museum and their audience stems. In looking to design for the answer it can take a closed, fearful organization and transform it into one of openness and courage. A traditional, segregated environment changed into one of innovation and collaboration, a blind and indifferent company to one of powerful reflection and empathy.

Recognizing the disconnect between museum and audience, the continued challenges in funding and change in generational philanthropic patterns generate alarm. As long as museums continue to work in a divided fashion, so too will their efforts be divided when designing their future. By adopting a designful process and mindset, museums can finally get in touch with a broader audience base and solidify their future with the strength of agility, teamwork, and creation of deeper value. The benefits of design in business have been proven and broadly adopted, and those that align it at the highest level see the greatest, long-term benefit. It’s time for museums to get messy and more comfortable with the chaos that is creativity, to take risks and trust that innovative, sustainable answers (for the time being) lie in what does not yet exist.

A final quote by Paul Rand asserts the validity of this undertaking, illustrating
that the true magic of innovation lies within the ubiquity of design: “Innovation distinguishes the leader from the follower, never satisfied with what has been, but intent on what will be. It is the driving force of the creative spirit, sensitive to change and the changeless. It focuses not only on what is right, but what is exceptional. Surprise, not predictability, is its hallmark” (Heller et al., 1998). In recalling the process of the Australian design firm Christopher Doyle & Co., they believe that in order to solve a problem, it needs to be talked about. So, let’s talk.
Appendix A

Photos: Gallery One at the Cleveland Museum of Art
Appendix A

Photos: Gallery One at the Cleveland Museum of Art

Photo 1. The entryway into Gallery One.
Large, sliding glass doors mark the entry into the interactive gallery space. The transparency and grand presence of this space lie to the left of the main entry to the museum.

Photo 2. Screen shot from the ArtLens app.
Many pieces in Gallery One are accompanied by a camera lens icon that when scanned, takes the viewer to detailed information about the art object. Here, this screen shot shows options to read more about Akron-based painter Raphael Gleitsmann’s piece, dated 1939. Options to read about how this painting was made, its composition, and Ohio in the 1930’s are presented.
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Photo 3. Touchscreens.
Another example of extending the educational experience of an object, this time on an interactive touchscreen found frequently throughout Gallery One. Here, *The Driller* by American sculptor Max Kalish is highlighted. More about the common themes found in this artist’s work, his life history, and what inspired him, are some of the topics offered for further exploration.

Photo 4. The museum collection, presented interactively.
The final room in Gallery One, housing the 40-foot touchscreen showing the entire collection of The Cleveland Museum of Art. A user can search pieces by period, artist, or other constraints, in any combination, to organize and create an individualized tour that can then be shared with other visitors.
Appendix B

Sample Interview Questions
Appendix B

Sample Interview Questions

Museum professionals:
1. Describe your experience with the management structure here.
2. In your experience, where and when do conflicts and frustrations arise?
3. Can you describe a typical process for how conflict is managed at an administrative level?
4. What are some examples on conflict in your organization?
5. What is the process in relating to donors?
6. What about audience outreach—how is the museum’s relationships with the audience built and nurtured?
7. Is there research involved?
8. Are the curatorial of design departments involved in audience outreach?
9. What is interdepartmental collaboration like?
10. Where does the board fit in regarding these efforts?
11. Do you think the museum responds well to audience needs?
12. Is there anything you would like to see change in regard to the way things are managed?
13. Could these changes improve the collaborative efforts amongst departments?

Professor Buchanan:
1. What is the best way to implement change in an organization?
2. How do organizations inhibit change?
3. What does it mean to lead by design in an organization?
4. How would you define design?
5. When does design fail?
6. What is it about museums that you personally value?
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Photo 1. Panoramic view.
The entryway in Museum 1, depicting segments of the 63,000 square-foot renovation. This architectural change represents the museum’s efforts in becoming more transparent, literally and figuratively, connecting with the community, and confidently stepping into the 21st century.
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Photos: Space for Yoga Classes in Museum 2

Photo 1. Space for yoga in Museum 2.

The floor-to-ceiling space that has been designed to match the space of the correlating exhibit, *Yoga: The Art of Transformation*. 
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