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Abstract

Art Around Town is a Columbus Museum of Art outreach program designed for family audiences. The program takes an authentic work of art from the Museum’s collection into different Central Ohio locations, along with a host of family-friendly activities such as artmaking, gallery games and discussions. Art Around Town was created to provide Columbus families with a fun, free, and accessible opportunity to experience authentic art in the comfort of their own respective communities, as well as raise awareness about the Museum and its family-oriented programs and initiatives.

The concept for Art Around Town was inspired by the notion of the democratic museum which is an idea championed by museum theorists John Cotton Dana, Stephen Weil, and George Hein. They argued that museums are inherently public institutions and, as such, are bound to serve and be active in their communities in meaningful ways. Museums’ collections belong to all of their community members; not merely to the ones who have the means or inclination to visit the museum buildings. Art Around Town was designed with this philosophy at its core and included only very high quality, important works of art-- some of which were literally removed from the Museum’s walls specifically for the program. In addition, the activities included in Art Around Town were modeled on constructivist pedagogical principals, encouraging active participation for genuine learning and personal experience.
The central research question that I address in this paper is: What might a museum program look like that is both pedagogically progressive and socially conscious, that serves the community while encouraging learning through experience and meaning-making? I argue that Art Around Town is such a program, presenting the evidence I gathered through a survey that was distributed to the adult (parents, grandparents, guardians, etc.) participants of the program. I also supplement the survey findings with observational data and photographs.

The research showed evidence that Art Around Town successfully increased participants’ comfort level with authentic art, raised their awareness of the family-friendly nature of the Columbus Museum of Art, and was positively received by its participants. My observations provided incidences of families having meaningful social interactions with art and evidence of creative problem solving. However, more structured data needs to be collected to confirm these findings. I concluded, therefore, that the research I gathered regarding Art Around Town shows that it is a socially-conscious museum program that adheres to progressive educational philosophies. The program displays evidence that it is meeting many of its goals, however further research needs to be done in order to better understand to extent to which some of the goals are being accomplished.
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Introduction

In a 2005 article titled “The Role of Museums in Society: Education and Social Action”, museum theorist George Hein wrote, “Not only do educational progressives emphasize active learning and recognize personal meaning-making, they view education as a socio-political activity with a goal of improving society” (p. 358). What a statement! In this one sentence, Hein places enormous pressure on educators who consider themselves to be progressive-- pressure to develop and implement educational programs and initiatives that are not only progressive in the constructivist paradigm of John Dewey, Lev Vygotsky, Jean Piaget and others, but are also designed to be socially aware and, ideally, make the world a better place. Hein, heavily influenced from a pedagogical standpoint by Dewey and from a museum ideological standpoint by John Cotton Dana--author of the influential work *The New Museum* (1999)-- argued that the best museums will find a way to marry the two ideas. What might a museum program look like that is both pedagogically progressive and socially conscious; a program that serves the community while encouraging learning through experience and meaning-making? In the following chapters I argue that, at the Columbus Museum of Art (CMA) in Columbus, Ohio, I created and implemented such a program with the support of CMA staff. This program is a family-oriented community outreach program called Art Around Town.
Chapter 1: An Introduction to Art Around Town

Background

Art Around Town is a community outreach program that I created with the collaboration of many fellow staff members of the Columbus Museum of Art. The concept for Art Around Town was hatched about a year prior to its inception when the plans and schedule for the Museum’s building renovation were finalized. The renovation dictated that CMA’s main building, commonly known as the Broad Street building, would close for approximately fifteen months. The plan left only a tiny portion of the Museum open-- the small front wing that housed the main lobby and office spaces on the first floor and traveling exhibition space on the second floor. This space limitation was, of course, problematic for many departments and programs but particularly for the Museum’s Family Programs. As the Museum’s studio and large special event space-- Derby Court-- were both housed in the Broad Street building, most of the Museum’s Family Programs did not have ample space in which to function. Only Art Challenges would be able to continue in the Museum as scheduled; all of the others-- including 1st Saturdays, Family Sundays, Doodles, Summer Art Workshops, and WOW! Art-- would go on hiatus during the fifteen month construction period.

As CMA’s Educator for Family Programs, this hiatus period was concerning to me. I could have, perhaps, justified spending the fifteen months planning for post-
renovation programming. Instead, Cindy Foley (CMA’s Director of Education) and I decided to look upon the hiatus as an opportunity to embrace a new initiative. Since families would not be able to attend any of the large Family Programs within the Museum, we decided it was best to take the programs to the families. By doing so, CMA would practice being the socially conscious museum about which John Cotton Dana, Stephen Weil, George Hein, and others theorized. The Columbus Museum of Art would take a new Family Program, called Art Around Town, into different Central Ohio communities where widespread accessibility could be offered to families.

While the concept of Art Around Town was a collaborative effort, I was responsible for the development and implementation of the program. I wanted it to be as similar in both philosophy and function to the already-existing in-house Museum Family Programs as possible. This was important to me for several reasons: CMA’s Family Programs all have clearly defined and meaningful goals and outcomes, are built on constructivist educational philosophies, and have been thoroughly reflected upon and evaluated. At the time of the creation of Art Around Town, I had spent more than two years witnessing various Family Programs in action; for the most part, I had seen the programs meet their proposed goals and outcomes effectively. I was confident that these programs would serve as a strong basis for Art Around Town.

Art Around Town would be designed to particularly resemble 1st Saturdays and Family Sundays. These two long-standing CMA Family Programs are similar in that both are drop-in programs (meaning that families are welcome to come to the program at any point within the allotted time period and complete the activities in whichever order they
choose) designed to accommodate sizable audiences, both include a gallery activity designed to encourage families to engage with an artwork or collection or artworks together, and both include an artmaking project designed for families to work together or side-by-side on individual projects. This model seemed best suited for the type of casual, comfortable, fun program Art Around Town was created to be.

I decided early in the planning process that it was absolutely essential for each Art Around Town event to be accompanied by an authentic work of art from the Museum’s permanent collection. This decision added serious complexity to the program that will be discussed in greater detail in future pages, but the art was an ideological necessity. Art is as essential to meaningful art museum programs as it is to the museum itself. Any arts organization with thoughtful educators can develop a program that has an interesting art project and educational activities focused on a reproduction. Indeed, classroom art teachers develop lessons of this sort all the time. However, the one truly unique component an art museum has to offer to its public that cannot be recreated by other institutions is the presentation of authentic art. The artworks-- the real objects, not reproductions-- are central to the Family Programs I oversee within the Museum. I was determined for CMA’s art to be just as central to Art Around Town.

While the ultimate goal of this thesis is to explore Art Around Town as a program that is a response to the question, “What would a museum program look like that is both pedagogically progressive and socially conscious?” it is necessary to provide a history and context of the creation of Art Around Town before this question can be properly addressed. The remainder of this chapter outlines the history of the formation of Art
Around Town and an explanation of the logistics of the creation of the program. Such context should give the reader a more holistic understanding of this unique family-oriented community outreach program.

Choosing the Communities

When Art Around Town was conceived, it was done so in great part to experiment with the concept of providing a meaningful educational community experience to families in the Columbus vicinity. The program was to function on a finite timeline from November of 2009 through December of 2010 with the reopening of the renovated Broad Street building scheduled for early January 2011. As originally planned, I would develop and lead fourteen Art Around Town experiences.

The Columbus vicinity covers a large geographic area, so it was immediately obvious that CMA would need to make institution-wide choices to determine which specific communities the program would serve. I created a list of every Columbus community that I was familiar with, consulted several sources to confirm my list was accurate, then scheduled a large interdepartmental meeting to discuss the locations. This meeting included representatives from several key departments-- education, curatorial, development, and marketing as well as community liaisons and CMA’s director, Nannette Maciejunes.

It is important to note that Columbus is not a destination location and CMA relies heavily on the development and retention of its local audience. Therefore, while providing an educational service to the community was the main motivation for creating
Art Around Town, we also needed to consider the Museum’s sustainability. We hoped the program would help us to retain the devoted family audience we had already established and build new family audiences from locations in the Central Ohio area that historically had shown low Museum attendance. In order to meet both of these goals, it was decided that Art Around Town would focus on communities that were lacking in meaningful art experiences, ones that showed a strong relationship with the Museum—through membership, attendance, and collaborations—and those that exhibited a weak presence at the Museum but exhibited a strong affinity for art (based on an AMS Planning & Research corp. study from 2006).

The communities that have historically exhibited a strong relationship with the Museum were fairly obvious (based on previous program experiences and data from collected visitor services), and easy to choose. The remaining communities were more difficult to finalize. Diversity was a key consideration; diversity both in terms of region and population. With these considerations in mind, we gradually worked through the list I had created and narrowed it down to the fourteen locations we felt best fit the stipulations we had decided upon. The final list was: Lincoln-King district, Bexley, Gahanna, Powell, German Village, Clintonville, Westerville, Franklinton, New Albany, Grove City, Dublin, Upper Arlington, Pickerington, and Worthington.

Admittedly, there were some gaping holes in the list we compiled. We were prepared to face some contention, however we all felt strongly that we had considered our options carefully and had effectively used the resources available to us to the best of our ability. Additionally, the knowledge that the program was free and open to the public
and that visitors from any community were welcome at every event greatly eased potential concern.

Choosing the Art

Once the decision to include art from CMA’s collection was definitive, the program’s infrastructure became intensely interdepartmental. The artwork in any museum is, of course, held in the care of many individuals housed in several departments. Museum educators, in fact, have little to do with the handling of the objects themselves. The curators acquire the artworks, choose how and when to display them, and serve as their academic safeguards. The registrars keep careful records of the art objects, care for them, prepare them for display, and have them restored when needed. Security protects the works at the most visceral level, making sure that they stay safely within museum care. Hence, as soon CMA’s art objects became integral to Art Around Town, so too did the curators, registrars, and security staff members.

Thus began months of interdepartmental meetings to clarify protocol regarding the artworks leaving the building, and to decide which works would be given allowance to be included in the program. Initially it was proposed that works would be limited to those that were appraised at less than a certain monetary value. However, early in the decision-making process, CMA Director Nannette Maciejunes decided that if the Museum was going to be serious about the program it should also be serious about the art for the program. The focus in choosing the works, then, changed away from monetary value to the potential for community connection with the artworks. In a memorable
meeting, the CMA curators racked their brains, mentally searching through the collection to develop a list of artworks that exhibited potential fit with their respective perspective communities. For example, an artwork by Aminah Brenda Lynn Robinson went to the Art Around Town event at the Lincoln-King district because that was the neighborhood in which she grew up and then created art about. Some of the works proposed were costly enough to cause concern, but it was ultimately determined that the value of the program was significant enough to outweigh the risks associated with taking such works out of the Museum. See Figure 1 for the final list of artworks and their corresponding communities.

Choosing the venues

Once the list of communities was set and the artworks were decided upon, visits to specific community venues began. Certain stipulations for these venues were decided upon--they needed to be free of admission (at least for the duration of the program), open to the public, decently-sized with multiple rooms, have ample access to parking, and have available tables and chairs, bathrooms, and sink access. We concentrated our efforts toward finding community centers, recreation centers, libraries, and arts centers that would be interested in hosting Art Around Town. CMA’s Studio Programs Coordinator--Susie Underwood, who often works with Family Programs--and I researched venues online, drove to the plausible-seeming locations, walked the venues, and decided on the most ideal one in each community. I then contacted venue representatives to schedule meetings with them to discuss the logistics of the program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Art work</th>
<th>Art project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 21, 2009</td>
<td>Lincoln-King district</td>
<td>Lincoln Theater</td>
<td>Aminah Brenda Lynn Robinson <em>A Holy Place</em> 1984-93</td>
<td>Wooden plaques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5, 2009</td>
<td>Bexley</td>
<td>Jeffrey Mansion</td>
<td>Chaim Soutine <em>Melanie, the Schoolteacher</em> c. 1922</td>
<td>Dress-up photos and photo frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 2010</td>
<td>Gahanna</td>
<td>Olde Gahanna Sanctuary</td>
<td>Charles Burchfield <em>October</em> c. 1922-24</td>
<td>Wind chimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 27, 2010</td>
<td>Powell</td>
<td>Powell Municipal Building</td>
<td>Middleton Manigault <em>The Zoo (Menagerie in Central Park)</em> 1911</td>
<td>Animal puppets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 20, 2010</td>
<td>German Village</td>
<td>Schiller Park Recreation Center</td>
<td>Vincent Smith <em>The Black Family</em> 1972</td>
<td>Canvas tote bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10, 2010</td>
<td>Clintonville</td>
<td>Whetstone Community Center</td>
<td>Rae Russel <em>Eviction Family, New York City</em> c. 1948</td>
<td>Photo albums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2, 2010</td>
<td>Westerville</td>
<td>Westerville Community Center</td>
<td>Sandy Skoglund <em>The Wedding</em> 1994</td>
<td>Paper cakes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Art Around Town Communities

To help these meetings run smoothly, I created a packet of information for the venue representatives. The packet included a table of contents, a flier that addressed the
Art Around Town program’s basic information, an image of the artwork planned to go to the respective location, a sheet that described each planned activity (docent discussions, gallery activity, art project, Art Challenges, and related arts performance), a requirements and provisions page and our business cards. We reviewed this information with the venue representatives and were often immediately accepted. On several instances we did need to make multiple negotiations regarding a space rental fee; as a non-profit requiring space for a community collaboration program, we requested the venue space free of charge, a request with which the vast majority of venues were willing to comply.

Once an agreement was made, the venue representative(s) and I chose a date. Sometimes we were able to do this on the spot, other times we made the decision via emails or phone calls. When the date was decided upon, I created a contract that outlined our agreement and had it signed by the venue representative. At that point, the event became official and was marketed as such.

Marketing

Art Around Town was the first major program I created at the Columbus Museum of Art that required a comprehensive marketing scheme. Because the program was community-based, rather than Museum-based, it provided a new set of challenges to us regarding audience development. It is well established in the field of marketing that it is vastly more expensive to develop new audience than it is to keep the audience you already have. Ideally we wanted to retain the established Family Programs audience, but we also wanted to encourage new families to attend Art Around Town. Hence we
(myself, Director of Education Cindy Foley, and the CMA marketing department) decided that we needed a two-prong marketing plan.

Art Around Town would be marketed to the CMA audience through Museum publications such as Art Speaks (the bimonthly members magazine) ArtBytes (a weekly email newsletter) and fliers at the Museum’s front desk. For the community audiences, we would produce a series of posters to hang at strategic locations throughout the community (an idea that was later largely abandoned when it proved to be futile), submit press releases to the local newspapers, and distribute fliers to the schools in the vicinity of the event (see Appendix B). An Art Around Town page on the Museum’s website (www.columbusmuseum.org) and a Facebook group (http://www.facebook.com/group.php?v=info&gid=336169985155) served both audiences.

Event Protocol

With the artworks, locations, and venues decided upon and a marketing plan in place, it was time for the Art Around Town interdepartmental team to meet and discuss event protocol. This team consisted of myself, Susie Underwood, at least one other representative from the Education Department, Rod Bouc (CMA’s Deputy Director), CMA’s Security Supervisor, and at least one representative from each of the following departments: Collections and Exhibitions (registrars), Curatorial, Marketing, and Development. The purpose of these meetings was to establish a framework for each Art Around Town event. We needed to decide who would represent each department that was
required at the events; what their specific duties before, during, and after the events would be; and what the general outline for each event would look like.

I created a document to outline the proceedings of each meeting (see Appendix C). The first meeting was, at the point of the completion of this paper, the longest by far. The interdepartmental meetings following the first event, for the most part, went smoothly and succinctly. For the majority of these meetings we followed the outline I created, but on several occasions we added additional pieces such as presentations of the data collected to that point.

One critical aspect of these interdepartmental meetings was choosing the team to attend the event and find a time for that team to walk the venue. As the caretakers of the art objects, it was crucial for the security and registrar staff to see the space and choose the safest location for the artwork within that space. Typically within one or two weeks of these meetings, we set a venue walk-through to make these important decisions. Art Around Town would not have been possible without the sanctity of the art being the foremost concern for all involved in the program, particularly because we made the conscious decision to value the community experience with the art over the monetary value of the art and thus took several costly pieces out of the building.

Art Around Town’s Goals and Desired Outcomes

In developing the Art Around Town program, it was important to me that we focused the program on several key goals; some of which apply to all of the Museum’s Family Programs, and some of which are unique to this particular program. All of the
goals refer to the George Hein quote presented in the introduction to this study--
progressive educational philosophies and democratic museum practices. The five goals
for Art Around Town that I developed, in conjunction with Merliee Mostov of CMA and
Jessica Luke of the Institute for Learning Innovation were (in no particular order): to
increase Museum awareness within communities that have low Museum attendance, to
raise awareness that the Columbus Museum of Art is a fun, worthwhile family
destination; to increase participants' comfort level with authentic works of art; to
encourage meaningful interaction with authentic art from the Museum's collection; and to
encourage creative problem solving and critical thinking skills.

The first two goal of increasing Museum and CMA Family Programs awareness--
particularly in communities with low Museum attendance-- addresses the creation of Art
Around Town as an opportunity to provide participants with the CMA Family Programs
experience in community venues. We know from the zip code data we collect at our front
desk that many Columbus-area communities are poorly represented at the Museum. It is
difficult to say why; a number of possible factors include lack of awareness of the
Museum's existence or the types of programs it offers, financial reasons, lack of time,
lack of interest, and distance concerns (a question that was included in the survey tool I
created for Art Around Town, the results of which will be discussed in future chapters).

However, I keenly believe that CMA’s Family Programs experience can be
equally enjoyed by, and valuable to, visitors of all areas of central Ohio, not just a
specific few. Ideally, in addition to providing community families with a meaningful one-
time experience, Art Around Town could also cultivate a family audience who, after
experiencing the program for themselves, would want to relive such an experience through different CMA Family Programs taking place at the Museum (upon completion of the renovation in January 2011). It was important for me to use Art Around Town to reach out to underrepresented communities and raise awareness about the Museum and also give the program participants the opportunity to experience the kind of family-friendly, educational programs CMA has to offer.

As the third and fourth programmatic goals for Art Around Town state, it was important for the program to, not only provide the physical presence of the art, but also encourage participants to feel comfortable while having a meaningful interaction with the art. To provide some context for this goal, note that it is well documented that art museums can be intimidating places for the average visitor who may have just a casual interest in art or is simply looking for something to do (Falk and Dierking, 1992; Dana, 1999; Hood, 1983). This is especially true for families--art museums have the perceived reputation of being quiet, pensive places where one is to look and not touch, speak in very low but highly intellectual voices, and where one, if one is lucky, might go on a studious tour lead by an upright, stern docent. As Harold Skramstad noted, “Once seen as a place of curiosity, wonder, and delight, the ‘museum’ became associated with quiet galleries where artistic treasures were displayed for contemplation” (p. 120, as reprinted in Reinventing the Museum, Anderson, 2004). None of these qualities are remotely becoming to the family lifestyle. Even though art museums have been making large strides over the past couple decades to become more welcoming, lively, active spaces for all audiences, a reputation of such magnitude and longevity as art museums have endured
takes a long time to erode. Families still tend to choose their local zoo or park over the art museum because those institutions are more emotionally comfortable and still provide the fun yet educational experience many families are looking for (Hood, 1983).

Art Around Town was designed to help break through that barrier by providing comfortable-- and often fun-- access points to the art through discussions and games. As such, the interpretive strategies of Art Around Town includes both a discussion-oriented portion and a game opportunity. The former consists of a CMA staff member standing by the artwork asking guiding questions to the family visitors-- what they see, what they think it means, and why they think it means what they say. In some cases we incorporate a dry erase board into the discussion where ideas that are shared are written down for all to see and think about or respond to. The game component of Art Around Town is called Art Challenges. It is an activity that encourages careful looking at the art while inviting a competitive spirit. Both of these activities were devised to meet the goals of decreasing art's intimidation factor and allowing for a meaningful connection with it.

The final goal of Art Around Town-- to encourage creative problem solving and critical thinking skills-- predominantly revolves around the artmaking portion of the program. I strategically design all of the art projects so as to provide enough structure to be easily comprehended but still open-ended enough to encourage creative problem-solving and exploration. The art projects always have a connection to the featured art from the Museum, but that connection is not formulaic. The goal of the art projects is never to emulate or copy the authentic art. It is unreasonable and unproductive to ask participants to recreate what they see; in all likelihood, such a request would lead only to
frustration and disappointment as non-artists tried to reproduce works considered masterful enough to be owned by a museum. Rather, I think of these projects as an opportunity to present an idea alongside a plethora of interesting materials with which participants can bring that idea to life.

Because there are no right or wrong answers (as there would inevitably be if the goal was to reproduce), the intimidation factor is low, and the excitement factor is high. Asking a casual participant with a pedestrian interest in the arts to draw a cat can be terrifying, but giving her wreath rings, colored wire, beads, buttons, bells, and wooden doodads and asking her to make a wind chime is fun. And, not only is it fun, but it is educative in the constructivist paradigm, which will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 2. When offering just a simple prop followed by an array of materials, we are able to encourage thoughtful decision-making (“Should I use the blue wire or the purple wire? Which would look best with the beads I’ve chosen?”) and critical thinking skills (“What would happen if I twisted the two wires together? What if I twisted a bunch of wires together?”). With choices come decision-making opportunities and with decision-making opportunities come learning opportunities that the participants create through their experiments and experiences.

The preceding pages were created to provide the reader with an overarching understanding of the Art Around Town program; why it was created, how it came into being, who was involved in the process, what questions we faced, and what we ultimately hoped the program would accomplish. As one can gather, it is a complex program with many facets and challenges. Each individual Art Around Town event, in fact, provided a
new set of challenges for me and I was constantly tweaking the program’s protocol to meet those challenges. As such, the information described above is an accurate overview of the history and logistics of the creation of the Art Around Town program at the Columbus Museum of Art.
Chapter 2: The Philosophical Foundation of Art Around Town

In my opening statement I posed the question, “What would an art museum program look like that addresses both progressive educational practices and the notion of the socially active, democratic museum?” George Hein is a major proponent of this idea, as is Harold Skramstad who notes,

Museums have helped shape the American experience in the past, and they have the potential to play an even more aggressive role in shaping American life in the future. They offer a powerful educational model that can help redesign and reform American education, and they can be important centers of community development and renewal. However, to accomplish these two things, museums must engage the world with a spirit of activism and openness far beyond what they are used to (p. 118, as reprinted in *Reinventing the Museum*, Anderson, 2004).

I made the argument that Art Around Town is a program of such activism and openness, then offered a detailed history and description of the program. In this chapter, I will more thoroughly explore the foundations of Art Around Town, both in terms of progressive pedagogy and museum democracy. This chapter will conclude with the essential questions that will be explored in Chapters 3 and 4.

Art Around Town has a multidimensional nature: it is a Columbus Museum of Art Family Program and a unique art museum outreach program. As such, it is necessary for
me to discuss the philosophical and pedagogical underpinnings of both of these aspects of the program as they play an equal role in the significance of the goals of Art Around Town. Additionally, while there is some cross-over, each of these key aspects to the program are supported by different theorists and researchers.

Art Around Town and Progressive Educational Philosophies

The Columbus Museum of Art’s Family Programs, like many of the programs and other initiatives at the Museum, are designed in accordance with progressive educational philosophies. Of particular focus are the constructivist theories of John Dewey, Jean Piaget, and the social learning theories of Lev Vygotsky. These theorists produced a body of works discussing the nature of learning-- that learning is most effective when it is connected to experience and that individuals create learning and meaning-making through activity and social interaction (Woolfolk, 2001; Dewey, 1938/1997; Vygotsky, 1978). The latter theory is key to CMA’s Family Programs as they are designed for families to explore, create, and learn together.

My predecessor, Merilee Mostov, observed that the programs she inherited, like many "family" programs in other museums, were actually programs for children with their parents, grandparents, or guardians serving as chaperones. Then, as now, most of CMA’s Family Programs included an art project, a gallery activity, and a related arts performance-- but all of these elements were designed with children in mind. The adults accompanying them were simply a means to an end. Because these programs were not truly family-oriented, she began to adjust the details of CMA’s Family Programs. For
example, the descriptions of the programs changed from being for “children ages five and older” to being for “families with children ages five and older.” Additionally, adults were encouraged verbally by the staff to participate in the different aspects of the programs, including the art project.

Since being promoted to the position of Educator for Family Programs, I have worked to push the role of family learning within the programs even further. I hold intense training sessions with my Family Programs Assistants staff in which we brainstorm about movies, books, television shows, places, and anything else we can think of that are successful in equally engaging both the adults and children in a family. We read articles about family learning and discuss the strategies that could relate to the Museum’s Family Programs. We talk about the importance of details-- of talking to both the adults and the children when they are greeted at the front table, about giving both the adults and children obvious permission to participate in all of the activities within the program, making eye contact with all of the participants when addressing a family, and giving genuine feedback to the families and offering such feedback to all of the family members.

Arguably, a museum program could be considered successful on many fronts without this kind of attention to all-ages participation. It could have high attendance, produce creative visitor art projects, and provide a fun experience. While all of those factors are important to CMA’s Family Programs, equally, if not more important, is the parent/guardian involvement in the experience so as to provide a positive social learning opportunity for both the children and the adults participating in the programs.
Several recent studies regarding family learning in museums (Folk, 2007; Sheppard, 2005; Dierking, 2010; Luke and Adams, 2007) emphasized the significance of social interaction among family members as a crucial learning mechanism. As museum consultant Lois Silverman (1993) noted, “The meanings we make are influenced and constrained by other people, including those with whom we participate in relationships and social groups” (p. 237, as reprinted in Reinventing the Museum, Anderson, 2004). These studies echo Vygotsky’s extensive research about the role of social interaction as a key component of child development and learning (1978). His concept of scaffolding—that of an individual with a more mature skill set offering guidance to an individual who is in the process of learning new skills (Woolfolk, 2001)—is especially applicable to all of CMA’s family programs, including Art Around Town. Scaffolding presents itself in CMA’s programs when a mother shows her daughter how to use scissors to cut out a shape, or a father explains to his two young children the proper amount of glue they need to use in order to effectively adhere buttons to their projects. I see scaffolding when a grandmother works on a project alongside her grandson and shares a story from her life that relates to the artwork she is creating and her grandson then, in turn, shares his story about his work. Scaffolding is equally significant when a Family Programs Assistant converses with a family about a work of art and gives guidance to all the family members, teaching them skills to "read" works of art and share their ideas together.

John Dewey, a major proponent of the idea that learning is experiential, also recognized the significance of social interaction as it relates to learning. He wrote, “all human experience is ultimately social: it involves contact and communication”
Humans do not live, or learn, in vacuums; we are social creatures and thrive on our ability to exchange thoughts and ideas with one another. As we interact with the world around us--a world that includes environments, objects, and other people--we have experiences and these experiences inform our learning, particularly when we share them with others. Social interacting and learning is an active experience; it involves talking, listening, and sharing. As Dewey, Vygotsky, and many more recent theorists have argued, active learning is far more meaningful and memorable than the passive learning of reading a book or listening to a lecture (Woolfolk, 2001).

In addition to emphasizing social learning, Family Programs at the Columbus Museum of Art--including Art Around Town--focus on the creation of activities that encourage hands-on and minds-on experiential learning in accordance with progressive constructivist educational theories. As previously noted, these theories state that learning happens when the learner creates his or her learning through active experience. When arguing for progressive education versus traditional, lecture-style education, Dewey posed the powerful question,

“What avail it is to win prescribed amounts of information about geography and history, to win the ability to read and write, if in the process the individual loses his own soul: loses his appreciation of things worthwhile, of the values to which these things are relative; if he loses his desire to apply what he has learned and, above all, loses his ability to extract meaning from his future experiences as they occur?” (1938/1997, p. 49).
In applying Dewey’s frustrated plea to art museum education, I would ask what would be the purpose of imposing facts of Formalism, Cubism, artists’ names and dates, and medium specifications upon families? What would the family members take away from such an experience? Dewey and I would argue that they would leave the Museum with very little, other than boredom and disappointment. But when, instead, families are presented with activities that encourage experiential learning and interaction with one another, the experience is meaningful and enjoyable (Folk, 2007). Dewey was also a major proponent of the concept of democratic education, placing him firmly in both of the critical aspects of Art Around Town. As Hein noted, “Dewey recognized the need to maintain a sense of community and social responsibility in a society that appeared to be losing these values” (p. 182, 2006).

Regarding museum education, George Hein has repeatedly argued that, “the most powerful and appropriate educational theory and practice for museums is constructivism” (2005). Indeed, the constructivist educational theories make perfect sense as a model for museum education, especially regarding the family audience. As “informal” learning institutions, museums are not under the direct pressure of standardized tests or statewide subject standards. They also have the huge advantage of having authentic objects at their disposal. As such, museums have the great opportunity to provide their visitors with a plethora of interesting and active experiences with their collections of objects in a free-choice learning environment (Falk and Dierking, 2002). They can encourage discussion and social interaction by posing questions about the objects, active learning by providing hands-on experiences relating to the objects, and meaning-making through a variety of
experiences that encourage the visitors to relate their lives to the objects on display. These ideas of active learning are key to main components of CMA's Family Programs--the gallery activities and the art-making activities.

As I discussed in the preceding chapter, the art project component of Art Around Town and the other CMA Family Programs is designed to be open-ended and allow for an infinite number of possibilities. That is not to say that they are without boundaries, but they are never formulaic. There are no right or wrong solutions to these projects, only opportunities for exploration, creativity, and experimentation. In developing art project ideas, constructivist philosophies play a major role in the projects I design. Visitors are encouraged to experiment with materials, designs, constructions, and methods to create an art product that is meaningful to them and can be created without fear of judgment. This concept of creative play has been researched and extensively written about by numerous researchers and psychologists (Vygotsky, 1978; Singer, Golinkoff, and Hirsh-Pasek, 2006; Nachmanovitch, 1990). Professor George Szekley, an art educator and major proponent of the concept of play as learning, wrote in From Play to Art, “When art instruction is planned around the experience of play, children can draw ideas from their own experiences instead of strictly following the teacher’s lead” (1991, p. 1). While his context for this quote an art classroom filled with children, the ideas apply equally well to adults and children participating in a program like Art Around Town. When given an idea and materials with which to experiment, participants of all ages are encouraged by the opportunity to explore and create while infusing their personal experiences into the art making process.
In the introduction of her book, *Teaching Meaning in Artmaking* (2001), Sydney Walker wrote about the influence of constructivist approaches to artmaking in the classroom as it relates to the goal of teaching art. While, again, the audience and setting for Art Around Town is different than that of an art classroom, the principles are very similar. She wrote, "... students make artworks to investigate and express ideas; and, based upon constructivist practices of authentic learning based on the real world, that students model their artmaking on that of adult (professional) artists and thereby learn how adult (professional) artists make art. The goal, however, is not to develop students into professional artists, but to structure classroom artmaking into a more meaningful activity, one based upon real-world authenticity" (parenthesis added, p. xiv). Art Around Town has all of the components Walker touched upon-- the presence of authentic artwork (which is rarely available in the classroom, requiring art teachers to have to rely on reproductions instead) that visitors can look to as inspiration, and projects that encourage meaning-making on a personal level while simultaneously using and creating personal experiences.

Through my own experiences as an educator at the Columbus Museum of Art, I have learned a great deal about how best to create programs that are effective for all members of the family. By analyzing both formal and informal data collected through trial and error, family focus groups, surveys, and careful observation, I have discovered, for example, that the art projects that have the highest success rate with both adults and children are those that have utilitarian appeal. Having reflected on this discovery, it makes a great deal of sense to me that this would be the case; utilitarian objects provide
visitors with the best opportunity of creating something that makes sense in their world (see Figures 1 and 2). For example, when given the supplies to make a wooden plaque, the participants can think about where they would want to put that plaque: Would they want to personalize it and make it for their bedroom door? Or put it on the front door and thus create a sign that expresses the family's identity for all of their guests to see and enjoy?
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Additionally, when interesting or unusual art materials are available which fascinate participants of all ages, projects tend to be received with enthusiasm and the results are often wonderful. On the other hand, I have learned that art projects that are skill-laden (representational drawing or painting, for example) can be enjoyable for children but intimidating for their adult companions. While I still find pencils and paint to be highly valuable art materials, I try to use them in ways that focus less on needing a particular skill, and more on requiring creative problem solving or artful play. When the
focus remains on the latter goals, participants tend to react to the projects with enthusiasm and a sense of fun and wonder, rather than fear or intimidation.

The other key Family Programs component I mentioned as being influenced by progressive education philosophies are the gallery activities. A gallery activity, in this context, refers to the activities I design to provide families with interactive and interesting ways to engage with the art. Examples of such activities include scavenger hunts, discussion questions, puzzles, and other types of games that encourage careful looking See Appendix D). In addition, the activities are designed to encourage discussion and create entry points for the visitors to make meaning by relating what they see to their own lives. The game aspect of these gallery activities serves as an enjoyable and comfortable means of interacting with the artwork. As is well documented, the typical museum visitor spends, on average, only seconds looking at each artwork they pass. When some kind of connector is available, such as a game, to slow the visitor down, they have a higher likelihood of having a more in-depth experience with the art (Falk and Dierking, 1992).

Based on my observations in CMA’s galleries during Family Programs, in the vast majority of cases these activities lead to social interaction that ranges from families working together to find all the items on a scavenger hunt to asking each other questions about the art they are looking at.

Art Around Town and the Democratic Museum

In addition to being a program for families, built on constructivist principles and philosophies of social learning, Art Around Town is also a community outreach program.
This outreach aspect carries its own philosophical significance. To this end, I looked to the writings of Hein, Stephen Weil, and John Cotton Dana as major contributors to the concept of the democratic museum. All three wrote extensively on the role of the museum as an institution with a significant social responsibility. All three argued that the museum needs to be cognizant not only of the objects it harbors, but also the people it serves. During a visit to Columbus, George Hein personally applauded Art Around Town as being the type of program that strives to meet the kinds of social and progressive goals he had in mind when he wrote of the need for museums to take a proactive role in their respective communities (personal communication, April 8, 2010). I like to believe that Dana and Weil would agree with him and feel the same way.

John Cotton Dana was a major figure in the world of museums and other public institutions in the beginning of the 20th Century. His work all but disappeared until 1999 when his book *The New Museum: Writings by John Cotton Dana* was released (Weil, 2002). Having originally worked extensively in the library profession, Dana wrote that museums needed to follow the library model. He wanted them to be of direct and useful service to the general public (1999). Writing in a time when the mission of most museums--art museums certainly notwithstanding--was to collect, protect, and exhibit objects, Dana was far ahead of his time when he argued that museums need to be of immediate practical aid to all of their respective communities (1999). Surely a program like Art Around Town, whose main goal is to provide a fun but meaningful active educational experience to family members of various communities in the Columbus vicinity, meets the criteria Dana discusses when speaking of *The New Museum*. 
Dana also wrote that, “the kind of museum best worth having in your community is the kind that is alive and active, is doing some rather definite work in the field of entertainment, and of enlightenment and education” (1999, p. 31). In reading this quote, I was immediately struck by how well it pertains to Art Around Town and relates to the Skramstad quote offered earlier in this chapter. In doing such a program, the Columbus Museum of Art is unquestionably alive and active in the community. The activities that are essential to Art Around Town-- the artmaking, the discussions, and the Art Challenges games-- are educationally driven but also designed to be fun; to be entertaining. Dana recognized that experiences that are enjoyable are the most likely to be remembered and repeated. I have seen such theory in action through the many families who repeatedly attend various CMA Family Programs, including those who followed Art Around Town to each community that we visited.

In his book, *Making Museums Matter* (2002), Stephen Weil looked at the history of museums in America, described the changes these institutions have made, and offered some explanation as to why these changes happened. Particularly regarding art museums, he noted that, “Over three decades, what the museum might be envisioned as offering to the public has grown from mere refreshment (the museum as carbonated beverage) to education (the museum as a site for informal learning) to nothing short of communal empowerment (the museum as an instrument for social change)” (p. 34). I would argue that this quote particularly applies to Art Around Town as it is a program that has the potential of providing communal empowerment. It offers the Columbus Museum of Art to anyone and everyone who is willing to make a short trip to a public location within
their own (or neighboring) community. It breaks down the barrier of the art museum as an institution for the elite and helps CMA live fully up to its mission of providing “Great experiences with Great Art for Everyone.” Community members of all socio-economic statuses, races, religions, and backgrounds come together to explore and create art together. Furthermore, all of these community members are invited to then come to the Museum itself and are even given free family passes in order to do so. I would argue that any museum that invests in such democracy is a museum that serves as an instrument for social change.

In speaking of art museums, Weil stated, “What we have inherited was once a grand and imposing structure. With most of its ideological foundations long since rotted away, that structure can no longer function in all the ways its builder intended... [However] it still provides value, and, properly adapted, it could provide far greater value still” (2002, p. 196). Indeed, a program like Art Around Town, that takes the public’s artwork into the community, along with educational activities, is, I believe, a manifestation of the kind of art museum initiative Weil referred to when he spoke of adapting the museum to provide greater value to the public. In her article Changing Values in the Art Museum: Rethinking Communication and Learning (2000), Eileen Hooper-Greenhill emphatically echoed such a statement, saying that, “Today, museums are subject to diverse demands to enable them to play valid roles in new worlds. Art museums must demonstrate their viability and argue their value in new contexts where former values are no longer taken for granted” (p.11). Museums that simply put objects on display are no longer living up to expectation. Instead, they have an obligation to
“play valid roles in new worlds.” An art museum that ventures to community centers, recreations centers, libraries and arts centers with the objects that are traditionally seen only on museum walls is playing such a role.

In the preceding pages, I have argued that Art Around Town is the type of art museum program that is both educationally progressive and socially conscious. I have referenced literature that addresses both of those aspects of the Art Around Town program. However, I have yet to address the public reaction to the program. Do the participants recognize the value of Art Around Town? Does it work as a Columbus Museum of Art Family Program? Is it recognized as fulfilling a socially-conscious, community-oriented purpose? Is it changing participants’ perceptions of the Columbus Museum of Art? Is it gaining new audiences? I will address these questions in the following chapters as I describe my methodology for data collection for the Art Around Town program, then analyze the data that I have collected thus far.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The Significance of this Research

At the conclusion of the previous chapter I posed a list of questions relating to the Columbus Museum of Art’s Art Around Town program; questions that were created to help me gain an understanding of the educational and functional significance of the program. In this chapter, I will describe the methodology I devised to address those questions. Before doing so, however, I feel it is necessary to offer an overview of museum outreach programs and the research that coincides with them. As will quickly become apparent, this overview shall be brief as precious little research has been conducted on museum outreach programs (particularly art museum programs) to this date.

In spite of the lack of research, art museums have a reasonably long and well-established history of devising and implementing community outreach programs. Such programs are any museum program, created and run by museum staff or volunteers, which take place outside of the museum building. Typically, but not exclusively, art museum outreach programs fall into three main categories: programs designed essentially as a marketing tool, lecture-style programs for adults, and programs offered to schools for their students.
The first type, including the Columbus Museum of Art’s Museum on the Move Community Outreach program, often takes place at festivals, fairs, or other large public events (sometimes art-related), and includes some kind of make-it-and-take-it art project along with brochures touting the museum’s upcoming programs or events. This brand of outreach is intended to remind the public of the museum’s existence by providing a visual reference, a hands-on activity, and literature about the museum. These programs tend to be pedagogically simplistic with few goals: to be seen and to remind participants to visit their local art museum. Little evidence exists to support the latter intention, yet museums continue to spend thousands of dollars a year on such initiatives.

The second type of outreach programs, such as the Metropolitan Museum of Art's Community and Workplace Programs (http://www.metmuseum.org/events/communityworkplace), The Art Institute of Chicago's Art Express program (http://www.artic.edu/aic/education/artintheworkplace.html), and the Columbus Museum of Art's Speaker’s Bureau (http://www.columbusmuseum.org/pdf/speakersbureaubrochure.pdf) are typically some kind of lecture format in a public space. These kinds of outreach programs are commonly presented by docents or curators, or occasionally by other museum staff members. The justification for these types of programs tends to be to fulfill a perceived public need of continuing adult education and/or to create excitement about a new museum acquisition or exhibition. Again, these types of programs tend to be straightforward and follow a traditional lecture-style format, rather than a progressive social or interactive approach.
Finally, many museums have outreach programs designed for K-12 schools. Examples of these types of programs include the Living With Art: Art in the Home program at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (http://www.lacma.org/programs/TeachersSchoolsOutreachPrograms.aspx#living), the Artful Citizenship program at the Wolfsonian (http://www.artfulcitizenship.org/main_content.html), and The Columbus Museum of Art's Pressing Matters program (http://www.columbusmuseum.org/pdf/Pressing_Matters_outcome_worksheet.pdf). Some institutions have docents or education staff take museum works from a study collection to the schools. Others use slides, posters, or other reproductions to provide a visual reference for the students to see and possibly discuss. Often these programs serve as an introduction to the museum as a prelude to a class field trip. Other times such programs serve as the substitute for a class trip for a school that, for one reason or another, is unable to travel to the museum itself. Although the artwork that accompanies these programs is generally relatively insignificant or represented in form of a reproduction, in many cases, these programs are more complex and meaningful than the two types previously mentioned. As such, somewhat more research around these types of programs has been published.

Certainly the nuances in museum outreach programs are far more numerous than I have discussed here; in the above sentences I was referring to art museum outreach programs in a highly generalized way. I do, however, feel confident that most museums (including the Columbus Museum of Art) could successfully categorize the majority of
their outreach programs in one of the three types listed above. Surprisingly, even though outreach programs are very common in art museums, almost no research exists to support them. When searching for studies of museum outreach programs I found almost nothing. The few studies I did find related to school outreach programs. Community outreach programs, it seems, are left to their own devices; surprisingly so in our currently economic climate, considering how costly they are to run and manage. It would seem to be in the museums’ best interests to evaluate these programs to confirm that they really do accomplish those goals for which they were created. I would theorize, however, that most art museums simply assume that outreach is a good thing and should carry on as such, without too many questions being asked.

Such a laissez-faire approach to community outreach does not work for me, particularly when considering a new program like Art Around Town. As I discovered for myself in the early stages of this work, far too little literature has been written about the role of art museum outreach programs and what they accomplish for their respective communities, particularly as these programs relate to the family audience. Family learning in museums is, itself, a relatively new field with a small group of champions including Lynne Dierking, Jessica Luke, Marianna Adams, Beverly Sheppard, and K.C.G. Folk. To then find work that addresses family learning in museum outreach programs is a veritable impossibility. As such, the research I have done on the Art Around Town program related to those issues serves as the first step in closing a huge gap in the field of art museum education.
That being said, I do wish to emphasize that this research is only a first step. The methods I worked with help to answer some questions, but certainly not all. Additionally, data needs to continue to be collected as the program continues in order to create a more complete understanding of what we have learned from Art Around Town. At the time of the creation of this paper, the program was about halfway through its fourteen scheduled events, with conversations taking place concerning the possibility of continuing Art Around Town even after the completion of the CMA building renovations. Thus, research will continue beyond the scope of this paper--continue in both breadth and depth with the diversification of research methods. And, certainly, this research will raise more questions that will need to be addressed through other means and projects. For the purpose of this thesis paper, however, the research methods used are those that served as the starting point for developing an understanding of the Art Around Town program and the purpose it serves within the Columbus community.

Applied Methodology

Since Art Around Town is a functioning program, the methods I used to study it are those common to action research. The Art Around Town program is a case study, or, perhaps more accurately, a series of case studies. At the time of the completion of this paper, I had overseen and gathered data from seven Art Around Town events. These events took place in the following locations in the following order, beginning in November and ending in May: the Lincoln Theater in the Lincoln-King district, Jeffrey Mansion in Bexley, the Olde Gahanna Sanctuary in Gahanna, the Powell Municipal
Building in Powell, Schiller Park Recreation Center in German Village, the Whetstone Community Center in Clintonville, and the Westerville Community Center in Westerville.

Each Art Around Town event took place on a Saturday from 1:00-4:00pm, with the exception of the first event (at the Lincoln Theater) which took place from 10:00am-2:00pm due to a time conflict. Art Around Town was designed for a family audience and each event was free, open to the public, and drop-in. Every Art Around Town event included at least one authentic artwork from the Columbus Museum of Art’s permanent collection, an artmaking project, gallery discussions and Art Challenges. Some events included additional activities such as related arts performances.

I chose to follow a mixed methods research approach to study the Art Around Town program which consisted of observations and a survey tool. It was important for me to pursue a mixed-methods approach in order to gather a dense set of data. The qualitative observations provided a richness that could not be attained through survey responses alone. However, the survey results provided important insight into the visitor’s reactions, thoughts, and backgrounds that could not have systematically been gathered through qualitative methods. The survey did serve as my main data collection tool; its development will be discussed in detail. My observations and those of other CMA staff serve to fill in some of the blanks left by the survey data and to give a more completed picture of the Art Around Town program and the interactions of its participants.

The survey tool was created to align with the goals and outcomes (discussed in Chapter 2) of the Art Around Town program. I developed the initial draft of the survey
that was then reviewed by ILI researcher Jessica Luke. I made several edits to the tool based on her comments and this edited version became the final survey (see Appendix A). It was given to an adult in each family unit as part of the Art Around Town welcome packet to be completed at some point during the course of the program. Some participants filled out the survey during the program, but most completed it as they were preparing to leave the event. Every participant who completed the survey received an Elijah Pierce magnet as a token of appreciation for their effort.

The survey was designed to help us formulate an understanding of the functionality of the program from the perspective of the visitors. Specific questions were created to gain data relating to the goals of the program. To justify that alignment, I will review each question on the survey tool and discuss the reasons for its inclusion. Please see Appendix A to refer to the exact wording and layout of the Art Around Town survey questions.

The first two questions were designed to give us a sense of who the audience for Art Around Town was. The first asked visitors why they attended Art Around Town and gave them a selection of motivations to choose from. This question was included in the survey to gain a sense of the reasons families attend programs like Art Around Town; if they came because they have an interest in the arts or they simply wanted something to do. This information helped us to better understand who our audience is from a motivational viewpoint and this knowledge guides how we design our programs. Museum research has shown the significance of motivations in understanding audience (Falk, 2009) and is a predominant interest in the museum field today. Also, looking in the context of the whole
survey, this question helped us understand if Art Around Town worked equally well for families who are arts-interested versus those who simply wanted an activity to do together. The second question asked who was included in the attending group. This question is straightforward and designed simply to help us gain a sense of what the family units who attended Art Around Town look like from a numbers and ages perspective.

Question three, a multi-part question, was designed to gather data relating to the participants' existing relationship (or lack thereof) with the Columbus Museum of Art. It asked if the participants had been to CMA before, how many times within the past two years they'd visited, and, if they had not visited, what their reasons were for not doing so. This question let us know if we were reaching out to new audiences through the Art Around Town program and, if we were, why these new audiences have not visited the Museum itself. As one of the goals for Art Around Town is to increase awareness of the Columbus Museum of Art, this questions gave us a sense of whether or not we had accomplished that goal.

The third and fourth questions asked visitors to rate their knowledge of and interest in art, respectively. These questions helped us to reinforce our understanding of what kind of relationship our audience has with art. This information is useful because, when it is crossed with other data from the survey, it told us if there is a correlation between the participants' relationship with art and their reaction to the Art Around Town program. As one of the goals for the program is to encourage meaningful interaction with the art, it
was helpful for us to know if participants have any knowledge of or interest in art to begin with.

The sixth and seventh questions addressed participants' comfort level with interactions with authentic art. The former asked participants to rate their comfort with art before the Art Around Town event, and the latter asked them to rate their comfort level after the event. One of the goals for the program is to increase participant's comfort with authentic works of art. This question gathered data to give us a sense of how effectively we were able to meet said goal.

The eighth question asked participants to rate their enjoyment of the Art Around Town activities including the gallery activity/discussion, Art Challenges, and the artmaking activity. These questions were designed to give us useful information, particularly when crossed with other questions, as to the participants’ response to the Art Around Town program. It also gave us data relating to the goal of raising awareness that the Columbus Museum of Art is a fun, worthwhile family destination. Question nine gave additional information along these lines by asking participants to rate the helpfulness of the CMA staff. This question relates to the belief that the quality of the staff interactions can have a major effect on the visitors' reactions to the program.

Question ten asked participants if the Art Around Town program changed their perceptions of the Columbus Museum of Art and, if so, in what ways. This question speaks to the stigma that art museums are typically considered to be places of quiet contemplation that are designed only for the well-educated middle-upper class. While art museums have been working for decades to deconstruct this perception, it is still widely
held by the non-museum going general public. Because one of the goals of the program is to increase Museum awareness (including awareness of Museum programs) and awareness that the Museum is a fun, worthwhile family destination, this question helped us gather data that speaks to both of those goals. This question also provided the opportunity for us to gather data on the participants’ reactions to Art Around Town as a community program as most community members do not equate CMA Family Programs with being anywhere but the Museum itself.

The final question asked visitors to rate their likeliness of visiting the Columbus Museum of Art in the future. This data, especially when crossed with data from other questions, helped us to understand our success rate in raising Museum and CMA Family Programs awareness. It also gave us a sense of how strongly participants equate Art Around Town with the Columbus Museum of Art and how well they responded to the program.

The Art Around Town survey tool addresses some of the goals of the Art Around Town program but, admittedly, not all. It does little to gather data regarding the educational goals of the program--to encourage critical thinking skills and meaningful interactions with artwork. In the future, I intend to address these goals through follow-up phone calls to participants to ask them a series of questions relating to their learning experience with Art Around Town. For the sake of this thesis, however, I have incorporated my personal observations as a means of addressing these issues in a qualitative manner. The data and its analysis, of both the surveys and observations, are discussed in detail in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4: Data and Analysis

In the previous chapter, I discussed my methodology for researching the Art Around Town program. I created a survey tool which participants completed on a voluntary basis, and I observed audience interactions. At the point of the completion of this paper, I had collected seven programs’ worth of data which I will proceed to share and analyze throughout the course of this chapter. My analysis efforts were assisted by researcher Jessica Luke of the Institution for Learning Innovation, who also helped me create the survey tool.

The Art Around Town survey was designed to gather specific information from the participants of the Art Around Town program, particularly regarding their motivations for attending the program, their relationship with art and with CMA, their comfort levels with art both before and after participating in the program, and their perceptions of the Museum after their Art Around Town experience. Upon the completion date of this paper, I had collected eighty survey responses (n=80). The surveys were completed by the adult members of the families that participated in the Art Around Town program at one of its seven events. Because the survey was voluntary and the respondents were, therefore, self-selected, there are limitations to what the data from this survey can tell us. We must assume there is a possibility of bias since the respondents
were not randomly selected. We must also recognize that each Art Around Town event was unique and featured changing variables including the type of venue, the art project, the artwork, the gallery discussion activities, the Art Challenges activities, the space configuration, the types of chairs people were sitting in, the lighting, and a host of other factors. In other words, it is important to note that this research does not reflect an experimental design nor does it feature controlled variables; action research dictates a different variety of methodology. The limitations being noted, the survey did provide us with some very interesting and useful data which I will explore over the course of the next several pages of this chapter.

The responses to the survey provided us with some contextual information about the families who participated in the Art Around Town program. As the program was designed for families (meaning a unit consisting of at least one adult and at least one child who have a close personal connection and who are often, but not always, biologically related), it is unsurprising that the vast majority of adults (n=73) listed that they were attending the program with at least one child. Most of the family units were of average size-- one to two adults with three or fewer children. Only five respondents listed that they had four or more children with them. Somewhat surprisingly to me, 87.2% of the respondents (n=68) had been to the Columbus Museum of Art at some point in their lives. When the program was developed, I had anticipated that the Art Around Town program would be attended to by a larger percentage of people who had never visited the Museum that what the survey data shows. However, upon reflection, it does make sense that the people who would be interested in participating in Art Around Town would also
be those with a high interest level in art and, therefore, a strong likelihood of visiting their local art museum—CMA, in this instance. However, it is interesting to note that only 40.5% of these participants had visited the Museum more than four times within the two years prior to their completed survey date. In other words, most of the Art Around Town participants were infrequent CMA visitors.

The first question on the survey requested that participants checked their reasons for attending the Art Around Town program (see Figure 3). They were given the following list of responses to choose from: to get out of the house, to be around art, to have a cultural experience, to have a fun/playful Columbus Museum of Art, and other (with space provided for a write-in response). Participants were invited to choose as many of these responses as they felt applied to their family.

Figure 3. Motivations Chart
The most frequently chosen responses were “to have a fun/playful experience” (n=64), “to spend time with my family” (n=51), and “to be around art” (n=50). The next most common responses were “to get out of the house” and “to have a cultural experience” (n=42 for each). Finally, the responses with the lowest response rate were “to learn something about art/artists” and “to experience the Columbus Museum of Art” (n=33 for each). This data supports what we already know about the art museum experience for families-- that their motivations for having art museum experiences tend to be social and entertainment-based (Falk and Dierking, 1992). These findings also support the notion that families, even when looking for cultural or educational experiences, do not want to be fed hard facts and information (“to learn something about art/artists”), but want to have fun and meaningful experiences together.

While it could be perceived as disheartening that so few participants listed “to experience the Columbus Museum of Art” as a motivation for attending Art Around Town, I am not terribly surprised by this data, especially when seen in the greater context of the survey results. A number of the participants happened upon the program in the midst of doing something else (taking a walk in the park, having a picnic, participating in soccer practice, etc), and it is understandable that experiencing CMA would not have been a strong motivating factor for their participation in the program-- they were simply interested in trying out the event that happened to be taking place where they were. It is also possible that the 40.5% of participants labeled as frequent visitors (those who had visited four or more times in the two years prior to their survey completion) would not list “experiencing the Museum” as a motivating factor because their familiarity with the
Museum removes the novelty of the experience. Furthermore, the selection “to be around art” did have a high response rate; an encouraging data set as one of the key components to the Art Around Town program was the presence of authentic art from the CMA collection.

In addition to gathering information about why people came to Art Around Town, the survey also asked those who had not been to CMA within the past two years their reasons for the lack of visitation (see Figure 4). The choices were: cost, distance from home, time factor, was not aware of the Museum’s existence, was not aware of the kinds of programs CMA offers, do not feel comfortable in art museums, did not think CMA would be an ideal family location, and other (with space for write-in responses). Because the majority of participants had been to the Museum at least once within two years, and the question was phrased such that it asked only those who had not been to the Museum to respond, the sample size for this question is only 18 respondents. Such a small sample size cannot be effectively analyzed, but I will note that the most frequent response to this questions was “time factor” (n=6) followed by “was not aware of the kinds of programs CMA has to offer” (n=5). The most infrequent response was “do not feel comfortable in art museums” (n=0). Until I am able to gather a larger data set for this question, it is impossible to say if this trend will continue.
Included on the survey was a question which asked respondents to rate their interest in art on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being low and 7 being high (see Figure 5). Not surprisingly, that vast majority rated their interest level at either a 6 (n=20) or a 7 (n=37). Part of the reason I wanted to include this question was to discover if families who were merely looking for something free to do together, an interest in art notwithstanding, would attend the program. The data collected up to the point of this paper shows that not to be the case. As I noted earlier, however, it is logical that those with an interest in art are the most likely to attend an art-related program.
Using the same scale of 1-7, the survey asked respondents to rate their knowledge of art (see Figure 6). As was to be expected according to anomaly that people tend to underestimate their own knowledge of a subject, these numbers were much lower and covered a wider spread with an average response rating of 4.44 and the majority of the responses falling in the middle ratings of 3, 4, and 5 (n=12, n=21, n=22, respectively). While this data set was not particularly surprising or informative on its own, it did provide some interesting information when crossed with the data from other questions. Specifically, the data showed that participants who had visited the Museum more than three times in the previous two years rated their knowledge of art much higher than those who had visited fewer than three times. This data is interesting outside of the context of
Art Around Town as it shows that frequent Museum visitors consider themselves more knowledgeable about art. In terms of Art Around Town, it helps to reemphasize the point that participants came from a variety of art, and other, backgrounds.

![Knowledge of Art Chart](image)

**Figure 6. Knowledge of Art Chart**

One of the most exciting findings from the survey was that there was a statistically significant increase in participants’ comfort levels with art from their participation in the Art Around Town program. Using the 1-7 rating scale, with 1 being uncomfortable and 7 being very comfortable, we asked respondents to rate their comfort level interacting with art before the Art Around Town program and after the Art Around Town program (see Figure 7). While responses in general were high, the average rating jumped from 4.44 prior to the program to 5.95 after the program. This finding shows that
the Art Around Town program is currently succeeding at meeting its goal of increasing visitor’s comfort interacting with authentic works of art. In the future I hope to contact the participants who noted substantial increases to gain some further information regarding specifically in what ways their comfort with art was increased by their participation in Art Around Town. Such information could help me to better understand why their comfort levels increased and what aspects of the program led to the increase.

Two questions included on the survey were designed to gather data regarding respondents’ reactions to the activity and the staff components of the program. Participants were asked to rate their level of enjoyment of each of the Art Around Town activities, with 1 being not enjoyable and 7 being very enjoyable (see Figure 8). The activities participants were asked to rate were the gallery activity (discussion), Art Challenges, and the artmaking activity. As was consistent with my findings from data collected on Family Programs within the Museum, the artmaking activity received the
highest response rating with a mean response rate of 6.69 and 74% of the respondents (n=54) choosing a rating of 7 for the activity. While the unique aspect of Art Around Town was the presence of authentic artworks from CMA, this data shows that families responded the most positively to the portion of the program in which they were provided the opportunity to create. Perhaps these responses also speak to expectations (families tend to assume that, when attending an art museum family program, they will make art).

The activity with the next highest rating was the gallery activity with a mean rating of 6.58 and 55.2% of the respondents (n=37) giving the activity a rating of 7. Finally, Art Challenges received a mean rating of 6.27 and a response of 49.3% (n=34) for a rating of 7. It is also notable that 20.9% of respondents did not participate in the gallery activity and 18.8% of respondents chose not to participate in Art Challenges while only 6.8% did not participate in the artmaking activity. Again, these statistics reiterate that families are most responsive to the artmaking portion of the program. However, all of the activities received consistently high scores and many positive written comments including the following: “Lots of fun;” “Great family event;” and “Wonderful creative activity.” This data, while not addressing any one specific goal of Art Around Town, does illustrate that the general reaction to the program and its activities was overwhelmingly positive. Part of the success rate of the program relied on its being enjoyable to the participants, and this data shows such to be the case.
Additionally, a question was posed regarding the helpfulness of the Art Around Town staff. On the 1-7 scale, participants were asked to rate the helpfulness of the staff, with 1 being not helpful and 7 being very helpful (see Figure 9). The average rating was 6.90 with 91.8% of participants choosing a rating of 7. Because the staff is so integral to a program like Art Around Town-- serving as the face of the Museum while in the community-- it was encouraging to me to see such a positive response rate for this question. I feel that this data also speaks to the importance of having a positive, well-trained staff involved in a program such as Art Around Town; participants recognized the difference that it made.
When asked if the Art Around Town program has changed their perception of the Columbus Museum of Art, 48.6% of respondents (n=36) chose “yes.” Considering that almost 90% had been to the Columbus Museum of Art, and were, therefore, already at least somewhat familiar with the Museum, I found this response rate to be encouragingly high. Respondents were requested to explain how their perceptions had changed, and their responses, when grouped, were revealing. Notably, nine respondents wrote comments relating to the community aspect of Art Around Town. Eight of the participants noted that they learned the Museum was more child-friendly than they had previously thought. These two groups of comments were especially meaningful; the former let us know that participants recognize their appreciation for the community
aspect of Art Around Town, and the latter shows evidence that the program has had some success at accomplishing the goal of raising awareness that CMA is a fun, worthwhile family destination.
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Figure 10. Likelihood of Returning Chart

The final survey question asked respondents to rate how likely they would be to visit the Columbus Museum of Art in the future (see Figure 10). The rating system was based on a 1-7 scale with 1 being very unlikely and 7 being very likely. The average rating response was 6.78 with 82.2% of respondents (n=60) choosing a rating of 7, 13.7% of respondents (n=10) choosing a rating of 6 and 4.1% of respondents (n=3) choosing a rating of 5. Considering that most of the participants to the program had visited the Museum fewer than three times in the two years prior to their survey completion, it was
encouraging to see such a high percentage of interest in future Museum visitation. After all, audience building was a desired outcome of Art Around Town. Granted, it is also true that the vast majority of participants had visited CMA, so it is logical that they would express a high interest in visiting again at some future point. None the less, considering that a substantial portion of participants commented that they had not been aware of the types of programs CMA had to offer, it is encouraging to think that the Art Around Town program may have built new family audience, or at least raised awareness of the Museum and its programs.

The Art Around Town survey provided data that helped to gather information regarding some of the goals of the program. At the time of completion of this paper, it showed a there was statistically significant increase in comfort in participants before and after the program. It showed some evidence that Art Around Town had raised awareness that the Columbus Museum of Art is a fun, worthwhile destination for families. It also showed some evidence of raising general Museum awareness as illustrated by the comments that noted that some participants knew nothing about CMA prior to their attendance at Art Around Town. Additionally, the survey provided us with data regarding the attendants’ motivations, their relationships with art, and their relationships with CMA. All of this information provides us with a comprehensive picture of the Art Around Town participants.

However, the survey has significant limitations: it gathered little information regarding the educational impact of Art Around Town. It did not show evidence of critical thinking or creative problem solving related to Art Around Town. It did not
provide information on how the family members interacted with one another during the program. Finally it did not give us much of an understanding of the interactions between the visitors and the art. Since two of the goals for Art Around Town are to “encourage meaningful interaction with authentic art from the Columbus Museum of Art” and “to encourage creative problem solving and critical thinking skills,” it was important to the sanctity of this research to address these goals. Since this information could not be effectively gathered from a survey, I will proceed to discuss my observations of the program and include images to illustrate my observations. The limitations of these observations are, of course, that they are biased according to my personal viewpoint. As the creator and manager of Art Around Town, it is difficult, if not impossible, to distance myself from the program. In sharing my observation, however, I intend to be as indiscriminate as possible.

It is difficult to make concrete analyses of people’s interactions with art based on casual observations by a non-researcher. In trying to find evidence of meaningful interactions with the art, I looked for families who spent time, either during Art Challenges or during the gallery discussions, looking carefully at the art and conversing with one another. Indicators of careful looking tended to include pointing, extended glances, and verbal cues indicating a specific visual detail. Conversations were significant when they were focused on the artwork, included questioning and answering, and involved multiple family members.

Throughout the various Art Around Town programs, I witnessed some meaningful family interactions with the art. The gallery discussions tended to provide
mixed results. When leading discussions, staff members typically focused on several main questions including: “What do you see?” “What does it mean?” and “How can you tell?” The staff members were also invited to ask whatever questions they felt would best promote discussion based on the participants’ responses. In other words, there were no set scripts for these gallery discussions. Some of families were very responsive to the idea of being invited by CMA staff members to look carefully at the artwork and share their ideas about what they saw, but others were less so. Individual personalities played a substantial role in responsiveness and this individualism was certainly a factor that we could not control.

The gallery discussions seemed to be the most effective when dry erase boards were incorporated into the discussions. The boards provided us with a space in which we were able to write down the participants’ responses as they were shared (see Figure 11). The board allowed visitors to see and react to what others had discussed and, through their sharing, become a part of a larger conversation involving multiple families—a concept which many families seemed to respond to. The participants generally seemed the most comfortable responding to the “what do you see?” prompt, most likely because this question is so non-threatening. In general, children were more likely to offer responses than adults but adults would often chime in when encouraged to do so. Both the adult and child members of the families occasionally offered particularly insightful responses to the questions—sometimes seeing things in the artworks that we had not noticed, or, in other instances, making interesting connections to their lives in ways that we had not anticipated. Such insights were the exception, not the rule, however. There
were also a fair number of families who "just wanted to look" and chose not to join into conversations with staff or other families at all.

Figure 11. Visitor Response Board

The Art Challenges activities granted the families the opportunity to experience a different kind of interaction with the art. Because these activities were game-based and competitive (and included prizes for participants) the participation rate tended to be higher among both adults and children. Some families (particularly those with older children) interacted by competing against one another, and other families (often those with younger children) worked together on the challenges. Certainly some of the Art Challenges activities were more engaging for the families than others. Scavenger hunts, for example, were successful in engaging all of the family members; in the majority of cases they worked as a unit to find all of the required visual cues. When the participants
had a specific list of details or objects to look for, adults often asked the children to look for a particular item, or the children requested assistance to find a visual clue that was especially difficult, or they asked for confirmation when an object was found. In some cases, the children asked their adult family members what a certain item looked like, which tended to lead to quick discussions. As one participant noted on the survey, "Excellent challenge-- made us see things in the photo that we didn't notice before."

Slowing the family participants down and encouraging them to look more carefully was one of the main purposes of the Art Challenges activities and, as the quoted participant recognized, the challenges tended to accomplish that goal for the families who chose to participate.

Some Art Challenges were much less successful at engaging family members than others. For example, the Art Challenges activity that required participants to stack as many paper flowers onto a cake stand as they could within a two minute time frame (relating to Sandy Skoglund's *The Wedding*) was enticing to children but not adults. The vast majority of the adult family members stood back and watched their children complete the activity. Some assisted with the counting when the challenge was completed, which is a valuable learning opportunity, but not the kind of interaction I had had in mind when I created the activity. Perhaps this separation was due to the set-up of the activity or the nature of the activity itself; it is difficult to say purely based on observation.

I do feel confident in saying that, for the most part, the Art Challenges activities and the gallery discussion activities provided an opportunity for engagement with the
artwork and a platform for conversation for the families who participated. However, to better understand the value of Art Challenges and the gallery discussions as a portion of Art Around Town, I will need to hold interviews or focus groups with the participating families to gather specific information from them regarding their response to and interaction with those activities. As a future research project, I will need to ask more probing questions to gather the kind of information that cannot effectively be collected from either surveys or observations alone.

Evidence of creative problem solving and critical thinking can be equally difficult to analyze. Although many researchers have written on the subject of creativity, there is little consensus as to what creativity actually looks like. In many ways, it is easier to say what creativity is not: rote memorization, regurgitation of facts and figures, imitation of something that has already been made, the creation of step-by-step projects in which all of the outcomes are the same, and the production outcomes of mindless repetition. Educator Marvin Bartel echoed this sentiment of anti-creativity in his article "Ten Classroom Creativity Killers" (2008) in which he reflected upon his own practices as an art educator and the ways in which he had inadvertently killed creativity. Some of my favorites are: "I kill creativity when I show an example instead of defining a problem," "I kill creativity when I praise neatness and conformity more than expressive original work," "I kill creativity by making suggestions instead of asking open questions," and "I kill creativity if I give an answer instead of teaching problem solving experimentation methods." Creativity can often be thought of as synonymous with terms such as exploration, experimentation, open-ended problem solving, risk-taking, and the
development of something new or unique. Interestingly enough, many of these same terms are those that frequently coincide with the language of progressive pedagogy.

This begs the question, then: did I witness evidence of creative problem solving at Art Around Town events? My answer is most definitely in the affirmative, although, certainly, with some mixed results. As I discussed in length in Chapter 2, I designed the artmaking projects for Art Around Town to be open-ended, to encourage exploration, and to encourage creative problem solving. The task for each of the Art Around Town art project was fairly simple (to create a photo album, decorate a tote bag, build a paper cake, etc.) and the instructions were straightforward. A wide array of materials were available for each project along with several widely varying samples to serve as a starting point for those who needed it. From my experiences with Family Programs at the Columbus Museum of Art, this set of circumstances--the creation of a simple object (that is often utilitarian) as the project base, a wide array of interesting supplies, and positive staff support--provides the ideal situation for the encouragement of creativity.

At almost every Art Around Town event, at least one CMA staff member commented to me how amazed they were by the families' dedication to their projects. Some of the art projects (most notably the tote bags, photo albums, wind chimes, and cakes) engaged the families--the adults and children--for at least sixty minutes. This engagement included experimentation with different materials, the sharing of ideas with one another, and exploration of new means of creating art. Some art projects--such as the photo albums, frames, tote bags, wooden plaques and wind chimes--were more conducive to the adults and children working side-by-side on their own separate projects.
Others—such as the puppets and paper cakes—were more conducive to the adults and children working together on a single project.

I made the claim that I did see evidence of creative problem solving during the artmaking process of Art Around Town and I would like to discuss in more detail several concrete examples of this evidence. Figure 12 shows the tote bag made by a young boy, about nine or ten years old, during the Schiller Park Art Around Town event. He created an unmistakable volcano by cutting out the mountain base from brown patterned fabric, and then added orange and red puff balls to represent exploding lava. He included some fantastic details—a stretch of black and white spotted ribbon across the top to represent smoke, strips of red material to indicate the lava dripping down the side of the mountain, and a jewel in the middle of the largest puff ball as well as a flower in the middle of the mountain. These latter two details may have referred to something specific or may just have been aesthetic touches—in any case they are interesting additions to the project. I cite this work as an example of creative problem solving for several reasons: it is imaginative in that the boy did not have any visual references of volcanoes to work from other than what was in his mind, he used a variety of materials to solve the problem of how to create a volcano on a canvas bag, and he used the materials in interesting and unexpected ways—especially the puff balls. Additionally, not only did this project show evidence of creativity, but it also exhibited the personal connection of the creator's interest in and knowledge of volcanoes.
Figure 13 shows another tote bag created at the same event, but by an adult. Her approach was very different from the boy who created the volcano bag but equally successful. Her tote bag design was more abstract, and instead of creating a representational image on her bag, she chose to develop an enticing design using color, patterns, and texture. I cite her work as an example of creativity for her use of materials; the way she used tiny shapes of fabric in an almost mosaic-type pattern was completely unlike any other project created that day. She also incorporated flowers and buttons in an interesting way by layering and scattering. She embraced color and pattern in this project, and the result was both beautiful and unique.

The puppet project from the Powell Art Around Town event provided a wide and imaginative variety of creations. Whereas participants were invited to create animal puppets (to accompany Middleton Manigault's *The Zoo*), many of the family members chose to make much wilder and more creative creatures. Figure 14 shows one of my favorite puppet artworks. This creation, perhaps part-bird and part-monster, is an excellent example of imaginative exploration and play. It was covered in a multitude of multi-colored feathers in all different shapes and sizes and featured a face full of google
eyes. This puppet's creator did not feel the need to follow any particular stipulations or rules, and, because of his inhibitions, was able to make an unusual and creative creature.

Figure 14. Google Eye Puppet

Finally, as an example of a creative project designed by a family group, I have included an image of a Hawaiian-themed cake created by a mother and her two daughters (see Figure 15). After seeing Sandy Skoglund's *The Wedding*, which prominently features a wedding cake, participants were invited to create their own paper cakes using boxes, cardboard rounds, a variety of papers, markers, buttons, ribbons, flowers, stickers, and other materials. This project produced, perhaps, the widest array of participant artworks. The cake created by the mother and daughter team featured a plethora of interesting details-- different patterns of papers, flowers, pipe cleaner “frosting”, glitter spray, and a hula girl topper. I cite this work as a creative example because it exhibits so much evidence of critical thinking skills-- figuring out how to balance the different cake pieces on top of one another, making decisions on which flowers to put where and why, and
choosing how to incorporate details that clarified the theme of this cake. And, I must say, the addition of the hula girl topper was the proverbial icing on this paper cake.

Figure 15. Hawaiian Cake

Certainly it would be misleading for me to say that every art project that was created at every Art Around Town event represented the epitome of creativity. Many of the participant’s projects were much more predictable than the examples I have cited. However, I can say with confidence that every project was unique to the person who created it and experimentation, play and creative problem solving was encouraged in everyone who participated, albeit to varying degrees.

To better understand the results of the Art Around Town artmaking projects, further research will need to take place. Like the gallery discussion and Art Challenges
components of Art Around Town, the artmaking portion would benefit from more in-depth qualitative data collection through interviews or focus groups with the program participants. These discussions or focus groups would be the ideal next step in researching Art Around Town to discover more definitive and measurable information regarding the educational value of this community outreach program.
Chapter 5: Conclusion and implications for the field

In the writing of this thesis paper, I set out to argue that the Columbus Museum of Art's Art Around Town program is an example of an art museum program that is both socially conscious and community oriented, and developed according to progressive educational philosophies. I provided an in-depth description of the logistics of the program to provide the reader with a contextual understanding of Art Around Town. I then proceeded to describe the philosophical groundwork for the program, focusing on the museum theorists George Hein, John Cotton Dana, and Stephen Weil, and the educational theorists John Dewey, Jean Piaget, and Lev Vygotsky. Finally, I described the research methods that I incorporated to study Art Around Town, and provided an analysis of the data I collected from the survey tool I created and my personal observations of the program.

As I stated earlier in this work, I feel strongly that Art Around Town is the kind of program that exemplifies the concept of the democratic museum. As defined by theorists Hein, Dana, and Weil, the democratic museum is one that focuses on its role in the community. It recognizes that it is an institution created for the well-being of the people it serves. Art Around Town meets these stipulations by bringing CMA art into the community to be experienced in a free, public location. Additionally, it includes activities that are designed to be both fun and educational for families, and to encourage
exploration, experimentation, and conversation. Few, if any, other art museums in the United States currently run outreach programs for families that align to these standards.

Art Around Town also adheres to progressive educational philosophies through the inclusion of activities that were designed to encourage active learning and personal meaning-making through experience. These activities include gallery discussions about the CMA artwork, Art Challenges games that encourage deep looking through a spirit of competition, and artmaking activities that encourage hands-on, socially-driven experiences. Educational theorists Dewey, Vygotsky, and Piaget wrote extensively on the significance of active, experiential learning as the foundation for meaningful pedagogical practices that are essential for life-long learning. Their concepts, although a century old, are still pertinent today and served as the foundation for the Art Around Town components.

While the theorists write that museums should strive to support democratic, community-based ideals and progressive pedagogy, little research exists on museum practicum that supports these philosophies. Although I do feel confident in saying that Art Around Town is both democratic and educationally progressive, these components alone are not enough to make for a successful program. One could create a community-based program that incorporated progressive educational methods that was poorly received by its participants or that simply did not achieve its intended goals. To provide a means for assessing success, five main goals were developed for Art Around Town: to increase Museum awareness within communities that have low Museum attendance, to raise awareness that the Columbus Museum of Art is a fun, worthwhile family
destination; to increase participants’ comfort level with authentic works of art; to encourage meaningful interaction with authentic art from the Museum's collection; and to encourage creative problem solving and critical thinking skills.

To evaluate these goals, I chose a mixed-methods data collection approach. I developed a survey tool designed to gather information on the goals relating to Museum awareness and increased comfort levels with art. However, the survey provided limited data relating to the participants’ meaningful interactions with art and evidence of creative problem solving and critical thinking. To supplement this data, I provided information from my personal observations during the program along with photographs that provided additional visual data.

The data I collected from the Art Around Survey exhibited some enlightening results. It showed that the gross majority of the respondents had visited the Columbus Museum of Art and a substantial portion of those visitors were frequent Museum-goers. This unexpected finding decreased the opportunity to raise awareness about the Museum and its programs. However, written responses by respondents who were not regular Museum visitors showed evidence that some visitors, while they may have been familiar with the Museum itself, were not aware of its family-friendly opportunities. Additionally, about 10% of the survey respondents had never been to CMA. While these numbers may have been smaller than anticipated, the survey still showed some evidence of meeting the goals of increasing awareness of the Columbus Museum of Art and its level of family-friendliness. The survey data also showed evidence that Art Around Town raised participants’ comfort levels with authentic art by a statistically significant margin, which
was a substantial finding since it speaks to one of the goals of the program. Finally, while not attached to any one specific goal, the survey exhibited evidence that the components of Art Around Town-- particularly the artmaking portion-- were well-received by the participants.

As an observer of Art Around Town, I saw evidence of both meaningful family interactions with art and creative problem solving. The vast majority of the families who attended Art Around Town worked and communicated together throughout the course of the various activities. The gallery discussions and Art Challenges activities encouraged careful looking and the sharing of ideas-- albeit some activities more so than others. As exhibited by the photographs and examples I discussed in Chapter 4, I witnessed evidence of creative problem solving in the artmaking processes of children, adults, and family units. As with the discussions, though, the level of creativity was not consistent from family to family or event to event.

To develop a better understanding of the data gathered during Art Around Town, both from the survey and the observations, research efforts will need to continue and diversify. Surveys will continue to be collected beyond the scope of this paper. The collection of observational data and photographic evidence will also continue. Additionally, I am interested in pursuing more in-depth data collection through interviews or focus groups to gain a better understanding of the information collected to this point. Such information could help to clarify some remaining questions, particularly those stemming from my observations. This next step will be crucial to the larger CMA evaluation plan for Art Around Town.
As this thesis has exemplified, it is possible for art museums to develop initiatives that are community-centric and pedagogically progressive. Art Around Town is an example of such a program. I have also shown that, based on the data collected to the point of the completion of this paper, Art Around Town has exhibited evidence of meeting the predetermined goals of the program and that it has been well-received by its participants, granting validity to the program.

I believe the implications for the art museum field from this research are substantial. As I discussed in the early pages of this paper, few, if any, art museums take important artworks from their galleries into their respective communities as a part of a free program for a family audience. All of the art museum educators I have spoke with about the program expressed their amazement that CMA supported the notion of including the artwork in this program; all of them said they would never be able to do such a thing. My hope, however, is that Art Around Town will exhibit to the field that it can be done-- that important art from our respective collections can be safely displayed in the community as part of a public event. Art Around Town has the potential to open the doors to a whole new wave of community-based art museum programs that were considered impossible in the past. The seven Art Around Town events I have led confirm what Hein, Dana, and Weil suspected; it is, indeed, possible.

The participants themselves have recognized the significance of this major step; when asked on the survey if Art Around Town had changed their perceptions of the Columbus Museum of Art, nine of the respondents referenced the community aspect of the program. Within the Museum itself, participants of Art Around Town-- as well as
visitors who have simply read about the program-- have mentioned to the front desk staff how appreciative they are of CMA’s willingness to bring the Museum experience into Columbus neighborhoods. Art Around Town is even appreciated to the point that it has a core group of families who follow it around the city to each of its monthly locations.

Art Around Town, as it was originally conceived, was designed to replace the Museum’s large Family Programs during CMA’s renovation period. However, the staff involved in the program—including, but not limited to, myself-- have been so impressed by the outcomes of the program that internal conversations have already taken place regarding the indefinite continuation of Art Around Town as a CMA community outreach family program. That other staff members are willing to continue to put forth the time and effort into this program, and to give up their weekend time for it, speaks volumes to me and, I hope, the art museum community about the power of this program. While it may not be perfect, and I will be the first person to express as much, it has great potential and has already produced positive impacts on the Columbus community.

I do recognize that this program would not have been possible without the support of the Columbus Museum of Art’s administrative staff and board of directors. Director Nannette Maciejunes never balked at the notion of removing the art from the building and taking it into the community; she, in fact, initiated the idea that we would take out more valuable works than originally planned. Her support, and the support of other staff, was imperative to Art Around Town. I hope that she may be recognized as a visionary in the field and that, now the risk has been taken and shown to be worthwhile, other museum directors will feel comfortable following suit.
Art Around Town is merely one version of the myriad of possible programs like it that have the potential to be created and implemented by other art museums. It has paved the way for other institutions to consider sharing their work with their respective communities outside of museum walls. It is possible that, with the constantly changing museum climate, these kinds of programs may even become essential to the basic survival of art museums. It is my hope that community outreach programs featuring authentic art and meaningful activities will be included in art museum repertoire long before the point of necessity to museum survival, and that Art Around Town, as a democratic program built on progressive pedagogy, will be considered an important part of the art museum outreach legacy.
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Appendix A: The Art Around Town Survey Tool
ART AROUND TOWN

By completing today's survey, you will receive an Elijah Pierce magnet.

1) Why did you attend today's Art Around Town event? Check all that apply.
   - To get out of the house
   - To be around art
   - To have a cultural experience
   - To have a fun/playful experience
   - To spend time with my family
   - To learn something about art/artists
   - To experience the Columbus Museum of Art
   - Other: __________________________________________________

2) Please list who you came with today. If you came by yourself, skip to question 3:
   Number of children: _______ Their relationship to you: __________________________
   Number of adults (not including yourself): _______ Their relationship to you: __________

3) Have you ever been to the Columbus Museum of Art?
   Yes
   No

3a) If yes, approximately how many times did you visit within the last 2 years? __________

3b) If your answer is no, circle all of the reasons that apply for why you have not visited the Museum:
   - Cost
   - Distance from home
   - Time factor
   - Was not aware of the Museum's existence
   - Was not aware of the kinds of programs CMA offers
   - Do not feel comfortable in art museums
   - Did not think CMA would be an ideal family location
   - Other: __________________________________________________

4) On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being low and 7 being high, please rate your interest in art.
   Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High

5) On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being low and 7 being high, please rate your knowledge of art.
   Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High

6) On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being very uncomfortable and 7 being very comfortable, please rate your level
   of comfort interacting with artwork before today's Art Around Town experience.
   Very Uncomfortable 1 2 3 4 5 Very Comfortable 6 7
   Please flip
7) On the same scale, please rate your level of comfort after today’s Art Around Town experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Very Comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) On a scale of 1 - 7, with 1 being not enjoyable and 7 being very enjoyable, please rate your level of enjoyment with each of the Art Around Town activities you participated in today:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Enjoyable</th>
<th>Very Enjoyable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallery Activity</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6   7   N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Challenges</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6   7   N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art making activity</td>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6   7   N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:________________________

9) On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being unhelpful and 7 being very helpful, please rate the helpfulness of the Columbus Museum of Art staff today.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unhelpful</th>
<th>Very Helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:________________________

10) Has today’s Art Around Town event changed your perception of the Columbus Museum of Art?

Yes
No

If so, please explain how your perception has changed.
Please be as detailed as possible and provide an example.

________________________

11) Based on your experience today, with 1 being very unlikely and 7 being very likely, how likely are you to visit the Columbus Museum of Art in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for completing this survey!

If you are willing to allow the Columbus Museum of Art to contact you to set up a phone interview about your experience today, please list your phone number and/or email address below. If interviewed, you will be given a CMA poster as a token of our appreciation.

Phone number:________________________

Email address:________________________
Appendix B: Sample Art Around Town Flier
February 27, 2010
NOON - 4:00 PM
Powell Municipal Building
47 Hall Street • Powell, Ohio 43065

Experience the fun and excitement of the Columbus Museum of Art’s adult and family programs in your neighborhood!

Featured Artwork: The Zoo (Menagerie at Central Park) by Middleton Manigault
Noon - 1:00 PM
One Work One Hour
Adults will enjoy a lively CMA docent-led conversation about our beautiful painting, The Zoo.

1:00 - 4:00 PM
Great activities for the whole family.
See a favorite CMA painting: The Zoo by Middleton Manigault.
Create a wild and wonderful animal puppet.
Listen to the music of ProMusica
Play Art Challenges to win CMA prizes.
Discover the great time your family can have with the Columbus Museum of Art!

Free and open to the public.
No registration required.

This Art Around Town event is presented in collaboration with the City of Powell and ProMusica.
Appendix C: Interdepartmental Meeting Agenda

Art Around Town:

Schiller Park Recreation Center

March 20, 2010

12:00-4:00pm

Topics for discussion:

- Presentation of data collected so far: Education (AAT surveys) and Development (Survey Monkey registration)
- Other comments
- Discuss publicity usage for upcoming events: April (photo league), May (*The Wedding*), June (*Watergate*)

Event Overview:

Artwork:
Vincent Smith, *The Black Family*

Timeline:
**9:30-10:30am**: All Education, Prep, and Security staff arrive at the site and begin setting up and securing artwork, setting up activity areas and welcome table. Signs are displayed, seating is placed, and all other preparations for the event are addressed.
11:00-11:15am: Other CMA staff arrive and go to their assigned locations.

11:15-11:30am: Staff take a tour of the space and review the activities of the day.

11:30-11:50: All staff lunch break.

12:00-12:45pm: Docents lead One Work One Hour discussion at the art

1:00-4:00pm: Family portion of Art Around Town takes place: Art making activity happens in the largest room. Gallery activity takes place at the artwork. Welcome table with handouts is set up in the lobby.

2:00-4:00pm: Art Challenges takes place at The Black Family

4:15-6:00pm: Breakdown of the event: Artwork is uninstalled and resecured in the van, then taken back to the Museum with Collections and Security staff. Education staff and CMA staff breaks down the art making activity, signs, welcome table, and Art Challenges table. The space is cleaned and returned to the state it was in before the event.

Spaces available:
Art rooms, smaller activity room, hallway space
*Note: A basketball competition will be taking place that day in the gym*

Schiller Park contact:
Ron Brush

**Department Personnel and Responsibilities:**

**Education:**
Personnel attending day of event:
Dayna, Susie, at least 6 Family Programs Assistants, Rachel, Merliee

Responsibilities before the event:
- Develop art project
- Develop gallery activity
- Develop Art Challenges
- Create signs
- Contact venue
- Create contracts with venue
- Hire staff to help run event
- Develop One Work One Hour docent discussions
- Find out about food appropriate spaces
- Contact Gahanna schools
- Send the temperature and humidity form to the venue
- Develop a handout/sign concerning photography
Responsibilities during/after the event:
- Set up spaces
- Transport materials to venue
- Provide stools at the artwork
- Meet and greet visitors
- Run art project
- Run gallery activity
- Run Art Challenges
- Run One Work One Hour docent discussions
- Run welcome table
- Coordinate all other pieces of event, including performing arts
- General schmoozing with attendees
- Clean up spaces
- Repack the van with supplies, return to the Museum and unpack
- Gather evaluation surveys
- Gather Focus Group information

Notes:

Security:
Personnel attending day of event:

Responsibilities before the event:
- Check with the venue to find out what is acceptable regarding security
- Develop a plan of action to get the art out of harm’s way in case of an unforeseen event
- Schedule a group walk through of the site for security, collections, and education to see the site and discuss the plan for the artwork’s location

Responsibilities during/after the event:
- Bring and set up portable recording devices as needed
- Remain with the art
- Provide a passive (unless intervention is required) watch over the art until the event ends

Notes:
Collections and Exhibitions/Preparators:
Personnel attending day of event:

Responsibilities before the event:
- Choose personnel to attend event
- Contact insurance company as needed
- Attend the field trip to the site with security and education
- Pack the piece
- Figure out the display
- Check the lighting
- Create the label

Responsibilities during/after the event:
- Unpack and display the artwork (tables, table cloth with skirt, rolled blankets, etc)
- Set-up stanchions
- Stay with the art
- Repack the art and return it to the Museum

Notes:

Curatorial:
Personnel attending day of event:
Responsibilities before the event:
- Meet with Collections to discuss set-up of the painting, if necessary

Responsibilities during/after the event:
- Follow up with Collections to address issues, if necessary

Notes:

Marketing:
Personnel attending day of event:

Responsibilities before the event:
- Designing:
  - Posters for the specific Sanctuary event
  - Updating website presence as needed
- Contact Michelle Lemon from the Dispatch
- Contact local papers
- Coordinate with development concerning a table for the event

**Responsibilities during/after the event:**
- Run a table with Development concerning membership, the campaign, the construction project, etc.
- Collect an contact list through Survey Monkey tool

**Notes:**

**Development:**

**Personnel attending day of event:**

**Responsibilities before the event:**
- Coordinate with marketing concerning a table for the event
- Inform membership about the Art Around Town Program

**Responsibilities during/after the event:**
- Run an information table with marketing; providing info on campaign, construction, etc
- Provide membership information

**Notes:**
Appendix D: Sample Art Challenges Activity
Art Around Town

Art Challenges

What’s wrong here? Look carefully at Middleton Manigault’s painting *The Zoo* and compare it to the image below. Find the 10 changes that have been made to this image and circle them on the sheet using a white pencil. When you’re finished, turn your sheet in to the Art Challenges staff to have it checked and receive your time score. The best time wins!
Appendix E: Comprehensive Data Collection Information from the Survey
## Art Around Town Survey

1. Why did you attend today's Art Around Town event? Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To get out of the house</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be around art</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a cultural experience</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a fun/playful experience</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To spend time with my family</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn something about art/artists</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To experience the Columbus Museum of Art</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question:** 77  
**Skipped question:** 3

2. Please list who you came with today. If you came by yourself, skip to question 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children you came with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their relationship to you:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adults you came with (excluding yourself):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their relationship to you:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered question:** 77  
**Skipped question:** 3
47 (59%) of the respondents had visited the Columbus Museum of Art three or fewer times within the previous two years.

32 (41%) of the respondents had visited CMA four or more times within the previous two years.
5. If NO for number 3, select all of the reasons that apply for why you have not visited the Museum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from home</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time factor</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was not aware of the Museum's existence</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was not aware of the kinds of programs CMA offers</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not feel comfortable in art museums</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not think CMA would be an ideal family location</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>skipped question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being low and 7 being high, please rate your interest in art.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>46.8%</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **answered question** | 79 |
| **skipped question**  | 1  |
## Art Around Town Survey

On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being low and 7 being high, please rate your knowledge of art.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3% (1)</td>
<td>8.9% (7)</td>
<td>15.2% (12)</td>
<td>26.6% (21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected options:**
- answered question
- skipped question

Response Count: 79
8. On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being very uncomfortable and 7 being very comfortable, please rate your level of comfort interacting with artwork before today’s Art Around Town experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one:</th>
<th>Very Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Very Comfortable</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>1.3% (1)</td>
<td>1.3%  (1)</td>
<td>7.7% (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 78
skipped question 2

9. On the same scale as question 8, please rate your level of comfort after today’s Art Around Town experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Select one:</th>
<th>Very Uncomfortable</th>
<th>Very Comfortable</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0%  (0)</td>
<td>3.9% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 76
skipped question 4
10. On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being not enjoyable and 7 being very enjoyable, please rate your level of enjoyment with each of the Art Around Town activities you participated in today:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallery Activity</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Challenges</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Making Activity</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

- answered question 74
- skipped question 6

11. On a scale of 1-7, with 1 being unhelpful and 7 being very helpful, please rate the helpfulness of the Columbus Museum of Art staff today.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unhelpful</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select one:</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

- answered question 73
- skipped question 7
12. Has today’s Art Around Town event changed your perception of the Columbus Museum of Art?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If so, please explain how your perception has changed. Please be as detailed as possible and provide an example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answered question</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skipped question</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Based on your experience today, with 1 being very unlikely and 7 being very likely, how likely are you to visit the Columbus Museum of Art in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>4.1% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answered question</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skipped question</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>