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ABSTRACT

The interrelationship of the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts is important to consider in the context of the Wexner Center's educational purpose at Ohio State University. Although the Wexner Center can have an impact on every student's cultural education here at Ohio State through programs and exhibitions, there is a logical link with the College of the Arts. The Wexner Center, because of its nature as an arts presenting organization, and the College of the Arts, as an institution that educates students in the arts, have missions that are distinct; however, they both focus on the arts. The relationship between the College of the Arts (COTA) and the Wexner Center for the Arts can take on special significance for students in the arts because it could provide opportunities for experiences that would aid their education.

The purpose of this study is to understand the collaborative relationship between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center for the Arts and the processes they use to create student involvement experiences for students in the College of the Arts. The three foci that this research addresses include: perceptions of the mission and educational intent of the Wexner Center at The Ohio State University; perceptions of the administrative and collaborative relationships, between the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts; and student involvement opportunities at the Wexner Center for students in the College of the Arts.
Arts and how they have been created. These areas will be framed in reference to research that centers on interrelationships of organizations and how organizations create and sustain collaborative alliances. In addition, this study will address how staff in the Wexner and the College perceive this relationship, how this relationship affects the actual involvement opportunities for students in the College of the Arts, and finally, how the Wexner and the College work together or do not work together to provide educational and involvement opportunities for students and faculty in the College of the Arts through a strategic alliance.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Wexner Center for the Arts at The Ohio State University is a multidisciplinary arts complex that serves the University and the surrounding community by providing programming in the visual, performing and media arts. As part of The Ohio State University, the Wexner Center provides the campus with a broad range of opportunities in the arts. Not only does the Wexner Center present work in the visual, performing and media arts, it also commissions and organizes residencies for the creation of new art. As stated in its mission, the Wexner Center strives to produce creative collaborations with artists of regional, national and international repute in order to provide a forum to engage the art-viewing public. The Wexner Center also aims to provide "a rich cultural complement" to the University, enhancing the scope and quality of the educational experience, acting as a forum for interaction between artists, students, faculty and the general public (Wexner Center for the Arts Mission Statement, 1996). Many universities across the United States house museums and/or performing arts centers; however, the Wexner Center goes beyond the typical organization of a museum
and a performing arts center by combining the two and by placing specific emphasis on the creation and presentation of contemporary art.

The relationship between a university and an arts center can result in a variety of mutual benefits. Arts centers can provide a venue to promote interaction of artists with students in educational settings. The exhibition schedule and performance calendar of the center can bring recognition to the university. The center can serve as a crossroads for interdisciplinary projects and through its programming can promote ethnic, racial and cultural diversity. Finally, an arts center can serve as an impetus for the exchange of new ideas through dialogue created by its exhibitions and performances.

Through association with a university and its diverse connections, an arts center can benefit in many ways. Academic research can be supported through the center’s resources including access to individuals presenting works at the center as well as through the collections which the center exhibits. Through collaboration with different departments and academic areas, the center can broaden its exhibitions to areas that might not otherwise be represented as well as widen its audience base. Co-sponsorship of programs with different departments also can benefit a center through financial support. The universities’ political, social and economic connections can open up possibilities for co-sponsorship that might otherwise not exist. In addition, an arts center can have increased access to and communication with university students, faculty and staff for the purposes of audience development because of its presence on campus.
History of the Wexner Center

The Wexner Center was established as a result of efforts undertaken by the College of the Arts to expand the University Gallery which was under the College’s direction. In 1980, while the College was searching for a new director for the University Gallery, the search committee asked each applicant to submit a proposal outlining a vision for a new visual arts center. Jonathan Green, the person chosen to become the new director, focused his proposal on the expansion of the Gallery’s activities. Through his leadership, the Gallery shifted its focus to a more contemporary direction and initiated collaborations across campus with academic departments and programs such as architecture, landscape architecture, photography and cinema, engineering, medicine, women’s studies, and the social sciences (About the Wexner Center for the Arts, 1989).

Along with Green’s expanded view and activities in the Gallery, the College proposed and obtained the right to initiate a capital campaign to form a new visual arts center (Donald Harris, 1996). In 1982, the project took on greater momentum when Ohio State alumnus, Leslie Wexner, pledged $10 million in support of the center, and an architectural competition was announced. Construction of the Wexner Center started in 1985 when Wexner increased his original contribution to $25 million (About the Wexner Center for the Arts, 1989).

In 1987, a committee of consultants outside of the University was formed to review the plans and organization of the Wexner Center. The committee consisted of Suzanne Delehanty, director of the Neuberger Museum; Janet Kardon, director of the Institute of Contemporary Art at the University of Pennsylvania; Richard Koshalek,
director of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Los Angeles; and Douglas Schultz, director of the Albright-Knox Art Gallery at the Buffalo Academy of Fine Arts (The College of the Arts and the Wexner Center, 1989). At the recommendation of the committee, the focus of the Wexner Center was expanded to include the performing arts. In addition, the committee recommended that the Center report directly to the Provost’s Office and not to the College of the Arts as plans to this point in time had assumed (The College of the Arts and The Wexner Center, 1989). This recommended reporting line was apparently accepted and, although the Wexner Center would report to the Provost’s Office, Provost Miles Brand intended there be a close relationship between the Center and the College. To underline this relationship, it was determined that the director of the Wexner Center would serve as an adjunct associate dean in the College of the Arts (Donald Harris, 1996).

Robert Stearns, the first director of the Wexner Center for the Arts, was appointed in 1988. The Center did report to the Provost and, in line with the Provost’s intentions, Stearns served dually as an associate dean of the College (About the Wexner Center for the Arts, 1989). Dean Harris observed that although the adjunct appointment to the College was made formal by the Provost, it did not define the nature of the relationship between the College and the Center. It left the relationship to evolve with no guidelines (Donald Harris, 1996). Whereas Robert Stearns officially accepted the title of associate dean of the College, the current director of the Wexner Center, Sherri Geldin, turned down the adjunct position upon her appointment. The Wexner Center is not currently affiliated with the College in any formal way. However, there is informal interaction
between the Wexner Center and the College on an on-going basis. This lack of any formal relationship or guidelines would indicate that the original concept of the Center being part of the College or even that Brand’s concept of a close relationship between the Center and the College, were not implemented (Donald Harris, 1996).

Educational Mission of the Wexner Center

The possible interrelationship of the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts is important to consider in the context of the Wexner Center’s educational purpose at Ohio State University. Although the Wexner Center can have an impact on every student’s cultural education here at Ohio State through programs and exhibitions, there is a logical link with the College of the Arts. The Wexner Center, because of its nature as an arts presenting organization, and the College of the Arts, as an institution that educates students in the arts, have missions that are distinct; however, they both focus on the arts. If an interrelationship could be developed, then such a relationship could can take on special significance for students in the arts because it could provide opportunities for experiences that would aid their education.

The Wexner Center’s mission statement does include education. The Center espouses, “to provide a rich cultural complement to its immediate academic community, enhancing the scope and quality of the educational experience,” (Wexner Center for the Arts Mission Statement, 1996). In addition, the Wexner Center endeavors to serve as a common ground where the University and the community can meet and a ground that “sparks creative exchange,” (Wexner Center for the Arts, Overview). Through statements
such as these, the Wexner outlines a conceptual framework of how it can work with, benefit and complement the educational purpose of the University through programming that will broaden the educational opportunities available at The Ohio State University.

In July 1987, a year before the first director was appointed, a status report concerning the Wexner Center of the Visual Arts was released by the College of the Arts. In this document, the College of the Arts outlined its conception of the new visual arts center as a teaching and research resource. The report states:

As a teaching/research resource, the Center will provide studio and laboratory facilities, seminar rooms, the fine arts library, and other special visual collections. The Institute for the Advanced Activities in the Arts will be housed in the Center. An extension of the multidisciplinary vision for the Center, the Center will bring together a group of artists, art historians, designers, philosophers, photographers, architects, computer scientists, and scholars from various disciplines and will provide opportunities for student apprenticeships and internships and for academic relationship among fellows and departments.

This statement outlines how it was hoped that the Wexner Center would have a strong link to education by providing students and faculty with a variety of formalized involvement opportunities. Although a decision was made for the Wexner Center not to be organized under the auspices of the College of the Arts, this statement does provide the espoused expectations of the College. The College wanted strong, formal educational connections with the Center. The Center’s past and present directors’ expectations, however, have been less clear and their behaviors seem to resist formalized relationships. This study will attempt to illuminate these dynamics and provide as much understanding of the relationship between the Center and the College of the Arts as possible.
Why This Study Is Important

Student involvement models outline how involvement outside of the classroom benefits students by increasing learning and development. Students benefit in the pursuit of their career goals, graduate education and psychosocial development if they become involved in activities related to their educational goals. The Wexner Center of the Arts could provide a key component of the educational experience of students interested in pursuing careers in the arts. In particular, the Wexner Center could provide students in the College of the Arts with experiences that will impact the achievement of their future goals.

Student involvement models have grown vastly over the last two decades as more and more research findings are published on how active participation in agencies, such as the Center, positively affects a students’ college experience and future. Involvement has been defined by Alexander Astin, director of the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA, as activities such as devoting time to academic studies, spending a considerable amount of time on campus, participating actively in student organizations and interacting frequently with faculty members and other students (Astin, 1984).

The positive impacts of involvement have been well documented over time and by many different studies. “Student Development Through Involvement: Specific Changes Over Time,” (Cooper, 1994), outlines how involvement in student organizations has a positive impact on educational involvement, career planning, lifestyle planning, cultural participation and academic autonomy. In 1991, George Kuh, professor of Higher Education at the University of Indiana, theorized that co-curricular experiences are linked
to satisfaction with college, retention and graduation, development of leadership skills, mature interpersonal relationships, altruistic values, and adult success (Magolda, 1992). Other studies have documented that students involved in co-curricular activities exhibit increased intellectual and leadership development, success in academic and career goals, are more likely to graduate and overall have positive educational and social experiences (Cooper, 1994).

In light of the logical link between the Wexner Center and its potential ability to provide access to arts related experiences, and with regard to its stated educational mission, it is important to look at how the Wexner Center currently provides involvement opportunities to students in the College of the Arts and how the current relationship has evolved. Therefore, the focus of this study will be: (1) to examine what is currently being provided by the Wexner Center concerning educational experiences for College of the Arts; (2) to examine the nature of the current working relationship between the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts; (3) to understand how student involvement experiences have been collaboratively developed; and (4) to assess the future possibilities for a formal collaborative relationship. Therefore, the following research questions will be posed: (1) How do staff in the Wexner Center characterize the mission and goals of the Wexner Center? (2) How do faculty in the College of the Arts characterize the mission and goals of the Wexner Center? (3) How do staff in the Wexner Center characterize the historical and current relationship with the College of the Arts? (4) How do faculty in the College of the Arts characterize the historical and current relationship with the Wexner Center? (5) What involvement experiences for College of the Arts students and faculty
are being provided by the Wexner Center and how did these develop? (6) What do Wexner Center staff see as possible future collaborations with the College of the Arts? (7) What do College of the Arts faculty see as possible future collaborations with the Wexner Center?
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study is to understand the collaborative relationship between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center for the Arts and the processes they use to create student involvement experiences for students in the College of the Arts. The three foci that have emerged through this research:

1. perceptions of the mission and educational intent of the Wexner Center at The Ohio State University;
2. perceptions of the administrative and collaborative relationships, between the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts; and
3. student involvement opportunities at the Wexner Center for students in the College of the Arts and how they have been created.

In this context, it is important to consider the research that centers on how organizations create and sustain collaborative alliances. Throughout this literature review, specific examples of how this information maybe pertinent to the interorganizational relationship of the Wexner and the College will be considered.
Interorganizational Relationships

Interorganizational relationships, or IORs, are defined by Christine Oliver (1990) as the lasting transactions, flows, and connections that occur between an organization and one or more organizations in its environment. One assumption about the development of an IOR is that an organization intentionally enters into a collaborative arrangement with another organization because such a collaboration will enable the organization to better fulfill its goals (Oliver). Oliver adds that although IORs are usually entered through top-management, they may occur between sub-units of two organizations or between individuals at lower hierarchical levels.

Whetten distinguished between IOR structures of mutual adjustment (voluntary), alliance structures (intermediate), and corporate structures of coordination (mandated). Similarly, Warren described IOR contexts in which interaction is dictated by a higher authority. In such environments, the higher authority sets the conditions that permit the organizations to interact (Oliver, 1990).

This relates to the relationship between the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts in several ways. The initial relationship of the College and the Center was a mandated relationship where the Wexner was a project of and under the auspices of the College of the Arts in the early planning stages. This historical relationship was never carried out in the actual functioning of the Center.
Interorganizational Relationship Development

According to research done by Smith Ring and Van de Ven in *Developmental Processes of Cooperative Interorganizational Relationships*, the developmental process of an IOR contains four stages. These include negotiation, commitment, assessment, and execution. From a development process perspective, cooperative IORs are "socially contrived mechanisms" for collective action which is continually shaped and restructured by the parties involved (Ring and Van de Ven, 1991). Continuous negotiation is often necessary, through formal and informal processes, to allow participants the opportunity to appraise the other's role, trustworthiness, rights and duties, as well as efficiency and equity in the partnership (Ring and Van de Ven, 1991).

In the commitment stage, an agreement is reached that outlines the commitments and rules for future action in the relationship. During the execution stage, the relationship is carried out along the guidelines agreed to by each party. Finally, assessment of the relationship occurs throughout the interaction of the two organizations. Assessment interrelates to all of the other stages of the developmental process (Ring and Van de Ven, 1991). Through assessment, if either party is unsatisfied with outcomes, Ring and Van de Ven state that, "the parties will initiate corrective measures by either renegotiating or reducing their commitments to the cooperative IOR," (1991).

In his research, Doz (1996) examined how the learning, along several dimensions (environment, task process, skills, goals), that takes place in cooperative IORs between organizations mediates between the initial conditions and the outcomes of alliances. Through a longitudinal case study of two projects in one IOR, a framework was
developed to analyze the evolution of cooperation in strategic alliances. Successful IORs evolved over time and went through a sequence of interactive cycles that included learning, reevaluation and readjustment. Failing projects, on the other hand, were exceedingly "inertial", with very little learning occurring (Doz, 1996).

Although strategic alliances may be a kind of organizational learning, Doz stated that the evolution of strategic alliances helps transcend simple depictions of inertia and adaptation. In particular, his research suggests that initial conditions may lead to an 'imprinting' of fixed processes that make alliances highly static or, on the other hand, enable the organizations to develop "evolutionary processes" that make them highly adaptive (Doz, 1996). Therefore, the initial circumstances, attitudes and perceptions by which the organizations come together in a cooperative IOR can have an impact on how the relationship is carried out.

Doz’s research may have significance concerning the strategic alliance between the College and the Wexner Center in two ways. First of all, organizational learning has occurred between the College and the Center as individuals at an informal level in each organization have evaluated the environment and have taken steps to collaborate with individuals in the other organization. They have then evaluated these experiences and tried to outline the best way to interact. However, conversely, Doz points out that the initial attitudes and perceptions under which the relationship was formed can have an impact on how the relationship is carried out. The history of the relationship between the Center and the College and the extraction of the Center from the College to become an independent organization at Ohio State left many negative perceptions by faculty in the
College of the Arts toward the Wexner. These initial perceptions might have impacted in the past, and could still have influence on how faculty view and form or do not form collaborative efforts with the Wexner.

Contingencies of Interorganizational Relationships

The contingencies outlined by Oliver (1990) of IOR development include the following key areas: necessity, asymmetry, reciprocity, efficiency, stability, and legitimacy. Some cooperative IORs are formed out of necessity when a higher authority mandates the relationship to occur. In these types of situations, the need to comply with such mandates is often shaped by the repercussions of non-compliance, such as through the loss of resources (Oliver, 1990). Mandated relationships often increase the frequency of interactions between the organizations but it can reduce an organization’s perception of power over its own environment.

Oliver goes on to explain that the implications between mandated and voluntary relationships are profound because the explanations and consequences of relationship formation associated with each are fundamentally different (Oliver, 1990). A majority of this research centers on voluntary interactions between IORs. As the research states, mandated relationships often increase the frequency of interactions between two organizations. If a formal relationship is outlined by the Wexner and the College, steps could be taken to guard against perceptions being developed concerning the feeling of a loss of power by either organization.
The asymmetry contingency in IORs refers to the possibility of one organization exercising power or control over another organization or its resources (Oliver, 1990). Resource scarcity often promotes such an interaction. If one organization is viewed as having the resources that another organization needs, one organization may attempt to, “exert power, influence, or control over organizations that possess the required scarce resources.” In addition, the formation of an IOR implies certain losses of power to organizations. This includes the possibility of the loss of decision-making latitude and discretion (Oliver, 1990).

The asymmetry contingency might apply to the association between the Wexner and the College in two ways: (1) through the resource of exhibition space desired by faculty on campus and (2) through the desire of providing in-depth experiences in the arts for students in the College of the Arts. Sullivant Hall was given up by the College of the Arts as an exhibition space with the anticipation that the Wexner Center would provide space for faculty exhibitions. This intention did not come to fruition because the Wexner Center was placed outside of the administrative domain of the College. The other example that should be viewed as a scarce resource that the Center has and which should be valued by the College are involvement opportunities for students. The ability of the Wexner to provide in-depth student involvement opportunities could directly enhance the educational experience of students in the College of the Arts.

Contrasting the idea of asymmetry and the control and power issues, related to the development of an IOR, the more common factor in relationships is reciprocity. Instead of the issues of domination, power and control, the reciprocity contingency establishes
the practice of cooperation, collaboration and coordination between organizations. Therefore, many types of IORs occur because two organizations want to pursue common goals or interests that would be mutually beneficial (Oliver, 1990). Certain assumptions outline this contingency. Resource scarcity may induce cooperation instead of competition. The development of the relationship will be characterized as balanced and equal. Finally, the benefits of this partnership will be realized by those involved as outweighing the disadvantages of the relationship (Oliver, 1990).

Efficiency and stability are two other contingencies that effect a cooperative IOR. The efficiency contingency is internally oriented. The motivation by which the IOR is developed is prompted by a need to improve internal input/output ratios (Oliver, 1990). Many organizations form IORs for reasons concerning stability. An unstable environment serves as an impetus for organizations to seek out partnerships in order to regain, "stability, predictability, and dependability in their relations with others," (Oliver, 1990).

Finally, the legitimacy contingent in institutional theory suggests that institutional environments impose pressures on organizations to justify their activities or outputs. These pressures motivate organizations to increase their legitimacy in order to appear in agreement with "prevailing norms, rules, beliefs or expectations of external constituents," (Oliver, 1990). Attempts to enhance legitimacy through relationship formation will be directed especially towards organizations whose level of legitimacy is perceived by the focal organization to be considerably higher than its own. In Oliver's research, she notes
that new organizations were able to increase their legitimacy as a function of their ability
to instigate affiliations with known organizations (Oliver, 1990).

**Enforcement of Collaboration**

The enforcement of a collaborative relationship between two organizations by the
authority of a higher administrative power could result in two different reactions. A
"forced" IOR could result in an increase in reciprocity and the ability to work together.
On the other hand, enforcement could produce conflict and "asymmetry," between the
two organizations which set in place a situation where conflict easily occurs and
dissatisfaction with the IOR results (Oliver, 1990).

**The Individual in the Interorganizational Relationship**

Typically, cooperative IORs face two types of uncertainty. The first is the future
state of their respective organizations and the second is the level to which the parties can
rely on trust in difficult situations (Ring and Van de Ven, 991). Interpersonal
relationships are vital to be able to rely on trust between the organizations cooperating in
the IOR. However, the building of these personal relationships requires attention to the
processes that establish the IOR. Each of the individuals cooperating in an interpersonal
relationship as part of an IOR must be able to understand why they are searching out the
expertise or cooperation from an individual in the other organization. The individuals
must recognize the value of cooperative action within the IOR (Ring and Van de
Ven, 1991). In addition, research concerning negotiation patterns in organizations has
indicated that "fair dealing", as a standard for assessing cooperative IORs, can be influenced by the personalities and differences of the individuals in each organization. This occurs more often when the organizations are in the early development of a cooperative agreement and personalities in the two transacting parties are not known (Neale and Northcraft, 1991).

Turner (1987) concluded that "identity" and "inclusion" were two fundamental forces that motivate human thought and action. These forces are the basis for an explanation of the development of interorganizational positions of individuals to engage in sense making and bonding processes. For example, these sense making and bonding processes are designed to permit parties with initially different views of the potential purposes and expectations of a relationship to achieve balance in their relationship (Ring and Van de Ven, 1991). Therefore, it is imperative for the two organizations to come together and create a shared vision as well as include and communicate this vision to the participants in each organization in order for them to be able to come together in their common purpose. Such a process establishes appropriate expectations between the organizations in the IOR. If expectations are not clarified explaining what each party will give to, and receive from the relationship, perceptions will vary in their degree of explicitness. In addition, individuals in both parties of the interorganizational relationship will often only be minimally aware of the exact nature of their expectations.

Neale and Northcraft (1991) indicated in their research that individuals do more than just process information about the context of a transaction. Individuals, as they interact within a certain context, such as an IOR, perceive the context of the situation and
then react to their perceptions. These reactions then validate or enact a compatible set of perceptions about the IOR. Therefore, if perceptions are not clarified as to the nature of the IOR, perceptions not in line with the intention of the collaboration could develop.

Finally, the replacement of individuals in an organization involved in an IOR could have a profound impact on the interaction between the two organizations. Turnover of personnel has the effect of restarting the psychological contracts which will define many of the processes of governance of the cooperative IOR (Ring and Van de Ven, 991).

The ways in which an IOR is formed and the reasons that underlie collaboration between two organizations have a profound impact on how effective the IOR will be. In addition, how well the expectations are communicated concerning what each organization will give to and receive from the relationship have an effect on how efficiently the organizations work together. Individual expectations of personalities within each organization also have an impact on how the IOR operates. Communication, joint decision making and expectation clarification are imperative to an effective IOR. Finally, the individuals that interact, as the basis of the IOR, ultimately influence the success or failure of the collaboration. Often, the dynamic of the relationship is based on the willingness of the personalities to be involved.

There are many factors, as outlined above, that effect the ability of organizations to create and sustain a cooperative IOR. Many of the factors outlined above may have specific implications for the relationships between the College and the Wexner. The next
chapter will outline the design and methodology of this study. The research questions will be presented and research design will be explained.
CHAPTER 3

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Research Questions

The primary purpose of this study is to understand the nature of the relationship between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center for the Arts. Furthermore, it will try to ascertain how staff in the Wexner and the College perceive this relationship, and how this relationship affects the actual involvement opportunities for students in the College of the Arts. In addition, when the term relationship is used, it means how the Wexner and the College work together or do not work together to provide educational and involvement opportunities for students and faculty in the College of the Arts through a strategic alliance.

The following are the questions that will be explored through this study:

1. How do staff in the Wexner Center characterize the mission and goals of the Wexner Center?

2. How do faculty in the College of the Arts characterize the mission and goals of the Wexner Center?
3. How do staff in the Wexner Center characterize the historical and current relationship with the College of the Arts?

4. How do faculty in the College of the Arts characterize the historical and current relationship with the Wexner Center?

5. What involvement experiences for College of the Arts students and faculty are being provided by the Wexner Center and how did these develop?

6. What do Wexner Center staff see as possible future collaborations with the College of the Arts?

7. What do College of the Arts faculty see as possible future collaborations with the Wexner Center?

Qualitative Research

The impact of perception is very strong in shaping how a person constructs their reality. Therefore, I explored not only how the Wexner Center fulfills its educational intent, but also how current perceptions of individuals in the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center affect the accomplishment of this original mission. This is primarily the reason for using qualitative research in this study and not quantitative. Open-ended interviews allowed each respondent to answer questions in their own words to express their individual perception of the current relationship between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center.

As Patton summarizes in *Qualitative Evaluation Methods* (1990), qualitative research depends on the type of data collected. I am interested in understanding various
constructions of the current relationship between the College and the Center as well as understanding constructions of the past relationship. This type of inquiry requires data that are both in-depth and detailed. Qualitative data consists of detailed descriptions of situations, relationships, events and observed behaviors (Patton, 1980). This research depends on qualitative data collection to understand the relationship between the College and the Center.

The utilization of interviews was chosen because they allow raw data in the form of quotations to be compiled. Direct quotations reveal the “respondent’s level of emotion, the way in which they have organized their world, their thoughts about what is happening, their experiences, and their basic perceptions,” (Patton, 1980). My task is to provide the framework that will focus these perceptions in an attempt to derive the information sought (Patton, 1980).

Research Design

Qualitative methods in this study were used to gain in-depth knowledge of the participant’s perceptions in order to construct the patterns of the relationship between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center and how the two collaborate or do not collaborate in creating student involvement opportunities. The specific relationship shared between the Center and the College of the Arts stems from a history of interaction between the Wexner Center and College of the Arts and the University administration’s eventual decision to sever formal ties between the Center and the College. I sought information through interviews with key individuals in the College of the Arts and the
Wexner Center. This in-depth knowledge of the relationship and the factors that influence this relationship can only be gained through qualitative inquiry. Therefore, I want to understand how these participants perceive the current relationship between the two as well as past factors that may have influenced the relationship.

I sought information in historical documentation and current literature provided by the Wexner Center and through interviews with several individuals involved with the Wexner Center or the College of the Arts. The documents that I reviewed included the Mission Statement of the Wexner Center for the Arts; About the Wexner Center, which included a history of the center; and Status Report: The Wexner Center of the Visual Arts, a report published in 1987 by the College of the Arts. Review of these documents as well as the responses from a set of preliminary interviews assisted me in further defining my research focus.

Preliminary interviews were conducted during Autumn Quarter 1996, with faculty in the College of the Arts and staff in the Wexner Center. Individuals with whom I spoke with personally or by e-mail included: Karen Bell (Dance Department), Patricia Trumps (Education Department, Wexner Center), Donald Harris (Dean, College of the Arts), Susan Roth (Associate Dean, College of the Arts), and Georg Heimdal (Chair, Art Department). In addition, I attended a public forum where Sheri Geldin, Director of the Wexner Center, addressed the topic of the Wexner Center and its educational mission at Ohio State.

There were three areas that emerged through my preliminary research; these included the mission and educational intent of the Wexner Center at The Ohio State
University, student involvement opportunities at the Wexner Center, and the relationship between the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts. Concerning the first focus, I wanted to ask questions that revealed the interviewee’s perception of the Wexner Center’s mission at Ohio State. This is important because it exhibits how well the mission is constructed and/or communicated to individuals in the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center. After establishing this, I asked questions about the Center’s educational goals at Ohio State and whether there are any particular goals focused on the College of the Arts.

The next area of questions dealt with student involvement opportunities at the Wexner Center. I asked how the Center provides educational opportunities for students in the College of the Arts and how the Center works collaboratively with the College of the Arts in creating and communicating these opportunities. Following this set of questions I then wanted to learn what staff in the Center and faculty in the College thought were future possibilities for such collaborations. Finally, my last question asked if there was anything the individual might tell me to better understand the relationship between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center. Factors that facilitate and hinder the relationship between the College and the Center emerged through the interviews but were not direct questions. See interview as follows:

1. How would you describe the mission of the Wexner Center?
2. What do you feel are the Wexner Center’s principle educational goals concerning the University community and specifically for the College of the Arts?
3. In what specific ways does the Wexner Center’s programming reflect or help to achieve these goals?

4. In your own personal experience, in what ways has the educational emphasis of the Wexner Center changed over time (from administration to administration)?

5. What are the College of the Arts goals with regard to student involvement in Wexner Center programming and operations?

6. Do you think these are appropriate ones?

7. What opportunities are you aware of for student and faculty involvement in the Wexner Center?

8. In your opinion, what kind of collaboration in creating educational experiences is there between the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts with specific regard to student involvement?

9. What about collaboration in curriculum development between various college departments and the Wexner?

10. Is there any kind of specific structure or policy that guides this relationship?

11. In what ways are the availability of student apprenticeships, internships or assistantships communicated to faculty and students in the College of the Arts?

12. Do you see any needs by students in the College of the Arts that could be addressed by the Wexner Center?

13. In what ways could the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts work together in providing students with educational experiences?
14. Is there any information you could share with me to assist my understanding of the relationship between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center?

Sample

Data collection for this study included interviews with staff in the Wexner Center and faculty in the College of the Arts. The selection of individuals served as a cross section of both the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center. Participants came from the administration as well as different departments within the College of the Arts. Wexner Center staff represent the major areas of operations in the Center: performing arts, exhibitions, media arts and education. The basis for the selection of these individuals was to obtain as many perspectives from different areas as possible, as well as from different levels within the College.

During the summer of 1995, I interned with the Wexner Center Education Department. Because of this experience I was familiar with the structure of the Center as well as individuals working there. When I returned to the Center in autumn 1996 for a preliminary interview with Patricia Trumps, the Education Director, she gave me an organizational chart of the Center. This assisted me in the selection of the individuals from the Wexner Center. In addition, during my preliminary interviews, I asked individuals within the College of the Arts for suggestions of others with which I might speak. I also obtained the organizational structure of the College of the Arts from the Dean’s Office.
Wexner participants included the following individuals: Sheri Geldin (Director of the Wexner Center), Donna DeSalvo (Curator at Large), Sarah Rogers (Exhibitions Director), William Horrigan (Media Arts Director), Charles Helm (Performing Arts Director), and Patricia Trumps (Education Director). Faculty in the College of the Arts included Robert Arnold (Vice Provost and Professor of Art Education), Donald Harris (Dean Emeritus of the College of the Arts), Judith Koroscik (Dean of the College of the Arts and Professor of Art Education), Karen Bell (Chair of the Dance Department), James Hutchens (Chair of the Art Education Department), Louis Lankford (Professor of Art Education), Donald Gibson (Chair of School of Music), Georg Heimdal (Chair of the Art Department), and Stephen Melville (Professor of History of Art).

Data Collection

The interview process utilized the interview guide technique. The interview guide was a set of questions that served as the basis for the interview. This interview style minimizes the influence of the interviewer on the interviewee by asking the same basic questions to each of the interview participants. The method also allows the interviewer to go beyond these basic questions to explore other areas when the opportunity arises. This allows for clarification of answers or the pursuit of additional information that had not been originally accounted for in the interview questions (Patton, 1990). The process made analysis of the interviewees’ responses easier to categorize and make cross-comparisons.
The interviews lasted anywhere from thirty minutes to an hour. In all, fifteen interviews were conducted. In every instance, I visited the interviewees in their environment either in the Wexner Center or their office in the College of the Arts.

Data Analysis

The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. After transcription, I reviewed the interviews and made notes concerning common themes and patterns. The analysis presented in Chapter 4 will be inductive in nature, as Patton explains, “inductive analysis means that the patterns, themes and categories of analysis come from the data, they emerge out of the data rather than being imposed on them prior to data collection and analysis,” (Patton, 1988). This is not to say that I did not have prior ideas concerning what I might find, however, my presentation of the data comes solely from the data collected.

Chapters 4 and 5 take on particular significance because the task is the organization and evaluation of the data presented. Evaluation of the data will primarily take place in the context of the literature reviewed concerning interorganizational relationships. Suggestions will also be offered concerning how the strategic alliance of the Wexner and the College might be more successful if guidelines offered by the interorganizational relationship literature are taken into consideration. Patton defines the following operational terms for data analysis:
Analysis: the process of bringing order to the data, organizing what is there into patterns, categories and basic descriptive units. Chapter 4 will organize the data into the themes that developed through the interviews.

Interpretation: involves attaching meaning and significance to the analysis, explaining descriptive patterns and looking for relationships and linkages among descriptive dimensions. Chapter 5 will look at the patterns in the relationship between the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts, what hinders and facilitates the relationship and how the relationship operates.

Evaluation: involves making judgments about and assigning value to what has been analyzed and interpreted.

Finally during evaluation, using the literature review as a guide, I will look at how the formation of the relationship between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center compares to models of interorganizational relationship development. After using this to evaluate the relationship of the two organizations, I will give suggestions as to how the two organizations might come together to more effectively collaborate in creating student involvement experiences.

To sum up, this chapter has described qualitative research and how it applied to this study. The method of inquiry was described and the sample of individuals that participated in this study was reported. The next chapter will present the findings of this study.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study is an attempt to understand the relationship of the Wexner Center for the Arts and the College of the Arts (COTA) and how this relationship ultimately effects student involvement opportunities at the Wexner Center for students in the College of the Arts. This study will neither attempt to understand the Wexner Center’s relationship to The Ohio State University as a whole nor the Center’s relationship with other departments and colleges on campus. This study will focus primarily on the relationship between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center.

The Wexner Center has the potential to serve as an educational resource for many departments. However, there is a strong logical alignment between the curriculum of the College of the Arts and the availability of in-depth experiences that can demonstrate this educational content at the Wexner Center. In addition, the history of the Wexner Center at Ohio State has a strong link to the College of the Arts. Therefore, an attempt to understand this relationship could shed some light on what the Center’s educational intent is for the College of the Arts.
One area that emerged through the interviews that was not accounted for in the original set of questions outlined in Chapter 3, but which arose through follow-up questions, was various interpretations of the history of the Wexner Center contained in the perceptions of those in the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts. Therefore, prior to the presentation of the data that follow the questions outlined in Chapter 3, views on the history of the Wexner Center will be presented. This history should assist in giving the data presented afterward more of a contextual basis. In addition to the presentation of the history, data emerged describing the evolution of the relationship between the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts. These data will be presented prior to the section concerning how representatives of the Wexner and the College currently view their collaborative relationship.

The presentation of data in this chapter will be delineated under the following areas:

1. a history of the Wexner Center through the perceptions of College of the Arts faculty and Wexner staff;
2. how staff in the Wexner Center characterize the mission and goals of the Wexner Center;
3. how faculty in the College of the Arts characterize the mission and goals of the Wexner Center;
4. the relationship of the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts;
5. how staff in the Wexner Center characterize their collaborative relationship with the College of the Arts;
6. how faculty in the College of the Arts characterize their collaborative relationship with the Wexner Center;

7. what involvement experiences for College of the Arts students are being provided by the Wexner Center;

8. what Wexner Center staff see as future possible collaborations with the College of the Arts; and

9. what College of the Arts faculty see as future possible collaborations with the Wexner Center.

The data collected emerged from interviews with fifteen individuals either employed by the College of the Arts or the Wexner Center for the Arts. The purpose of these interviews was not to develop a theory or test a hypothesis. Instead, it was to understand the working relationship of the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts and to ascertain the character and effectiveness of the collaborative alliance between the two in creating student involvement opportunities.

A History of the Wexner Center and the Initial Relationship to the College

The following history of the Wexner Center at The Ohio State University emerged through the interviews conducted with personnel of the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center. This is not intended as the official history of the Wexner at Ohio State, but an interpretive perspective told through many different viewpoints. A majority of the information presented is from faculty members in the College of the Arts who were present during the creation of the Wexner. The information provided is intended only to
shed light on the past relationship of the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts as a context for understanding perceptions of the current relationship.

The concept of the Wexner Center developed in the 1970’s through conversations among faculty in the College of the Arts. Through these conversations the College of the Arts decided to do something significant in the field of the contemporary arts. Ultimately, the College proposed to expand the University Galleries, which consisted of the Hopkins Hall Gallery and the Sullivant Hall Gallery, in such a way that they would have a real presence in the contemporary arts. The Dean of the College, Andy Brokema, endorsed the idea and convinced Edward Jennings, the President of Ohio State at the time, this was a good endeavor to undertake. With the central administration’s support, the project moved from a modest expansion of the University Galleries, to a building that was planned to cost around $7 million. Les Wexner became interested in the project and pledged $10 million for the construction of the Center. Because of Mr. Wexner’s desire for a distinctive building to house the Center, an architectural competition was developed and eventually a design by J. Peter Eiseneman was chosen.

As the plans for the Center moved forward, Dean Brokema had a heart attack and Associate Dean Robert Arnold became the acting Dean of the College of the Arts. At this time, Dr. Arnold became aware of conversations that had occurred between Dean Brokema and Provost Miles Brand concerning the administrative reporting line of the Wexner Center. It became apparent that Mr. Wexner wanted a direct line to either the Office of the President or the Provost’s Office. It was Dr. Arnold’s perception that Mr. Wexner did not want involvement from “unsophisticated faculty” that would inhibit the
operations of the Wexner. Therefore, the decision was made that the Wexner Center would report to the Office of the Provost. In addition, Jonathan Green, who had been the director of the University Galleries and was slated to be the first director of the Wexner, was dismissed by the Provost’s Office. Many faculty felt he was dismissed because he was not considered to be, “big enough for the job.”

Donald Harris became the Dean of the College of the Arts as these decisions about the administrative relationship of the Wexner Center to the University were being made. Provost Brand told Dean Harris that he wanted him to be part of the interviewing process for the new director of the Center. However, Robert Stearns was selected as the first Director of the Center the week after this conversation, and there was no input from the Dean on the selection. The Provost also informed Dean Harris that the Wexner Center would not be part of the College of the Arts. The Provost took Weigel Hall, a performance facility, away from the School of Music and gave it to the Wexner Center. Dean Harris fought this decision on the grounds that the School of Music had to have performance space and Weigel Hall was eventually given back to the School. These initial interactions between the Center, the College and the Provost’s Office resulted in an uneasy alliance between the College of the Arts and the Wexner.

Although there were no direct oversight powers by the College over the Wexner, a relationship between the Wexner Center and the College was outlined by the Provost’s Office. It was intended that the Director of the Center be an associate dean in the College of the Arts. The primary function of this relationship was to keep COTA and the Wexner in constant communication. In practice, this relationship was poor through the years of
Robert Stearns’ directorship. When Sheri Geldin became the Director of the Center, she declined the dual appointment.

Geldin did not accept the associate dean appointment because she felt that being director was more than a full time job. She did not want to take on a title in name only. In addition, this was her first interaction with an academic environment and she did not know what the implications were for such an appointment. As she said,

“it may be because as someone who hasn’t spent any of my professional life in an academic realm, I was frankly just concerned about what that obligation might mean. I consider running the Wexner Center a full time plus responsibility and I am someone who is generally reluctant to take on titles that are either airy or meaningless or that will suggest that my obligations are going to be beyond what I can adequately fulfill.”

Although she holds no administrative position in the College, she does hold an adjunct faculty appointment.

Under the leadership of Robert Stearns, it was felt throughout COTA that the Wexner Center became increasingly elitist and separate from the University and the community at large. A faculty member recalled that Stearns often referred to the Center as, “located at The Ohio State University,” implying that it was not part of the University. A College administrator remembered that when the doors first opened it was represented as a cultural institution in Columbus, Ohio, without any reference to Ohio State University.

As a result, perceptions began to surface that the Wexner Center was “divorced” from the University. There was not much student interaction with the Center, and there was not much communication between the Wexner staff and the College of the Arts. In
addition, the operations of the Center were not conducive to developing involvement between the college campus and the Center. Exhibition openings were scheduled while classes were not in session and the hours of the Wexner conflicted with the schedules of students, faculty and staff. As a result the Wexner operated as if it were not part of the University community, Stearns was eventually dismissed over these issues.

Sheri Geldin was hired as the new director of the Center in the fall of 1993. The consensus of those interviewed was that she has assisted in mending the schism that occurred between the University and the Center. At that time, an administrative relationship between the College and the Center was non-existent but there was interaction and continues to be interaction between the two. Furthermore, the animosity of the past is beginning to subside. Geldin said the Wexner is very mindful of the student population’s needs when planning events. The Center makes the appropriate adjustments and considerations when scheduling programs dependent upon which student population the program might appeal. Overall, Geldin now feels,

“what [the administration of the Center has] tried to do over the last several years is to be better citizens on campus, to be better partners, to think even more rigorously about how the programs we devise will play within the academic community and how we can sort of fine tune at the margins...what we are offering and how we’re communicating that to people so they can take advantage of it.”

An administrator said the Wexner Center has become more a part of the University over the last few years. A faculty member in the College felt that when the Center first opened, it was more concerned with establishing autonomy and making itself a visible arts presence. Now, he feels the Wexner has not totally embraced the University
but relationships have developed on a personal level between Wexner staff and College faculty. However, he concluded the educational intent of the Wexner at Ohio State University still remains unclear.

A college administrator said that at the genesis of the Wexner the educational intent was so nebulous that it was probably impossible to carry out. A faculty member agreed by noting that when the Center started functioning, it seemed the educational mission was more abstract; that is students would learn just by seeing cutting edge work. Initially, connections were not made to bring students into contact with the artists. It was difficult for the Wexner to find its niche educationally, however, one administrator stated, the educational mission has evolved over time. She believes the aim of the Wexner has changed a great deal overtime from concerns with autonomy to a slow integration into the University community.

Other difficulties between the College and the Center were based on the faculty’s disappointment over losing a potential exhibition space. As indicated previously, during the planning phase of the Wexner, the College gave up Sullivant Hall, which was one of the faculty’s largest exhibition spaces, in anticipation that a gallery in the Wexner Center would replace it. Therefore, faculty artists were disappointed that decisions were made by the Wexner not to exhibit faculty, MFA or student works. Sara Rogers, Wexner Exhibitions Director, worked on a compromise with the faculty. What eventually resulted were many collaborative efforts between faculty artists and the Wexner based on the faculty’s interests and how particular works fit into the Wexner’s program. This alliance has eased the initial tension concerning faculty exhibitions.
Rogers remembered “fights” the Wexner had with the College over faculty exhibitions. She said that no one had the patience to wait to see how the relationship would develop. Eventually what evolved was the Center’s treatment of faculty like any other artist. Now, when it is possible, the Center integrates faculty artwork into their exhibitions when it is mutually beneficial. She recalled that it took, “time and a track record,” but now it works very efficiently.

Part of the initial uneasiness of the presence of the Wexner on campus could be related to differences in the expectations of the COTA faculty and the mandate of the new Center’s staff to create a cutting edge multidisciplinary arts center. Many faculty members had certain expectations of the Center because of their roles in the genesis of the Center; however, when they were excluded from talks regarding the structure of the Center, many felt and were ostracized. One Wexner staff member explained when the staff of the Center was hired and meetings between the staff and faculty were held, sentiments began to surface from faculty that the Center was the College’s and that certain promises had been made to the faculty. However, the Wexner staff were brought in with a much different mission and with little early knowledge of the “baggage” that existed between the Center and the College. One Wexner staff member felt it has taken a while to negotiate the current relationship between the College and the Center.

The relationship between the Wexner and the College has evolved over time. The history of the Wexner at Ohio State explains to a degree why many in the College of the Arts have held “grudges” against the Center. It was their idea and it was taken away from them. Therefore, there were many COTA expectations of the Wexner that in fact were
not met. However, this is neither the fault of the staff of the Wexner nor of the faculty in the College; many of these misplaced expectations can be attributed to reporting and mission decisions by central administrators, perhaps due to the desires of Wexner himself. The non-communication of those decisions to the individuals involved in the College and the Center laid the groundwork for and guaranteed future conflict. These decisions include the decision to take the Center away from the College. This decision did not include the dean of COTA; however, it drastically effected the College. Another conflict involved the intended administrative relationship between the College and the Center. The Provost wanted the director of the Wexner Center to be an associate dean in the College with the intent to have the Wexner and the College in constant communication. There is a power implication in this intent. An associate dean would report to the dean, an implication that the dean of the College of the Arts would hold a certain degree of power over the director of the Center. The consultant committee and perhaps Wexner himself wanted an independent Center reporting only to the president or the provost. A decision was made to make the reporting line to the Provost and the current director has refused the associate dean appointment with no consequences.

The history should shed some light on how COTA and the Wexner work together today. What follows is the current perception of the mission and goals of the Wexner Center by faculty in the College of the Arts and Wexner Center staff.
Perceptions of the Mission and Educational Goals of the Wexner Center for the Arts

The mission and educational goals of the Wexner Center give the Center a philosophical basis for its activities. Therefore, it is important to consider how the staff in the Wexner Center view their mission and goals and how the faculty in the College of the Arts view the Wexner's mission and goals. Whereas the espoused mission of the Center is explicitly stated, there are no published goals for the Center. Therefore, it was interesting to see what the perceptions of these goals were.

The mission of the Wexner Center at The Ohio State University was initially expressed in similar terms by all of the interviewees, often correlating directly with the official mission statement of the Wexner Center. The official mission reads:

The Wexner Center for the Arts is a multidisciplinary contemporary arts center with programs in the visual, performing, and media arts. The Wexner is dedicated to presenting outstanding work by established and emerging artists of regional, national, and international significance; commissioning and co-commissioning new work in all fields; establishing creative residency programs to encourage the development of new work and to foster interaction among artists, The Ohio State University, and the larger community; providing a meaningful context in which to explore convergence and interchange among a wide array of artistic disciplines; nurturing an informed and diverse audience through interpretive programs; and preserving and presenting the works of arts in its collections and archives.

The Wexner Center serves The Ohio State University, the city of Columbus, and the regional and national art communities through a wide range of programs representing diverse artistic media, cultural traditions, geographic origins, and art histories. The Wexner Center aims to provide a rich cultural complement to its immediate academic community, enhancing the scope and quality of the educational experience; and acting as a forum for interaction between artists, students, faculty, and the general public. The Wexner also strives to build meaningful partnerships and collaborative relationships with other cultural, civic, and social organizations in the community and throughout the country. The Wexner Center functions as a creative laboratory, supporting the artistic process by
offering professional, financial and technical support to artists for the creation, experimentation, and critical evaluation of their work (1996).

The primary response was the Wexner Center’s mission is to serve as a multidisciplinary arts center with an emphasis on the creation of new art as well as to bring individuals into contact with contemporary art. There were however a few distinctions between how the faculty in the College of the Arts viewed the mission and how Wexner staff viewed it.

**College of the Arts Faculty Views of the Mission and Goals of the Wexner Center**

Overwhelmingly, the response by the faculty was that the primary mission of the Wexner was to create and present cutting edge contemporary arts. College of the Arts Dean, Judith Koroscik, summarized the mission by saying the Wexner is here to,

"move the disciplines forward, it’s not just about repeating what’s been done elsewhere, it’s about invention and innovation and that’s also a very important and appropriate fit to a university campus."

In relating the University’s mission with the Wexner’s mission, Dean Emeritus of the College of the Arts, Donald Harris, stated the missions were distinct. He felt the mission of the Wexner at best supplements the University’s mission and is not tied to an academic mission. Harris said the mission of the Wexner only supplements the mission of the University when the two intersect.

He felt many intersections of the two missions are easy to identify. For example, the Dance Department’s focus on modern dance and the Center’s focus on contemporary
art are compatible. Other collaborations have to be sought even when the intersections are not clear, such as in music and theater. "We had to look to reach those [intersections] because [the Wexner Center’s] mission is so very circumscribed, it lacks breadth, you have to fit into it," Harris emphasized. He concluded that this lack of breadth was not detrimental but what gave the Wexner its unique quality and its distinction as a first class arts center. Chair of Art Education, James Hutchens, echoed this sentiment by saying the Wexner Center had been very supportive when the educational missions of the Art Education Department and the Wexner Center have aligned.

Another faculty member said that part of the Wexner’s mission is not only to present the work but to provide a forum for supporting, understanding and addressing issues pertaining to the contemporary arts through educational programming. Georg Heimdal, Chair of the Art Department, referred to the Wexner as a teaching facility where students can learn from the artists in residency.

Dean Koroscik pointed out the distinction between an arts organization located on a university campus and one that is not. Because of the Wexner’s physical location on campus, there is an expectation concerning a more direct educational mission by the Wexner for the University. Since it is located on a campus, she believes there is an obligation to benefit students and the campus community through its presentations.

“I care that it sees itself on the campus and contributing to the University’s educational mission. There is a different level of commitment if it is on the campus, certainly the scope of its programs is different too,” she said.

Koroscik elaborated by saying if the Wexner Center is, "not here to benefit students then it’s nice to have it but it’s not essential and I would rather look at it as essential, and I think it is essential.”
Whereas many of the faculty could readily comment on the mission of the Wexner Center, they often had difficulty elaborating on goals that the Center might have for the College of the Arts. Although the answers were often ambiguous, many did have definite opinions on what the goals of the Wexner Center should be.

A faculty member commented on how the Wexner’s goals should try to impact the overall student experience on campus. She said,

“there should be something about the climate and the experience that is holistic, that is a bridge between what you are doing in class and studying and what you are doing outside of class. The Wexner Center could be a major contributor to the quality of life for students on campus. I think the current director is working at trying to break down some barriers so students will come in, but it’s hard.”

One faculty member stated,

“I don’t know what the goals are in particular. I can say they have done a lot to reach out to our particular student body to connect us with opportunities. The larger goal of keeping artistic expression alive around the campus is very much what they are about.”

Another professor said he did not think the Wexner Center, “had any particular educational goals, nor need it have any.”

One faculty member said the educational goal of the Wexner Center is to enable a kind of interaction between the University, College of the Arts and the larger art world. Another said the goals revolved around providing the best examples of new art and by being a resource for curricula in the various departments in the College of the Arts. A
professor in Art Education responded that he thought the Wexner Center’s primary
University audience was the College of the Arts. Therefore, he said,

“it is incumbent upon them to invite, encourage, and welcome
collaborative efforts between the faculty, staff, and students in the College
of the Arts and programs in the Wexner Center.”

Many of the goals cited by these individuals were very broad statements without any
elaboration of how the Wexner actually acts on these goals.

**Wexner Center Staff Views of the Mission and Goals of the Wexner Center**

The staff of the Wexner Center overwhelmingly echoed the stated mission of the
Center, demonstrating that the mission of the Center is well communicated to its staff. In
addition to stating the mission of the Wexner, individuals described the composition of
Wexner audiences. The audience of the Wexner Center was characterized as a series of
concentric circles, the center circle being The Ohio State University students, faculty and
staff, followed by the Columbus community, then regional, national and finally
international audiences. Wexner Center Director, Sheri Geldin, in reference to the
Wexner’s audience, said, “obviously, the focus on any one of those concentric circles is
going to ebb and flow, it is pretty much a kind of fluid mix.” Donna DeSalvo, Wexner
Center Curator-at-Large, said the Wexner is a resource to The Ohio State University
community, faculty and students and to the Columbus community, but the primary
audience is Ohio State.
One individual in the Wexner Center said the mission was to create an opportunity for artists to create as well as offer access to the artists for people within the University environment, to observe, and learn from the art. Therefore, she thought part of the educational mission of the Wexner is to create opportunities for people to learn and to grow, to understand and to interpret what they hear and what they see through educational programming and interaction with the artists. Nevertheless, she said, the educational aspect of the mission does not have as much of an emphasis as it could have. Another member of the Wexner concluded that the Center does have an educational focus through the examination of areas that "lodge" between the different disciplines in the arts. She said,

"from a certain vantage point, because of the location on the University and the involvement with the University, it can be as much a kind of teaching resource as it is a more general public resource."

Most staff from the Wexner when asked to specify the educational goals for the College of the Arts, were quick to point out that the Wexner Center does not exist solely to serve the College of the Arts. Often they replied the Wexner is here to serve the widest possible audience of students on campus. However, one staff member said there is a close affinity with the College of the Arts. When serving students, one interviewee said, the Wexner endeavors to offer opportunities for artists to be involved with the lives of students and the best place for that is in the classroom as part of curricular activities. In this vane, a Wexner Center staff member stated he thinks,

"there is nothing like having these performances and then the next day having the artists in the classroom and having some sort of in-depth
experience that relates directly to the curricular opportunities in the classroom.”

A Wexner staff member was very specific in how she articulated the goals of the Center. She said a primary goal is to introduce students and faculty to all of the contemporary arts through what is presented at the Wexner. In addition, the Wexner helps to provide opportunities for students to do their own research; to provide opportunities for students to learn; and to provide ways that faculty can build into their course structure what happens at the Center. Again, this person said these things should occur University wide, not just through the College of the Arts. However, she believes the Wexner Center has a special relationship with the College of the Arts.

An underlying broad goal of the Wexner, from one Wexner staff member’s point of view, is preparation of students to enter adult life. Cultural participation is an aspect of adult life that must be nurtured and is part of the social fabric of becoming a citizen. According to him, the Wexner can have an impact on this through its presentations and its programming. He added that the Wexner is really trying to enable people to make connections in all aspects of life through the arts. In line with this theme of the Wexner providing an integral part of the educational experience for all students at Ohio State, another Wexner staff member said that it is important,

“that the Center would be seen within the campus community as a resource, as a point of great interest, as something that is part and parcel of the undergraduate and graduate experience, whether you are an art student, or an engineering student, or a pre-med student or a law student.”
Conclusions on the Mission and Goals of the Wexner Center

The Wexner is part of The Ohio State University; it is physically located on the campus and is partially financed by the University. Therefore, one implication expressed by many of the individuals interviewed from both the Wexner and the College is that it has an educational obligation to the students at The Ohio State University. The educational intent of the Wexner Center at Ohio State is not clear because its focus, as a contemporary arts center, is the creation of new art. Nonetheless, in the second half of the mission statement an educational mission is referenced:

The Wexner Center aims to provide a rich cultural complement to its immediate academic community, enhancing the scope and quality of the educational experience; and acting as a forum for interaction between artists, students, faculty, and the general public (Mission Statement, 1996).

The Wexner finds itself in an interesting position. Many of the individuals interviewed stated what was in the official mission of the Center but often went on to express additional ideas they had about the mission. Many of these statements revolved back to an educational intent expressed by the Center with the focus being the Ohio State community. Many felt it should provide a forum where individuals learn and grow through the arts. Finally, it was stated that because of its physical location on campus, there should be an educational emphasis.

Following an exploration of the understanding of the mission of the Wexner Center, perceptions of educational goals were explored. Specifically, interviewees were asked about the Wexner Center’s educational goals for the University and the College of the Arts. This was a difficult question for a number of the interviewees to answer. Many
immediately responded by restating the Wexner’s mission and how it relates or does not relate to the campus community. However, when it came to defining specific educational goals of the Wexner Center for Ohio State and COTA, they often responded with specific examples of how the Center interacts with the University community and COTA, but were unable to enumerate specific educational goals for the College.

The Wexner Center does not publish any specific educational goals in general for the University or in particular for the College of the Arts. It appeared that goals are tacit and evolve based upon actions taken by individuals who come to know, respect and trust each other. Some of those interviewed were able to state specifics that were a direct reflection of the mission of the Wexner such as it being a place to educate students about the contemporary arts and to provide a facility where students can do their own research. Additionally, it was stated many times by staff of the Wexner Center that the Wexner is not here solely for COTA. However, the inter-active nature of a dancer in a dance class or a visual artist in an artist’s studio is a very unique one that does often take place, and has a direct relationship with students in the College of the Arts. Many of the connections between artists and specific areas in the College of the Arts are already being made, as will be seen later in this chapter. There was an interesting duality demonstrated by Wexner staff. They would recognize the special relationship the Wexner has with the College of the Arts but would then emphatically state that the Wexner is not here just for the College of the Arts.

Finally, it was also stated that a goal should be that the Wexner serves to enhance student life so students are equipped to become functioning members of society inasmuch
as the arts are a part of everyday life. The Wexner can have an impact on how students perceive the arts and interact with the arts. This goal is a broad one that not only effects the College of the Arts, but the University as a whole.

The Relationship between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center

The official relationship between the Center and the University is a reporting line through the Provost’s Office. The style and nature of the relationship between the Provost’s Office and the Center appears to depend on the individual staff members involved. At the time of this study, Dr. Robert Arnold, Professor of Art Education, was the liaison between the Provost’s Office and the Center. His management style was hands off, only stepping in during major decisions or incidents at the Center. In addition, the evaluation of the director of the Center occurs through the Provost’s Office. When major projects are being considered by the Center, the director will often consult the University president and the provost to tell them what is happening, but there is no formal mechanism for approval. Dr. Arnold said,

“it is pretty much an independent operation that is linked closely to the University and always with the idea that it is a tremendous resource for the students here to see contemporary arts.”

Sheri Geldin noted that the relationship,

“is more a function of personalities occupying various positions, my relationship has been as strong to the president as it has to the provost. In many instances I will go directly to [the president] for advice or assistance, in other cases I will go to [the provost].”
The interaction between the Center and the University administration is partially guaranteed by the president serving on the Wexner Center Board of Trustees. The provost and the dean of the College of the Arts serve in ex-officio capacities on the board. Geldin believes that having three senior level administrators on the board facilitates communication between the Center and the University. In addition, the dean of the College’s presence also helps facilitate communication between the Center and the College.

Many faculty members in the College and staff in the Wexner are now comfortable with the relationship between the Wexner and the College. A College administrator stated he did not think the College would have disrupted functioning of the Center due to the “slow” administrative nature of academic departments. However, he does understand the structure of the College is not conducive to making decisions quickly, and in the operation of organizations like the Wexner Center, decisions occasionally need to be made immediately. He now feels comfortable with the relationship between the Center and the College. In addition, he did not think it made any difference who the Center reported to as long as it was doing well.

A member of the Wexner Center staff emphasized that the Center’s main focus is not the University or the College of the Arts. The Center’s mission is to serve the entire University, the larger community and the world.

“I believe that to have made the Wexner Center a kind of subset within the College of the Arts would have suggested a different kind of focus and emphasis than the one which has materialized. That’s not to say that it would have automatically become too regional or too provincial but I think that the emphasis of its mission would have necessarily focused on the students and faculty within the College. Whereas, I see [COTA] as
one of many constituencies, not all of whom are served equally all of the
time, but all of whom remain important factors in our total audience reach
and all of whom may ebb and flow within the total trajectory of how our
programs develop over any given year. I also believe that by not being in
the College of the Arts that it sort of reminds all of us...that our obligation
is not just to one segment of the University population but in fact to the
entire University population and of course to the larger community as it
radiates out,” she said.

Another Wexner staff member commented that the relationship between the
College and the Wexner has “lightened” over time. “Academic environments are
skeptical by nature and from the beginning there has been a ‘prove it’ attitude from the
College towards the Center,” he said. It has taken time to interact and exhibit the real
potential between the Center and the College. He concluded that both the Wexner and
the College have now demonstrated a good faith effort, and the benefits of collaboration
are starting to be realized.

Informal Relationship of the Wexner and the College of the Arts

From the interviews, it became clear that the current relationship between the
College of the Arts and the Wexner Center exists primarily on an informal basis. Many
of the interviewees espoused the belief that the formalization of the relationship between
the two in the form of written policy would not necessarily be beneficial. Don Gibson
said that the relationship, in terms of producing collaborative experiences as well as
educational experiences for students, is difficult to realize because there is a difference in
the overall tempo of how professional artists conduct their business and the education of
students. However, when the goals of the programs align, collaboration can produce involvement opportunities for students.

One area where programs align particularly well is the performing arts program of the Wexner Center and the Dance Department in the College of the Arts. The dance program has a strong emphasis on modern dance which complements the Wexner’s contemporary art emphasis. The Dance Department is also viewed as competent by Wexner Center staff. There is also a good informal relationship between the two heads of the areas, Karen Bell and Charles Helm. They often share information about future schedules and discuss what would be mutually beneficial. There is mutual respect built from an informal relationship.

Addressing this informal relationship between the Wexner and the College, Patricia Trumps, Wexner Director of Education, eluded to the fact that she thought that the Wexner is reaching students in art, art history and art education through their faculty. “I think that the faculty use the Wexner Center, some more than others,” she said. At the core of what makes the relationship work or not work between the Center and the College of the Arts are the informal connections, the personalities and assessment of the quality and compatibility of what the faculty do by the Center’s staff. The locus of control is with the Center.

As Dr. Arnold stated, one has to consider the personalities involved,

“Everybody thinks that universities exist because of personalities, and personalities change. You get rid of a dean. A dean retires. Suddenly it’s a whole new ball game. I think that’s what makes a university strong.”
In addition, he said relations between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center need to be built. However, he did not think that those relationships could be structured administratively so that they could run smoothly. The relationship cannot be forced when the Center holds the locus of control and judgments of artistic quality are part of the equation. Personalities in the College of the Arts and the quality of their work are informally assessed by Center staff and then relationships are either built or not built.

Dean Emeritus Harris expressed his belief that some faculty members remain bitter toward the Center because it has not met their original expectations.

"In many ways we have had to drag the Wexner Center kicking and screaming into the University and I think we have done that but not to the extent that I think people would like. The University is not interested in promoting a greater collaboration between the Wexner Center and faculty in the College of the Arts or any other faculty, if it means that the Wexner Center loses its independence. This is a very political arena and the Wexner Center has its own board with a lot of strong allies. [The Wexner staff] would feel that they could maintain their standards by having all of this faculty substandard work ‘interfering’ with their mission, and you know, they are not all wrong. They are obviously not all right because universities are negotiations, you have to talk to people, but [the Wexner doesn’t] have to play by University rules," he said.

He added that there is no formal relationship and there are a lot of missed opportunities concerning the programming of the Wexner Center and how it can supplement or complement curriculum.

Concerning an informal relationship between the Wexner Center and the College Arts, Dr. Gibson, Chair of the School of Music, said, "I honestly believe [an informal relationship] is the way the best work gets done around a place like this." He does not believe that administrators can create mechanisms to force collaboration or that structures
can be created to mandate faculty and staff participation in that structure. Collaboration occurs because people are interested in making the connections. He concluded that he did not think that there was a lack of interest in making connections between the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts but that there is a lack of space and time.

In the five years that Dr. Gibson has been at Ohio State, he has seen a dramatic improvement in the Wexner’s interest and willingness to connect with academic units.

“My first exposure to them was not strong at all. I tried to get a room from them and found out that two hours in the afternoon would cost me a thousand dollars. I thought, this is nothing but barriers,” he said.

Now the relationship has moved past those types of interactions to more fruitful ones. This, he believes, is a real testament to the current leadership and the way the Wexner now conducts business.

Georg Heimdal, Chair of the Art Department, observed that it is healthy that the Center is independent of the College of the Arts. He is aware of other institutions where there is an administrative relationship between a college and a museum or an arts center. In such an environment, there are many conflicting agendas that take away from the center’s main purpose and from what it can achieve. If the Wexner Center was under the control of the College of the Arts, he believes, it would be much less than what it currently is.

A faculty member felt that there is no clear understanding of the relationship between the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts. If both the College and Wexner Center are interested in making the relationship clear, sitting down with both the missions
and talking about it would be a good place to start. He felt that it would be good to define that relationship to avoid unrealistic expectations of what the Center should do.

“If you think about some of the things they are being held responsible for, they have to relate to this massive campus and the needs of the faculty, students and staff. Otherwise, they should not be on the campus,” he said.

He felt that this was a large task and by making the relationship more explicit between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center, expectations could be made clear. He concluded that if these expectations were not made clear as to how the Wexner relates to the University community and students, then they should not be on campus.

“It is a very politically charged relationship, as anyone that has looked at the history of the two organizations might know,” a Wexner staff member commented. Although they are not administratively tied to the College of the Arts, the Wexner Center does have a very special relationship with it, she said. However, she believes that there is resentment from some faculty over the lack of an administrative tie. Therefore, she believes some divisiveness still exists. “I think that there has been some disappointment on the part of some of the departments over not having a greater say in the administrative structure and the artistic presentations,” she said. However, she believes that most of this is in the past and now, for the most part, the feelings are good. A faculty member added,

“there was an assumption that [The Wexner Center] belonged to the College of the Arts. I think that was a wrong assumption that set up a lot of wrong expectations and took a long time to undo. However, I think when [the Wexner] went out of the College of the Arts, it didn’t thereby enter the University.”
The description of this informal relationship helps define how the Center and the College collaborate together by setting the context in which these interactions occur. Below, the faculty of COTA and Wexner staff discuss how they view the collaborative process shared by the organizations.

Collaboration between the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts

Collaboration between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center is not guided by any formal policy in either unit. When I asked if there was a formal policy that outlined this relationship between the two, no one knew of any. However, informal collaboration does take place as described previously. Collaboration often takes the form of word of mouth networking. Donna DeSalvo, Wexner Curator at Large, said that interaction is often based on friendships that have developed between staff in the Center and faculty in the College of the Arts. In addition, this often occurs through adjunct appointment of staff members in the College of the Arts. Donna DeSalvo, Bill Horrigan, Sara Rogers and Sheri Geldin all have adjunct faculty appointments in the College.

Wexner Center Staff Views of Collaboration with the College of the Arts

When asked about the collaborative process between the Wexner and the College of the Arts, Sheri Geldin, Director of the Wexner, said it occurs in very different ways depending on the individuals and the program. She said, “There is no formal mechanism, per se, nor is there any kind of quota system.” She believes that there is a constant level of awareness of the collaborative efforts so there is no need to keep track of what is
happening in any particular area. The way in which the Wexner integrates or creates educational experiences, particularly with the College of the Arts, has become ingrained into the Wexner’s programming process in such a way that it is ever present, she said. For example, she explained the process that happened when discussions were being held to bring an artist to campus,

“It wasn’t two minutes after we talked about bringing him here that we thought about how we can plug him into a class situation. Let’s plug him into the theater department. And, so before you know it, one evening program is translating into a session he is doing with students and a book signing. That pretty much exemplifies the way in which anyone who we are bringing here is sort of thought about in terms of the ways that we can exploit there visit. That has become such a matter of course now that it’s not something that I have to develop a formula for.”

For Chuck Helm, the Wexner Performing Arts Director, collaborative opportunities simply involve looking for possibilities for student interaction and then talking with the appropriate person in the appropriate department. In the area of the performing arts, the collaborative process is based on the personal relationship that Helm has with the various departments. Helm continually looks for student involvement opportunities when he brings in performers. He often writes into contracts that the performer must have some sort of student interaction while on campus.

Mr. Helm’s commitment to creating these opportunities has benefited students in the dance, theater and music departments. The School of Music and the Dance Department have both developed special relationships with the Wexner because of their increased collaboration over the past several years. Cooperation between the School of Music and the Wexner has resulted in students in the department performing with
professional artists presented by the Wexner. Often the collaborative efforts start simply by talking. Helm contacts the person in the department and they start a dialogue about the possibilities. In terms of the College of the Arts and the performing arts, the Wexner Center is involved with all three major disciplines.

Patricia Trumps stated that the collaborative process often occurs because a faculty member is very """"planful"""" in addition to being aware of what is happening at the Wexner Center and thinking about how the relationship can work. She suggested that it would help facilitate the relationship as well as communication if the Wexner Center staff attended more faculty meetings. Sara Rogers noted that the collaborative process often takes the form of word of mouth networking based on strong connections that exist with various departments.

""""I think it is a pretty healthy relationship right now, I don't now that there won't be times when it will grow closer and then there might be times when it will ebb away. Right now it feels relatively well balanced to me,"""" said Geldin.

She believes that there is initiative coming from both sides as well as a respectful attitude. However, she said, that does not mean that every proposal that the Wexner receives from a faculty member or an administrator can be agreed to, nor that every request that the Wexner proposes to the College will be accepted. She concluded by saying,

""""I think there is a healthy understanding of what our respective missions are, what our roles are, unto our own operations as well as with respect to one another. I would be surprised if that relationship didn't continue because there is no reason for it not to continue."
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Dr. Gibson, Chair of the School of Music, said the Wexner Center effectively owns its own scheduling process; therefore, if someone did not take the initiative in the Wexner Center to involve other areas, then it probably would not happen. He felt the School of Music has been very fortunate that Mr. Helm has sought collaborative connections. Dr. Gibson observed that the collaborative process is often initiated by the Wexner Center in the performing arts, specifically in music.

In the visual arts, Professor Heimdal feels that much of the initiative in creating collaborations has come from academic units. Faculty members usually see an opportunity with an upcoming exhibition and then make the appropriate contacts. However, he added, a lot of what happens is a direct outcome of the on-going discussions that take place with Sara Rogers, Wexner Exhibitions Director, and Bill Horrigan, Wexner Media Arts Director. These two Wexner staff members also serve as adjunct faculty members in the College of the Arts.

Dean Koroscik felt that in the past faculty primarily initiated the collaborative process. However, she said, what has evolved during the past few years has been more Wexner Center initiation in contacting departments in an attempt to seek out connections that could be mutually beneficial. These experiences have ranged from getting students involved in assisting an artist with research to integrating exhibitions into curriculum. “It is not as one sided as it used to be,” Koroscik stated.
Conclusions on Collaboration

Collaboration is currently initiated on both sides of the relationship. In the performing arts it is usually initiated by the Center, in the visual arts, many felt it was initiated by faculty. There is no formal policy that guides this collaborative process. Although collaboration does occur without any formal guidance, a written policy outlining how collaboration could occur would be beneficial if personalities never meshed in a way that collaboration did not naturally occur. Many individuals were opposed to structuring the relationship. For others, a formal mechanism should be created in order to ensure future student involvement.

Student Involvement Opportunities

The Wexner provides student involvement opportunities and in-depth learning experiences in many ways. Although there is no formal policy or a set of goals that structure these educational experiences for students, they do occur in several places throughout the Center. Some experiences are organized through collaboration with COTA; students seek others out on an individual basis.

Currently, the Wexner Center provides student access to visiting artists in fields such as dance, theater, music, and the visual and media arts. Work experience takes on the form of graduate administrative assistants, internships, and work-study in areas such as curation, art education, development and marketing. Involvement in these departments provides students with practical training in these areas. In particular, two staff members mentioned the significance of the graduate assistantships. Because of a lack of staff,
graduate assistants get a chance to work along side professional staff in the Center. Students also benefit academically through the Wexner’s interaction with academic departments to develop curriculum that take advantage of current exhibitions and performances.

Student involvement in the Wexner ranges from casual to in-depth. Students have been invited to be artists’ assistants and design students have interned in the graphic design office at the Wexner Center. One faculty member however felt that the Center did not contribute very much to a design student’s education. He added that the architectural exhibitions have been the best source of information but, “not contributor of information for a designer’s domain of study and production.”

Students are often utilized in the installation of exhibitions as well as in the docent-training program to give tours. Students have been involved in the film production process including creating sets, filming, and editing. The Wexner Center Student Association interacts with administrators to give suggestions on policy and designs programming. Bill Horrigan, Wexner Media Arts Director, said the student association organizes a film festival which gives the students hands on experience of how to organize and present a film series. Dance Department Chair, Karen Bell, said dance students interact with performers, attend master classes and lectures, have been invited to watch closed and open rehearsals, and are occasionally incorporated into artists’ performances. This has been an excellent way by which dance students can apply what they have learned in the studio with more accomplished performers.
According to Bell, the dance link has been one of the strongest informal links between the Center and the College. There are no formal programmatic or curricular connections but the Wexner Center complements the education of dance students because of the focus of both areas on modern dance. Bell often meets with Charles Helm, Curator of Performing Art at the Center, to see how the Center’s performance schedule overlaps what the Dance Department is teaching. If there is common ground, an educational experience is outlined for students.

The dance relationship is perhaps one of the strongest because of the alignment of the modern focus, the constant nurturing of the relationship, and the good relationship of the individuals involved, Bell said. In other areas, as in dance, the informal relationship between the Center and the College often depends on how strong the relationship is between individuals and on the focus of the academic area, modern vs. classical. For example, Professor Fullerton, History of Art Chair, is focused on Ancient Greek and Roman art therefore his students have little interaction with the Wexner on an academic level. Dr. Melville, Professor of Contemporary Art, often encourages his students to be involved in the Wexner. In addition he noted that students in history of art often seek careers in galleries or museums. For these students, the Wexner Center can be a valuable resource to obtain practical experience.

In addition to his collaboration with the Dance Department, Chuck Helm, Wexner Performing Arts Director, has also collaborated with the School of Music to create involvement opportunities for students. During the Mark Morris residency, students from the School of Music accompanied the dance company while they performed. Helm said,
“There was more interaction with the music department students in terms of their understanding of the musicality of the choreography and how to perform with dancers which is very different from giving a chamber music recital in terms of cueing, tempo and all of these kind of issues.”

Dr. Gibson also referred to the Mark Morris residency as having been a great opportunity for student involvement. In addition, he said the School of Music orchestra was allowed to play and work with Terry Sands, which, he said,

“was absolutely a first rate opportunity to work with them. I think our students were extremely well served and got an opportunity to participate at a high level and from what I understand from Chuck [Helm] and others, they provided good service at the same time.”

Art Department Chair, Georg Heimdal, said involvement opportunities for art students are organized more often on the graduate level. In Art Critical Practices, the Art Department has built specific class experiences around working with visiting artists at the Wexner Center. There have been internships developed around the Mark Dion, Cabinet of Curiosities, exhibition and also around the photography exhibition, Evidence. In addition subject matter from both exhibitions became the focus of seminars. For art education students, Dr. Hutchens, Chair of Art Education, said the preservice programs for teachers and the teacher training programs organized through the Wexner Center are important for students to learn how to use an arts center as they are learning how to work with children in K-12 education. Patricia Trumps, Wexner Center Education Director, added that for art education students the Wexner can be a tremendous resource to do tours, teach, develop lesson plans, work on curricula, and develop teacher-training packets. For students in the Arts Policy and Administration Program the Wexner Center provides opportunities for required internships and graduate assistantships.
The Wexner Center also provides opportunities for students to interact with artists who are in residence, such as the Maya Lin project when the Wexner Center first opened, or with the Alexis Smith exhibition, *My Favorite Sport*. The Wexner can give students experiences that they would often not have. One art history student interned with Alexis Smith to assist with the creation of the exhibition. One of her projects was to find a Buckeye coffin, which was on display in the exhibition. Occasionally a film production takes place at the Center and students are involved. The Greg Bordewitz film, “The Suicide” did production work at the Wexner Center and many student interns were involved. Through experiences such as these, the Wexner provides students with opportunities that exhibit the practical side of what they are studying.

A staff member acknowledged that there is great room for growth in the connections the Center has with the College concerning how the two interact to provide educational experiences for students. However, she also mentioned that the Center does not focus as much on the College of the Arts because staff at the Center believe the faculty in the College already know how to use the Wexner. Therefore, the primary focus is on making connections with departments across campus not usually associated with the arts.

The interviews revealed that the Wexner Center provides many opportunities for student involvement. Experiences are organized on an individual basis between staff in the Center and faculty in the College of the Arts. However, other than immediate thought on how the Wexner can incorporate learning experiences with specific projects, there is no overall goal that guides these learning opportunities. If the College is to reap the
highest benefit from the experiences that the Wexner can provide, it would seem that
discussion at the top administrative level of both COTA and the Wexner needs to take
place. Such discussion could at least espouse the importance of these learning
experiences and possibly lead to other ways of collaboration.

Possibilities for Future Collaboration

To discern what other dimensions possible future collaborations could take on,
interviewees were asked if either the Wexner or the College had any needs that could be
fulfilled by the other and what were the possibilities for future collaboration. The staff in
the Wexner Center overwhelmingly talked about communication and how the College of
the Arts could serve in the dissemination of information about the Center, its programs
and services not only to students and faculty in the College of the Arts, but also to the rest
of campus. Faculty in the College of the Arts often commented that the Wexner Center
could assist the College with particular educational or curricular issues. Outlined below
are ideas for future collaboration by Wexner staff and faculty in the College of the Arts.

Wexner Center Staff Views of Future Collaborations

One Wexner staff member hoped that the students and faculty in the College of
the Arts could serve as “ambassadors” of the arts on campus beyond the College of the
Arts.

“You need a network of people with an affinity for the arts, and what
better group of people than those in the College of the Arts. So, I’m very
interested in the College of the Arts embracing the idea beyond the
Wexner Center,” he said.
In addition he thought the Wexner could assist students in the College of the Arts with an awareness of the business inside of the arts. He indicated that students need to understand marketing issues and audience development to be successful in their art form.

"I think of the Wexner Center as a testing ground for those ideas would be in terms of relating them to academic ideas. This would be a very interesting idea for future possibilities," he stated.

Many of the staff of the Wexner Center brought up audience development as well as the College of the Arts working as a "loud speaker" for the Wexner Center in spreading the word about programming at the Center. One Wexner staff member said, "All I can think of is recruitment, going out there and getting people to come in the door, spreading the word." Although she thinks faculty members are already doing a good job, she said a continual reminding of people of what it means to have a center like the Wexner Center on campus would be a great benefit.

"The College could help with spreading the word," another Center staff member stated. She said the faculty in the College could be an intermediary between the Wexner Center and students in the College for getting the word out about what the Center does. She believes that students really listen to what professors say, and if a professor highlights what is happening at the Wexner and how it relates to what the students are doing, then more people will come to the Center. The College could also help by referring students to the Wexner Center to get experience in a variety of ways, such as by being tour guides, teaching, and helping to develop teaching materials, she said.
Sara Rogers, Wexner Center Director of Exhibitions, feels it is not the College’s responsibility but the Wexner Center’s responsibility to seek out the intersections.

“Most [collaborations depend on] stream lining communication, so that we are co-sponsoring speakers to everyone’s mutual benefit, we are doing audience development to everyone’s mutual benefit, getting to those points of intersection, really figuring out how to best mine those possibilities,” she said.

Bill Horrigan, Wexner Media Arts Director, cited that he would like the faculty to communicate more to their students about films and videos the Center is presenting. However, he added that it was the Wexner Center’s responsibility to get the information to the departments and inform faculty why certain films may be relevant to their students’ educational experiences. He said the Wexner Center could do a better job of getting this communication out.

Many staff in the Wexner Center said that a formal internship program would be a great collaborative project. They felt it would be a good place to start in giving student involvement opportunities that take advantage of all of the resources of the Wexner. The internship program would be more formal than what currently exists in the Center.

One member of the Wexner Center staff said being more “planful” is one basic way the relationship could be more productive. However, this would only work with exhibitions, performances and residencies that are planned well ahead of time and not with the Wexner’s “sudden” opportunities. She felt these opportunities do not coincide with the academic planning needed to take place when trying to integrate them into curriculum.
Donna DeSalvo, Wexner Curator at Large, observed that there is no formal museum studies program at Ohio State. This, she felt, was a lost opportunity because of the Wexner Center's location on campus. She felt this would be a very natural link between the College of the Arts and the Wexner.

At the time of this study, Sheri Geldin said that Dean Koroscik and herself had yet to sit down in a focused way since Dean Koroscik assumed her position as Dean of the College of the Arts. However, she believes that there is a very good spirit of respect between the two of them. She said, "I would imagine that as we get together and talk about things that new opportunities for collaboration will follow."

College of the Arts Faculty Views of Future Collaborations

The future collaborative efforts of the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts seemed to be based on the ability of the two institutions to communicate effectively. One faculty member in the College of the Arts said that it was absolutely essential that the dean of the College and the director of the Wexner Center talk to each other on a continual basis. Another faculty member said it would be good to somehow formalize the relationship between the Center and the College and bring in faculty members as a resource for the research Wexner staff are doing.

One faculty member said it would be beneficial for students if the Wexner integrated their visiting artists into the Art Department more.

"When Bruce Nowman was here a couple of years ago to get the Wexner Center Prize, he was open for some round table discussions, but most artists like to get into other artists studios, [they] like to see what is
happening in the trenches. I suspect that we could have a much better relationship there,” he said.

He added that many artists come to Ohio State and never realize that there is an Art Department a hundred yards away from the Wexner and that many faculty and students would be interested in engaging them in critiques and dialogue.

Research concerning technology in education is another area that could be served by a collaborative alliance between COTA and the Wexner. One professor noted,

“The Wexner Center has the images and the faculty have the curricular expertise as well as the theoretical knowledge. I think it would be useful to form some kind of more formalized relationship between the department’s faculty and the Wexner Center, to use the Wexner Center as more of a research tool.”

He added that the Wexner Center could also be a good resource for students who are learning to use technology in their classrooms as well as how to use technology to teach art criticism and art history.

On the College’s part, Dean Koroscik said faculty need to recognize the expertise of the individuals in the Wexner Center. This is happening more often with some staff taking on dual positions as adjunct faculty, but it also needs to occur with such projects as Percent for Art. “Who better on campus would know about the commissioning of art than certain staff in the Wexner Center,” she said. In addition, she said that she personally tries to play a role in building bridges between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center and the Wexner Center and the campus.

“I don’t think the Wexner Center could [program for the campus] by itself, it’s too hard and you have a group of professionals who have never really had experience on a university campus. How are they supposed to know exactly what it is that we need? We don’t talk to them about it. And that has, quite frankly, been the attitude, which is quite silly I think,” she said.
A faculty member cited internship opportunities as one area for possible improvement in collaboration. He felt the Wexner and COTA could work together to ensure the quality of the internships students have at the Center are consistent. His experience has been that some student interns feel they are learning a great deal and they are doing a lot and are team players, others report that they are more or less “go fors.” He said, “Of course, we want our students to have high quality internships.”

Dean Koroscik noted on internships,

“I think there is more that can be done and it does interest the College a great deal. I think it will happen increasingly in the future, part of that problem is space...where are you going to put a bunch of students in that tiny administrative space? But, I think there is a real openness to [an internship program] on both sides.”

The Arts Policy and Administration program has an internship program that could serve as a model for a broader internship program for the Center. Interns set goals with their sponsor department or organization and set up meetings between their faculty advisor and the sponsoring organization to ensure adequate progress is being made.

Dr. Melville offered that there is the unrealized possibility that a staff member at the Wexner Center might offer a course in curatorship. This would utilize the specific knowledge that the Wexner staff have concerning curatorial work. This suggestion was echoed by Donna DeSalvo in the Wexner Center.

There is great potential to be realized in collaboration between the College and the Center. As one professor noted, “I think the idea of a center for the contemporary visual and performing arts located at a major university is a situation that is just soaked in
possibilities.” However, he went on to say that those possibilities have not yet been explored in this relationship to the extent that they should have been. Another faculty member added, “We have not exploited the Wexner Center to the point that we should have.” He concluded that,

“Ohio State had an incredible opportunity with the Wexner Center to become a center for the study of contemporary art, probably the best one between New York and Chicago, possibly between New York and Los Angeles, but we missed it.”

Conclusions on Future Collaborations

Communication was cited by both COTA faculty and Wexner staff as a key area to develop that would directly affect future collaborations. This could take on the form of increased interaction between the director of the Wexner and the dean of the College, but also through interaction in faculty meetings with Wexner staff that hold adjunct faculty positions. Two other areas eluded to by the staff of both organizations were the possible development of a formal internship program and a museum studies program. Overall, it was felt that heightened communication between the Wexner and the College of the Arts would result in the formulation of new ideas concerning collaboration.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to try to understand the relationship between the Wexner Center for the Arts and the College of the Arts. In addition, this study attempted to discern how student involvement experiences are created through collaboration between the College and the Wexner. I became interested in this topic because of an internship opportunity that I had at the Wexner Center. From this exposure as well as through studying student affairs and the college environment, I became interested in studying how interorganizational relationships take place on a college campus, with specific regard to how student involvement opportunities emerge through such strategic alliances.

My primary sources for this study were interviews of faculty and staff in the College of the Arts as well as staff in the Wexner Center. My main interest through conducting these interviews was to gain knowledge about individuals' personal perspectives that might shed some light on the relationship of the Wexner and the College of the Arts. These perceptions ultimately effect how the two work together to create student involvement opportunities. In this chapter, I will summarize the results of this
study as well as make suggestions as to how this relationship could improve. The interorganizational relationship literature has guided the formulation of these suggestions.

The presentation of conclusions in Chapter 5 will follow the order of the data presentation in Chapter 4. This will include the following areas:

1. clarification of mission and goals;
2. the relationship of the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts in the context of interorganizational relationship research;
3. patterns in the collaborative relationship between the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts; and
4. improving future collaborative efforts.

Clarification of Mission and Goals of the Collaborative Relationship

Although the Wexner Center's mission statement has an educational intent, there are no specific educational goals that the Wexner Center clearly states that are directed toward the College of the Arts. Therefore, it was very interesting to see how people responded to the question by stating what they thought the educational goals toward the College of the Arts might be. Currently, there is a lot of interaction that happens between the College and the Wexner Center; however, those interactions are not expressed or guided by a set of goals or a formal process created by the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center. These meaningful interactions take place on an informal level. Many individuals in the College of the Arts and in the Wexner expressed their doubt that any administrative mechanism which would force this relationship could work. However, an
articulated mission and set of educational goals are important for any organization, especially if that organization resides on a university campus.

Only with an articulated mission can the organization of student involvement experiences move from something that is very erratic, dependent on the programming schedule and personal relationships, to something that is organized and happens on a continual basis. At the least, with the establishment of a set of educational goals, it will be easier to align what the College and the Wexner Center can do. The literature reviewed in Chapter 2 supports this. Ring and Van de Ven (1991) discusses how imperative it is for organizations to come together and create a shared vision as well as include and communicate this vision to their respective faculty and staff in order to be able to come together for a common purpose. Such a process of defining goals and objectives establishes appropriate expectations between the organizations and the individuals in the strategic alliance. If expectations are not clarified explaining what each party will give to and receive from the relationship, individual perceptions will vary in their degree of explicitness and behavior will widely vary.

Another area impacted by the definition of the relationship of the Wexner to the College would impact how the Wexner is seen on campus. Many of the people that I interviewed expressed the belief that the Wexner Center resides “outside” of the University. Administratively it does and it does not. It has its own board and foundation. However, the University does provide operational funds for the Center and there is the administrative link under the Provost’s Office. In addition, it is physically located on the University campus and many of the respondents felt that the Wexner’s mission statement
has an educational intent. Therefore, although the Center is primarily an institution that supports the creative efforts of artists who endeavor to work on the "cutting edge" of contemporary art, the secondary mission should be an educational one because it is part of The Ohio State University and because it claims as much in the second half of its mission statement. Defining the collaborative efforts that already take place in a more explicit way might move the Center "psychologically" back on campus in the minds of many faculty. A closer strategic alliance with COTA could impact this.

A close relationship could result in more COTA faculty and student involvement with the Wexner and the Center being able to count on that involvement. This could result in better communication between the two organizations but also better communication with the entire campus. As stated by many individuals in the Wexner Center, they want the College to serve as a "loud speaker" for the Center. If more students in the College of the Arts know what is occurring at the Center, this communication might over flow onto the rest of the campus population.

Findings Related to Interorganizational Relationships

IOR's are socially contrived mechanisms for collective action which are continually shaped and restructured by the parties involved (Ring and Van de Ven, 1991). Continuous negotiation is often necessary, through formal and informal processes to allow participants the opportunity to appraise the other’s role, trustworthiness, right and duties, as well as efficiency and equity in the partnership (Ring and Van de Ven, 1991). The Wexner Center and the College do have an informal relationship expressed through
either organization's staff members; however, there are no formal mechanisms that allow for this continuous negotiation. Cooperating to create such a mechanism together would not necessarily force collaboration as much as it could create a regular on-going forum by which discussions could take place concerning possible future collaborations.

The lack of the development of a formal relationship or a regular process for discussions maybe linked to the initial values involved in the decision made about the Wexner Center not reporting to the College of the Arts. As the literature review indicated, the initial circumstances, attitudes and perceptions by which the organizations come together in a cooperative IOR can have an impact on how the relationship is carried out (Doz, 1996). Although a relationship exists between the Wexner and the College, it is an informal interorganizational relationship that has emerged over time and through different informal means, usually by the development of personal relationships between individuals in the College and the Wexner. Initially, the Wexner Center was to be part of the College of the Arts and it was unilaterally taken away from the College. COTA had no input or say in the decision which may have been a mandate from the donor and was the recommendation of the consultant committee. These early decisions and how they were made had a tremendous impact on how the relationship has developed over time. Many faculty in the College of the Arts and staff in the Wexner are very aware of this situation and their differences in values. Only after the dismissal of one director and the hiring of a new director who was very knowledgeable of the gap between the College and the Center, have the two organizations come closer together, but by informal means only.
There are two value positions that may be at the heart of why there has been no formal collaborative process put into place between the College and the Wexner. First, Wexner Center staff believe that the Wexner Center is at Ohio State to service all students and not solely the students in the College of the Arts. Nevertheless, many of the individuals interviewed believe that there is a special alignment between the College of the Arts and the Wexner by the sheer artistic nature of the two organizations. The formalization of the relationship between the Center and the College or of a process of regular conversation would not inhibit the Center’s effectiveness to provide educational experiences and opportunities for the rest of the campus. It would provide a venue or a process by which the students in the College of the Arts might be better served by the Center.

The second value relates to power or control. Formal relationships or even conversation processes may imply losses of power or control. This includes the possibility of the loss of decision-making latitude and discretion (Oliver, 1990). This may be the reason why the donor and the consultant committee wanted the Wexner Center to be independent and hence the two organizations have not come together in any formal sense. The Center is, in principle, afraid that the College will take it over or have too much influence. When the Wexner Center first opened and was trying to distinguish itself as an arts center, this may have been important; however, now that the Wexner Center has established itself, it does not seem that the notion of the threat of the College of the Arts influencing decision-making power is as important.
The questions also arises concerning where the true decision making power lies when decisions concerning the Center are made. When Mr. Wexner entered the picture with his funding for the arts center, this could be a point where the locus of power shifted from the College to Mr. Wexner himself. Mr. Wexner might have influenced this shift for the Center to be more independent so the Center could make decisions swiftly as to effectively deal with the situations that arise in the very fast paced art world. In addition, as Mr. Wexner is a businessman, it would seem logical that he would prefer a structure that would effectively cut through the bureaucracy of a university setting.

Another situation that signifies the locus of power here is Sheri Geldin’s refusal of the associate dean position in the College of the Arts. In most cases when a provost asks someone to take a position, the person does it, no questions asked. However, in this case, a person who administratively reports to the provost was allowed to decline. This effectively untied the close administrative relationship that was intended by this appointment to unravel. Therefore, the question arises as to who does the Wexner Center really report to?

The Need for the Clarification of Expectations in the Wexner/COTA Relationship

In their research, Ring and Van de Ven state that if expectations are not clarified, explaining what each party will give to and receive from the relationship, perceptions will vary in their degree of explicitness. In addition, the parties will often only be marginally aware of the exact nature of their expectations (1991). To build a successful collaborative process, expectations need to be clarified. Again, there is no formal relationship, but a
formal relationship should be established, and then expectations and goals be made clear. Only then will this relationship be exploited in the best ways possible. In addition, as there is a new dean in the College of the Arts, this is a prime time in which to establish and renew this relationship between the College and the Wexner. Turnover of personnel has the effect of restarting the psychological contracts which will define many of the processes of governance of the cooperative IOR (Ring and Van de Ven, 1991).

The Importance of Defining the Collaborative Alliance

As presented in the data in Chapter 4, collaboration between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center for the Arts takes place in many different forms, from creating student internships to students performing and interactions with individual artists. Even though the relationship is not defined on any formal level, it does exist. It may be important at this stage of the development of the relationship between the Center and the College to take the next step in their collaborative alliance and formalize the relationship. Cooperation and collaboration do take place on an on-going basis. By defining the relationship the two organizations can outline specific goals and also communicate the nature of the relationship to individuals in both the College and the Center in order to clarify expectations. As the research indicates, expectations voiced by the interviewees were varied on this issue, some agreeing and some desiring to keep all collaboration informal and dependent on informal personal assessments and decisions. Clarifying the relationship might assist in bringing expectations to a more common level.
Patterns in the Current Collaborative Relationship between the Center and the College

The most important single pattern in the relationship between the College and the Center is that it all takes place on an informal level. This informal working relationship takes on different characteristics depending on the area that is being engaged. The interaction the Wexner Performing Arts Department has with the different areas in the College of the Arts, such as with the Dance Department, Theater Department and the School of Music, are very deliberate as a result of the efforts put forth by Chuck Helm to make connections and ensure that involvement opportunities are produced. In addition, how Mr. Helm interacts with these departments, in particular Dance, is assisting him in outlining and enacting the same type of collaboration with the Theater Department. Although this relationship is very deliberate and he thinks about how student involvement opportunities can be a part of everything he programs, it is still informal and based upon Helm’s personal assessment of the various departments in the College of the Arts. There is no policy, guideline or goal that expressly states that this collaboration need take place.

There are many experiences provided by the Wexner Center for all students at Ohio State and in particular involvement opportunities for students in the College of the Arts. However, these relationships are based on personalities, assessments of each other and Wexner Center staff deciding to act on an opportunity. If the College and the Center do not put an emphasis on understanding their relationship and putting forth explicit goals that outline the relationship, then the collaborative process could be lost if certain individuals leave their current positions and new persons with different values are hired.
Often the interorganizational relationship will change based on the turn over of personalities.

According to organizational theory and research, a priority placed on defining this relationship would need to be sanctioned by efforts from the top administration in both the College and the Center. Only after the relationship is defined and goals are established that serve as a guideline will opportunities occur in a way that is not at the whim of the personalities involved. Relationships cannot be forced, but they can be facilitated and guided. There is a considerable amount of interaction occurring now; if an imperative is espoused by the top administrators to try and seek out other ways of interaction as well as other points of intersection, other opportunities will probably emerge.

Another trend expressed by personnel in both the Center and the College is that the relationship between the two has improved over the past several years, especially since the arrival of Sheri Geldin as the director. Trust takes a long time to build, especially considering the history of the Center and the College; therefore, it seems that the relationship has gotten stronger as the memories of the past relationship slowly fade with the years. In addition, when Sheri Geldin took the position as director, she actively worked to close the gap between the College and the Wexner.

Hindrances to the Collaborative Relationship

Three areas have emerged as possible hindrances to the collaborative relationship between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center. These include the perceptions of
the Center by faculty in the College of the Arts, a lack of communication between the two entities, and issues concerning time and space.

The question of whether the perceptions of faculty and staff in the Wexner Center effect the relationship that the two currently have is very interesting. Educational opportunities exist but are not used to their fullest possible potential. The Wexner Center handles these experiences very well on a case by case basis. This occurs when they are approached by a student who wants to have a very specific kind of experience, if they are called by a faculty member, or if they are aware of a need and then make the appropriate contacts in the College or University to fulfill that need. However, there could be much more done on an institutional level.

Many of the people I interviewed said that although they feel that most of the feelings between the Wexner Center and the College of the Arts are now very positive, they did recognize that there were bad feelings between the two during the inaugural days of the Wexner. University administration made the decision that the Wexner Center would not be part of the College of the Arts. However, the bad feelings of many of the faculty in the College of the Arts seemed to be directed at the staff in the Center. This is interesting because many of the Wexner staff were brought on new and had nothing to do with the decisions that placed the Wexner in an administrative limbo, somewhere between its board and the Provost’s Office. Although the relationship between the two is now very good, some faculty still hold negative views toward the Center because of the reporting line and lack of a formal relationship.
Another key area of concern between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center is the lack of communication. Communication was probably the one thing mentioned the most that could be improved between the College and the Wexner. Given the informal ties, Wexner staff see a need to communicate more thoroughly about their programs to the College of the Arts student population. Several other staff in the Wexner Center also said that better communication about the schedule would lead to more collaborative efforts. There is a strong relationship between some of the Wexner Center staff and some of the faculty in the College of the Arts; however, this communication relationship is not formally structured.

However, it is interesting to note that overwhelmingly staff in the Wexner Center said that they would like for faculty in the College of the Arts to act as ambassadors of the Center to get more information out about what the Center offers. Yet, one staff member admitted that the Center could do a much better job in communicating with the faculty in the College and added that it was the Center’s responsibility to do this, not the College’s to seek the information out. This would indicate a lack of knowledge by Wexner staff of what faculty in the College of the Arts do to support the Center because many faculty members feel that they already do promote the Center to the best of their ability.

Many of the individuals interviewed believe personalities are what ultimately have to work in a relationship and that a formal relationship cannot be mandated. However, it would seem that if formal communication channels were created and used,
then more people would be aware of the opportunities and more of these “informal”
connections could be made. Control could remain with the Wexner Center.

Finally, another concern expressed by many of the individuals interviewed was
time and space. Many thought that there were not enough faculty or staff in either the
College or the Center to address a collaborative relationship adequately. It was stated
that individuals were too busy with their primary responsibilities and even if they did
have time, there was not enough space, for example, to house a lot of interns in the
Wexner’s small administrative space. The concern of space probably could be overcome
if a more formal relationship were desired. Interns do not have to be housed in the
Wexner’s space, the interaction of the students with Center guests or staff members is
what is important, not where the intern is housed. In regard to time commitments,
interviewees felt that no one could expressly dedicate himself or herself to the betterment
of the relationship. However, if the individual involved would integrate involving and
cooperating with the other organization in how they operate instead of viewing it as a
whole new area of obligation, this too could be overcome.

Improving Future Collaboration

Several suggestions were made by those interviewed describing ways in which
collaboration between the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center could improve.
The list that follows are suggestions recommended by persons interviewed for this study:

1. the dean of the College and director of the Wexner need to design and
   structure formal communication opportunities;
2. more integration of visiting artists into activities in the College of the Arts;
3. more collaboration on curriculum and research possibilities such as technology in education;
4. College of the Arts should recognize and use the expertise of the Wexner Center in fields such as curation and the commissioning of art and utilize this expertise;
5. create a formal internship program; and
6. a commitment to collaborate should be stated by the top administrators in both the College of the Arts and the Wexner Center;

The dean of the College of the Arts and the director of the Wexner Center should design ways by which the two organizations could better communicate. This could be as complex as creating new meeting times between the two organizations for the sole reason to discuss future ways to collaborate, projects that both organizations are working on, and artists that are coming to the Wexner. Another way would be to have the Wexner staff members that are adjunct faculty members attend the faculty meetings in the College of the Arts. At each meeting, a short time could be set aside where discussion could occur concerning possible collaborative projects between the College and the Wexner. In addition, this would be an appropriate forum in which the Wexner staff could update College faculty members about future artists and performers at the Wexner.

There was a concern brought up by the College of the Arts faculty that artists sometimes visit campus without realization of the opportunity to visit with or teach
students. This concern could be resolved through the increased communication described above. If faculty know what artists are visiting the Wexner and when, then, if agreed to by the artists, an interaction could be arranged. Increased communication will also open up opportunities concerning collaboration on curriculum development around exhibitions in the Wexner, by informing faculty about what is scheduled in the Center. In addition, faculty can lend a hand in the development of the use of technology in education. The Wexner could serve as a testing ground for emerging opportunities in this field.

Each organization needs to realize the individual expertise that exists in the other. Wexner staff could use the faculty as resources more in research that they are doing. In addition, faculty who have specific in-depth knowledge in certain areas could lend themselves to the Wexner as resources. Conversely, Wexner staff could be used as experts in curation, performing arts programming, and the commissioning of art work.

The creation of a formal internship program was an area suggested by individuals in both the College and the Wexner. The Wexner does have interns in many different areas, but no formal program exists. A formal program would structure the experience in a way that students would set goals and objectives and their advisors could be a more active part of their learning process. Not only would the student benefit from hands on experience, but also their learning could be heightened by processing the experience in a more structured way. In addition, if there was a central area in the Wexner in which formal internship opportunities were kept, the Center would benefit by assessing areas of need and then advertising through the College and other various means that the opportunity is available.
Finally, future collaborative efforts would more likely occur if a priority was placed on the creation of these experiences by the leadership of both organizations. If a commitment to collaboration was espoused as a priority by the dean of the College and the director of the Center, individuals in both areas might commit themselves more readily to seeking these opportunities out. This could be done through a joint published statement by both individuals, circulated through both organizations, and through verbal espousal of this commitment at meetings and forums.

Suggestions for Future Research

To reshape how the Wexner Center for the Arts and the College of the Arts provide involvement experience for their students, the ecosystem design approach could be used. The Ecosystem Model is concerned with the relationship between the student and their environment and the development of environments that foster the optimum educational growth and development of students (Banning & Kaiser, 1974).

The ecosystem design process involves seven steps, including: (1) designers, in conjunction with community members, select educational values; (2) values are then translated into specific goals; (3) environments are designed that contain mechanisms to reach the stated goals; (4) environments are fitted to students; (5) student perceptions of the environments are measured; (6) student behavior resulting from environmental perceptions is monitored; (7) and data on the environmental design’s successes and failures, as indicated by student perception and behavior, are fed back to the designers in order that they may continue to learn about students/environment first and design better
environments (Banning & Kaiser, 1974). The steps of the ecosystem design process are interdependent and can therefore start at any of the given levels (Banning, 1991).

This process could be used once the relationship between the College and the Center is more defined. Future research could utilize students more to assess what their experiences in the Wexner have been and whether or not this experience has a significant impact on a student’s experience at Ohio State.

In addition, the question should be considered how the Wexner Center, being on the campus of and affiliated with a major university, is or is not different than other arts institutions and how they prioritize their educational efforts. Does the Wexner Center’s priority on education reflect trends concerning education across the art world and in other arts institutions? Should it reflect these trends? How could it differ because of its contextual basis?

Closing Notes

The strength of the Wexner Center lies in its ability to provide opportunities in very specific areas, or in case by case projects. As Sara Rogers stated, she thinks that the Wexner Center does really well in providing experiences on a case by case basis but not so well on a broader basis. I believe this is a reflection of the Wexner Center’s very narrow mission. The primary mission of the Wexner Center is to provide a laboratory for the creation of contemporary art and then to present that art, educational intent is secondary. Dean Emeritus Harris, I believe was very correct when he said that this very narrow mission is not related to the academic mission of the University but complements
it. He continued to say that, “I’m not saying that is a bad thing, but that is how they get their distinction as being a first class arts center. It brings a lot of prestige to the University.”

However, this is not to say that even if their educational emphasis is secondary that they cannot have a very profound impact on the educational experience of students. One way in which the Wexner can become more of an educational force on campus is through its collaborative alliance with the College of the Arts. The following are suggestions that should be taken under consideration by the College and the Center that have emerged from this research:

1. clarification of the goals of the Wexner Center with specific regard to the University and the College of the Arts;
2. clarification of expectations of the relationship between the College and the Center through establishing guidelines that shape this relationship through policy;
3. identification of effective communication paths between the Wexner and the College to ensure both organizations are aware of possible future opportunities; and
4. establishment of a formal internship program.

The above suggestions are not specific in nature but are guidelines that allow for the unique creative process that should occur through collaborative efforts of both parties to further define this relationship. The Wexner Center is a valuable resource to The Ohio
State University whose potential has not yet been realized. There are many possibilities for future collaboration that have yet to be determined. As the history surrounding the formation of the Wexner Center begins to subside and perceptions about what the Wexner is and is not about are clarified, a stronger relationship between the Wexner and the College can begin to form.

Throughout the study it was continually mentioned by the staff in the Wexner Center that the Center was not in existence for use by the College of the Arts. This it true, however, so much more can be realized through a closer relationship between the two organizations. Although this was continually cited, often individuals went on to explain what a special and unique relationship that already existed between the two. I would hope that the two organizations can realize the potential of this relationship and work together to make the Wexner Center not only a more valuable asset to the College of the Arts but also to the University as a whole.
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