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Abstract

The trend towards establishing one’s own private collection museum has been on the rise both in the United States and globally. Through research of publicly available data, this study analyzes two case museums: The Pizzuti Collection in Columbus, Ohio, and The Rubell Family Collection and the corresponding Contemporary Arts Foundation in Miami, Florida. Qualitative data was collected from the theme areas of the profiles of their founders, their management and governance strategies, the programs that they provide to their communities, their financial health and amount of public support, and their levels of community was used to situate each institution within Moore’s strategic triangle used in nonprofit management analysis to determine the benefit of the existence of these new museums. Research indicated that the case study private museums do generate public value and private museum functionality makes the public museums’ lives easier by providing artwork loans and allowing them to focus on their collections rather than making sure that a donor is satisfied with the display of their painstakingly assembled personal collection. The addition of the private collection museum is a positive evolution within the current museum ecosystem.
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Chapter 1: An Introduction

In the summer of 2015, I found myself working as an employee of a private collection art museum. As I went further into my term of employment, I became fascinated by this 21st century organization that told the tale of contemporary art through the eye of one collector. The art collection was loaned to the organization and displayed publicly for the community in a building gifted by the collector to the organization. There was no other access to contemporary art of this level of professionalism existing in this community and it was curated beautifully. I found myself asking questions during my employment that led me down the path of inquiry as to what was a private collection art museum.

As I began exploratory research I learned that there has not yet been any research conducted regarding the information available on these types of institutions, even though their popularity and rapid growth of these types of institutions had captured national attention (Cohen, 2015a). The work that did exist was hypercritical and investigative in nature, but not unbiased (Cohen, 2015a; Schuker, 2008). I felt called to do the work needed to tell the full story with an academic angle rather than a journalistic agenda. I felt the need to research and work towards a more complete definition for these types of institutions by
exploring the relationships that the institutions have with their stakeholders, which include the founder/owner of the exhibition collection, the private collection administrators, the physical local community and the entirety of the museum community.

**Problem Statement**

The idea of an artist or art collector, especially a wealthy one, establishing a foundation for their art collection is nothing really new to the visual arts community, examples include the Warhol Foundation or the Barnes Foundation. The idea of philanthropists gifting money to start a public collecting organization is also not unheard of, for example, Andrew Carnegie and Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney, but the founders had little to do with day to day operations and administrative protocol. Over the past 20 years, however, a trend has arisen among the 21st Century philanthropic art collectors, and that is to open a publicly accessible gallery space to show exhibitions of their collected artworks where there is a dynamic relationship with the collector and the institution.

Don and Mira Rubell are just one of these art collecting couples that have taken this step into establishing a brick and mortar home for their contemporary art collection. In 1996, Don and Mira Rubell decided that it was time to share the product of their years of dedicated art collecting with the Miami Community. The Rubells had been collecting contemporary art since the 1960s and had amassed an expansive collection of over 6,000 pieces of artwork. They purchased a warehouse space in Miami’s Wynwood District that was formerly used by a drug enforcement
agency to house confiscated goods. The neighborhood eyesore was transformed into a magnificent contemporary arts space where the public could now view temporary exhibitions of selections from the Rubell Family Collection. The Rubell Family Collection also serves as a lending agency, loaning artwork from the collection for museum shows, as well as assembling their own travelling exhibitions (Coetzee, 2004).

While this event initially seemed small, a great deal of concern was garnered in the arts museum community. An art collector had opened their own museum instead of donating to an established institution, as was the traditional model and expectations of the collector/museum relationship to date in the United States. A private collection museum of contemporary art had never been established in this way before. The visual arts world was stunned.

The initial shock of the opening of the public space for the Rubell Collection did not wear off, however, as other art collecting families began to take note of the process and success of the Rubell Family Collection’s organizational model. The ripple created by the Rubell Family Collection spread to other collectors in Miami. The Margulies and the De La Cruz families of Miami also opened up their own art collections to be publicly accessible. They modeled their organizations after the Rubell Family Collection, and these organizational models became coined as the “Miami Model” institutions (Rubell Family Collection, 2015).

The opening and continued success of these “Miami Model” institutions did not go unnoticed by other art collectors around the United States. Since the opening
of the Rubell Collection in 1996, at least 20 of these publicly accessible collections have come to exist all across the United States. The institutions touch both coasts, with the originals in Miami, to the most recently opened Broad Foundation, in Los Angeles California. The Midwest is also home to a number of these collections, represented by the Pizzuti Collection in Columbus, Ohio and Crystal Bridges in Bentonville, Arkansas, and the Eastern Seaboard with the Glenstone in Maryland.

**Research Questions**

My central question is: What is a “Miami Model” institution, or private museum and how does this institution fit into the existing visual arts museum organizational paradigm?

This question can then be broken down into smaller parts for research, each with it’s own set of subquestions. The original question itself has two parts:

- What is a “Miami Model” institution, or private museum and
- Where does it fit into existing paradigms?

**Portion 1** will be answered through three subquestions which are:

- Why does the private collection exist and what is the history of these institutions in the United States?
- What do the organizational frameworks of these organizations look like and how do they operate? And
- What is their relationship with their founders?

**Portion 2** will look at these subquestions:

- What public value do these museums provide?
o What existing frameworks for understanding museums do these
organizations fit into?

Procedural questions that I will explore in my study will include:

o What were the policy windows, gaps in services perceived, and other
environmental factors that pushed for the creation of a private museum?

o How do the founders describe their experience of starting these institutions
and their continued role within the organization?

o How do administrators of these institutions describe their experiences and
their relationship with their founder?

o How does the general museum administration field view these institutions?

o What are the perceived differences between a public, collecting museum and
a "Miami Model" museum?

o What is the difference in experience that a guest has in a “Miami Model”
institution?

o What are the benefits that access to contemporary art provides to the public?

o Are these institutions even able to be considered “institutions”? Or are they
still formalizing?

**Needs Statement**

Now that this trend of opening a private collection art museum has gone
national, it has also garnered the attention of national press outlets and the policy
agenda. The initial publication hit the Wall Street Journal in 2008 in Laura Schuker’s
article *The Firestorm over Private Museums*. From the very beginning, by calling the
discussion around these institutions a “firestorm” there is a negative connotation being generated by the press for these organizations. The author moved immediately into the negative side of the private involvement in the public sector, continuing to focus on the negative effect that these private museums are having on the traditional museums in the United States (Schuker, 2008). But what about the positive effects of having an amazing collection of art on display for the public instead of being locked away in a storage warehouse, or in the basement of a major public museums? Is it not better that these works be available to the public?

This trend towards distrust of wealthy individuals and their freedom to do with their art collections as they wished continued in a publication in January of 2015, this time in the New York Times. Author, Patricia Cohen, calls into question the “public benefit” of these institutions and calls their existence an exploitation of a “tax loophole” as her article focused on critiques of the tax breaks that the wealthy in the United States receive (Cohen, 2015a). There is no mention again of the impact that these institutions have had on their communities, or stakeholders beyond opinions of other established museum professionals outside of the private collection paradigm.

Now it seems that the United States Senate wants in on the action of determining the benefit that is truly provided by these museums. An article in the New York Times on November 29, 2015, stated that a senate committee headed by Republican Orrin G. Hatch of Utah sent letters to twelve private museums and art galleries that receive tax breaks under the US tax code. They asked for
documentation of financial records, attendance records, donations, trustees, valuations, and art loans. It is curious as to why after so many years that this issue is now on the national policy agenda. It is reported to be a part of a larger investigation that includes private universities and other institutions that also receive tax exemption, but most of these organizations are less than twenty years old. There is always some disagreement about the qualifications of organizations that receive tax exemption as nonprofit organizations in the US, but now the argument includes these private museums (Cohen, 2015b). The timely nature of these investigations will be pertinent to my research moving forward. It will also be important as I move in my research to tell the full story of these private museums so that the American public and policymakers can finally understand the true nature of the private collection museum.

There has been almost no academic research conducted on this minority population of museums that has been born in the US over the last 20 years. There have been investigative pieces by journalists who wish nothing more than to accuse these institutions of being tax shelters with little to no public benefit (there are other opinions presented, however, by some museum professionals). According to Jefferey Dietch, former director of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Los Angeles in an interview for the New York Times, “The private museum is ‘a part of our American art culture.’ And is ‘one of the most exciting developments in the international art world” (Cohen, 2015a). So why are museum scholars not conducting research on these institutions? It is this researcher’s desire to fill the gap
in the literature by providing a comparative case study of a selection of these private collection institutions to be used in the field as a beginning to understanding what it is that makes these organizations tick, and what their formation and popularity means to the visual arts museum community.

It appears, right now, that there is a great deal of fear and scrutiny of these organizations due to their unconventional methods. The term “private museum” alone, lends to an air of secrecy that already sounds a little suspicious as to what these organizations are and what they accomplish. I seek to replace this fear with understanding to move the private collection institution from a place of skepticism to acceptance. I hope that my research will be able to shed some light on the practices used by these organizations and situate my work as a learning text that all museums can learn from. One of the greatest dangers to museums currently is their reliance on operating in isolation. The nonprofit arts industry as a whole has much to gain from a greater spirit of collaboration, an opportunity that will most likely not be pursued if there is a distrust of these private collection institutions. Hopefully, the resulting framework of this research can have broader implications that lend to understanding among all art museums.

Research Methodology

“Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations,
photographs, recordings, and memos to self. At the level, qualitative research involves an interpretive naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011)

This is to be a qualitative research study where I, the researcher, seek to observe the private collection museum and interpret their activities. My research will include only information that is publicly available from the organizations, however, as transparency is rapidly becoming an important issue in nonprofit management. I want to see what image these organizations are broadcasting for the world to see. This type of information includes talks that have been given to students by the founders and the museum administrators, press coverage of the organizations, publications made by the private collection museums and information found from the organizational websites. The analysis of various forms of literature is also important so as to survey the exact lay of the land where the private collection exists. This will lead to an interpretation to help make sense of the private museum in terms of existing paradigms as well as move the organizations along in their formalization processes to be taken seriously in the museum community. There are already meanings associated with the private museum, and I will investigate these existing meanings as well as create new meaning based upon a holistic analysis of the organizations. There will be a blending of phenomenology and case study methodologies in this research approach.
The purpose of this phenomenological case study will be to further the
institutionalization of the private museum, or “Miami Model”, institutions by
deepening the understanding of the organizational structures of these institutions,
examining the relationships between the founders and the organizations, as well as
assessing their value to the public and positioning them within the already
established visual arts museum paradigm. The “Miami Model” is generally defined
as a museum run by private collectors that features exhibitions from the body of the
collector’s art collection. The terms “Miami Model”, private museum, private art
collection museum and private collection museum up to this point have been used
interchangeably.

There are two main types of data that I am collecting: literature from the
focus areas that my research question encompasses, and publicly available
information about the organizations that I am researching. The collection and
analysis methods will be influenced and guided by my methodology choice, which is
a blending of phenomenology and case study methods.

Phenomenology employs the analysis method of horizontalization. Due to the
fact that there seem to be a few different organizational models of private collection
institutions, I feel that clarity as to what these institutions actually are can arise
from the phenomenology method. Horizontalization will be used after I determine
what the central themes are that arise from my investigations into the experiences
of these founders. These content of these investigations will be primarily reading of
publicly available sources such as TV interviews, lectures, or newspaper interviews.
that the founders have given. I feel that the experience of the motivation to create a living organization can be telling as to why we are seeing a pattern of the creation of these private collection institutions instead of donating one’s art collection to an already existing institution.

Phenomenology is well suited to discovering the shared experience of these individuals by clustering meaning. According to Creswell (2007), procedures for this type of study “consist of identifying a phenomenon to study, bracketing out one's experiences, and collecting data from several persons who have experienced the phenomenon.” From there, the researcher analyzes the data and identifies themes present from the statements. Then a description is developed from both a textural and a structural standpoint that separates the experience into the phenomenon and the context. Together these elements convey an overall essence of the experience.

This will be the route of analysis that I will be conducting from my information that I gather. I will also analyze the organizational models from this idea of horizontalization to see what kinds of meanings and essence arise from similarities or differences that I see in the organizational frameworks of these institutions.

The case study method employs other angles that I feel will also be important in my investigation. The collective case study method will be employed, as I am looking at the private collection model and exploring how it plays out at two different institutions. The smaller and in depth collective case study of my chosen organizations will be analyzed in a phenomenological manner. This is not unlike the analysis of themes that is usually used in a case study, but for me, these themes will
contribute to my “essence” that I am seeking of the private collection model (Creswell, 2007). In theory, through the application of horizontalization and collective case study methodology, I will be able to draw conclusions about the nature of the private collection museum and situate the organizational model into the existing understanding of traditional, public institutions.

Methods

This study will focus on the private museums of the United States. There will be two institutions included in this study: The Pizzuti Collection (PC) in Columbus, Ohio, and The Rubell Family Collection (RFC) in Miami, Florida. These two Collections represent different stages of organizational formalization. The RFC has been established in Miami for almost 20 years, while the PC opened in 2012. This provides a sampling of ages for the organizations. This will allow the researcher to see what, if any, the effects of time are on these organizations. Literature will be analyzed to compare the case organizations.

Analysis will be conducted in a manner fitting nonprofit organizational structure. This includes the usage of Moore’s strategic triangle, which analyzes authorizing environments and existing support, operational capacity of the organizations, and their generation of public value (Moore, 1995). Research collected from the theme areas of the profiles of their founders, their management and governance strategies, the programs that they provide to their communities, their financial health and amount of public support, and their levels of community impact will be used to situate each institution in the strategic triangle used in
nonprofit management analysis (Moore, 1995). Significant financial ratios such as program efficiency and fundraising efficiency will also be analyzed. This information will be gathered from publicly available documents. Comparison across organizations in this manner will lend to seeing how they sit in a nonprofit framework, and begin to situate them in traditional museum frameworks.

A full analysis of literature already available on this topic will be conducted to determine what picture has been painted of these museums in the public eye. From these pieces published in periodicals, industry specific publications, and publications produced by the museums themselves, the stories of these organizations will begin to unfold. The literature will support the process of defining what a private museum is and add to the picture of the organization that I am trying to create from my other sources of information.

**Significance to the Field**

As far as the impact of my research is concerned, I see many, but only time will tell if any of the perceived impacts will come to fruition. My main goal is to clear the air surrounding the public, policymaker, and museum professional perceptions of the private collection museum model. In particular, I will be focusing on the “Miami Model” institutions. The only loose definition of Miami Model that I have been able to find thus far is from a piece in ArtNet News. According to writer, Eileen Kinsella, a “Miami Model” institutions are “…museums (that) are run by private collectors and mostly feature their personal holdings” (Kinsella, 2015). “Personal
“holdings” refers to the private collectors’ art collections. This is a rather broad definition that does not adequately describe all that is done by these institutions.

Media perceptions of the collections are also hypercritical as to their “public value” (Cohen, 2015; Schuker, 2008). I want to dispel this cloud of doubt that hangs above these organizations because, during my time of employment at one of these institutions, I experienced, firsthand, the benefit of the existence of these organizations to the public. While I am not sure that this can be said of all the institutions that operate under this model, I remain optimistic that their pure existence, that provides public access to the contemporary artworks on display that are otherwise an arts experience cost prohibitive to the average American, justifies their tax exemption. There are important experiences that happen around the works of art when displayed in this manner, that do not happen anywhere else due to the way that these artworks are presented, and I want to provide the necessary scholarly background to validate this access as the educational component of their missions that are required of them as 501(c)3 organizations. The literature around public value as it relates to management practices and how it is used to validate public funding will also contribute to my research as I seek to see what the organizations are accomplishing even beyond their educational missions.

Knowledge sharing is crucial to the future of arts management, and there is so much that these “Miami Model” organizations can all learn from each other. It is also important for all museum professionals to have an accurate understanding as to how the “Miami Model” operates. There is no need for public museums to fear
these private collection organizations. I believe and seek to prove that private collection museums occupy a separate sector niche than the traditional public museums. The museum field is growing as a notable proportion of arts organizations across the country. The traditional museum paradigm has been long established, and there is always a natural fear of change in human nature, however, the future of museums lies in collaboration between these organizations.

Policy makers have a large stake as well in the future of museums. Private collection museums are the product of American tax policy that allows for tax deductions to be taken for the donation of the artworks from the founder’s collections. I hope to show through my work that the tax deductions and public subsidies are worth it to the public, who influence their policy makers to keep this in consideration as U.S. tax reform looms on the political horizon. The research will not only add to the advocating for charitable giving incentives in tax reform, but will also advocate for arts organizations as I will be showing how the organizations have public value.

In addition to adding to the body of knowledge that consists of arts advocacy materials, my work will also contribute to the bodies of scholarly knowledge in the ever-growing literature for arts administrators and those pursuing museum studies. It will also contribute to the body of work for the philanthropy and fundraising professionals. The literature for arts administrators is steadily growing, but due to the new-ness (and by new, I mean formalized for only slightly more than 50 years) of the field, and it is not as extensive as it could be. As arts administrators become
more specialized and the field becomes more formalized in management practices, this information about the way that these organizations work will be helpful to the breadth of the literature. It will also be of interest to those that study museums from an organizational perspective as well as from the perspective of the benefits of museum programming.

Philanthropic professionals will also find the peek inside the head of these founders interesting. These founders are what would be considered a major donor, making large financial and capital gifts and creating endowments. Creation of these organizations also falls into the categories of estate planning, as the plans of these founders for their institutions after they pass will also be of interest. The story of the Barnes Foundation is a case study of estate planning due to the ownership issues that transpired after the death of Mr. Barnes. He left no plans for the continuation of his organization, and the issues experienced by the administrators as well as the legal issues as to who owned the art work were of interest to philanthropic professionals and arts administrators alike (Panero, 2011). It is human nature to learn from mistakes, but it is hard for others who are not involved to learn if there is no written documentation to learn from. My research will be the written documentation for the institutions that I am studying and hopefully will be able to be referenced by various professionals that are looking for information about issues such as philanthropy, management of these private collections and other pieces of information that will be included in my research.
Overall, it seems that my research has high aspirations to be impactful. I feel that this is probably an aspiration of all researchers. It does seem that due to the diverse fields that my research includes, I may create some ripples across the various ponds that my research dips into. It is exciting to think about the implications, as I am a supporter of these organizations. I am tired of the critical nature of publications about these organizations, and it is time for the world to become aware of all of the good that these organizations provide to the public. To say that private collection museums do not follow through on creating public value is a gross overgeneralization of the work being done by these organizations (Cohen, 2015). It is time for the other side of the argument to be presented, but in favor of these institutions. My research will create a holistic picture of these private museums in an academic manner is occurring at a time when the existence of these institutions being questioned by policymakers. It is a time for the stories of these private museums to be told from an academic perspective so that decisions can be made with the most current and accurate information available.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The academic literature that lays the groundwork for this thesis is immense and interdisciplinary. No formal academic writing currently exists in the literature in regards to private museums and the unique issues that they face. In order to assess the case study accordingly, numerous resources were gathered to help provide an adequate background for the study to ensure that it was comparable with other pieces in the literature already existing in the academy.

Arts administration topics are often complex issues that can be covered under more than one field, and as such, must be researched from an interdisciplinary perspective. This study is no different. To provide an adequate background for this study, literature from the fields of philanthropy, public management’s public value theory, public policy and the arts, arts law, and museum studies were analyzed. Also included in the study of the literature was the first major comprehensive, global analysis of the current landscape of private museums by the art collector mega list, Larry’s List. When studied collectively, this literature enables the private collection museum picture to be viewed holistically, rather than from one perspective.

Philanthropy
According to the Philanthropy Roundtable, “Philanthropy is a huge part of what makes America America” (2015). The spirit of philanthropy in the United States is the strongest of any other country in the world, and that spirit is growing. The nonprofit sector contributed 6 percent of the GDP in 2015 (Philanthropy Roundtable, 2016). In fact, 45 percent of Americans do not realize that our philanthropic efforts are at the forefront of the entire global economy (Philanthropy Roundtable, 2015). Since the 2008 Great Recession, charitable giving in the United States has risen to $358.18 billion in 2014; this is an increase of 7.1 percent in 2014. “The single largest contributor to the increase in total charitable giving in 2014 was an increase of $13.88 billion in giving by individuals- 58 percent of the total change between 2013 and 2014”(Giving USA, 2015). Of all of the subsectors to which a charitable donation can be made, the arts and culture giving percentages rose by 9.2 percent in 2014, the largest amount of growth experienced by any of the subsectors, including religion (Giving USA, 2015).

Beginning with Carnegie and his Gospel of Wealth, the wishes of the wealthy to give back to their community are evident in the United States since the Industrial Revolution (1889). Today, philanthropy has grown into its own industry in the United States, and charitable giving is still going strong despite the recent recession. Rather, it appears that recessions redistribute the areas that gifts are given to, i.e. gifts traditionally given to animals or arts and culture are now directed more towards social welfare causes.
In today’s society, there is an increasing focus on goal driven, “effective philanthropy” (Giving USA, 2015). Effective philanthropy is characterized by its ability to have measurable impact. There are many difficulties that result from this, as evaluation is always a tricky, and often expensive and time-consuming issue in the nonprofit sector (Katz, 2005). So here we already see the biggest issue that private museums face is the desire to measure their impact, but the question of how to measure with the correct consciousness when the social science is still in development plagues the proof of a philanthropic effectiveness.

This difficulty, however, does not seem to discourage individuals from creating philanthropic initiatives. According to a recent Fortune Magazine article, “America is in the middle of a philanthropic revolution” (George, 2016). This article continues to elaborate by saying that the reach of government is so limited and bureaucratic that if real social change is what is desired, then the government is not who should be looked to for assistance. Due to restraints placed on companies by shareholders, it is not the corporate world that is driving the transformational philanthropic gifts, but the individuals. 47% of Americans even desire that this aid come from philanthropic individuals, rather than government aid (Philanthropy Roundtable, 2015). These private philanthropic aids are also perceived by the public to be more efficient than government aid, and as such, the tax benefits for charitable giving are regarded as needing to be highly protected. Additionally 61% of Americans feel that nonprofit philanthropic initiatives should be given relative freedom from government intervention (Philanthropy Roundtable 2015). The
modern day Carnegies, Rockefellers, Fords, and Fricks are being called upon to enact social change with their vast resources (Walker, 2015). It is not uncommon for a tech billionaire to start his own foundation initiative to solve issues that he sees as needing to be solved, such as a lack of contemporary art access in his community.

These new philanthropists, in addition to their enormous wealth are also savvy businessmen, who seek results and returns on their investment. Not returns back to them, per se, but they want to see the ripple effects in their communities that occur because of their investments. They also desire to be directly involved and associated with their investments. Most gifts given charitably occur to local organizations (71% of all giving), increasingly showing the desire to give where they can see the efficacy of their donation (Giving USA, 2015). No longer are billionaires just giving away money and expecting the nonprofit sector to handle it accordingly.

Individuals that give do so because they wish to maintain control over their gifts as well as for the social aspects, as explained by the social exchange theory (Mathur, 1996). They want evaluation. They want numbers and data that show their money is making a difference and they want to be the ones at the helm of their investment ship, so to speak. They know how to run a business and this makes for more sustainable nonprofit ventures as a result of their oversight in addition to their charitable gifts.

So why do Americans give? Numerous attempts at capturing the motivations for charitable giving have been conducted by scientists from a vast assemblage of fields. A comprehensive literature review of more than 500 articles from multiple
fields of research by Bekkers and Wiepking identified eight main reasons why individuals decided to give charitable donations (2011). These reasons included awareness of need, solicitation, costs and benefits, reputation, psychological benefits, values, and efficacy. Typically, more than one of these reasons are cited as the motivation behind a charitable gift. While these reasons are given to categorize the current research on philanthropic motivations, there is still no concrete, accurate theoretical foundation, just a multitude of scientists attempting to prove “pet theories” (Bekkers and Wiepking, 2011). The majority of philanthropy, however, is characterized as “highly personal” in some way (Philanthropy Roundtable, 2016). As a result of the importance of charitable giving to many stakeholders in the public realm, the public policy surrounding giving, and in particular, government giving to the arts piece must also be dissected for this literature review.

**Public Policy in Regards to Arts Management**

Whether Americans realize it or not, they do contribute to the arts through their yearly taxes. Americans pay taxes and, in turn, some of this income goes towards subsidies for the arts in the United States (Mulcahy, 1987). Along with these subsidies, allowing for arts organizations to qualify as nonprofit, 501(c)(3) organizations, giving them tax-exempt status, is another method used by the government to support arts activities in the United States. These designations as 501(c)(3) organizations also gives the organization the ability to accept tax deductible charitable donations from individuals and corporations, as well as
eligible to receive grants from the government and foundations (Mulcahy, 1987).
This is an extremely limited financial support of the arts and culture from the
government in terms of what is common treatment of arts and culture by
governments internationally.

Public Value

The benefits of the arts, when discussed from a policy/nonprofit managerial
perspective are often discussed within the context of Mark Moore’s Public Value
theory (Moore, 1995). This portion of the literature review serves to analyze public
value as it relates to the arts by breaking down the relationship between public
benefit and cultural value. This relationship is being explored within the context of
private museum organizations at a time when their creation of public benefit is
being called into question. The public value theory also provides a framework under
which the following case study material will be analyzed in order to analyze the
generation of public benefit from the existence of private museum organizations.

The remaining discussion will foray into the history and a general
explanation of Mark Moore’s public value theory and explain the prevailing
approaches of public value theory application as an ongoing process in public
management, and as a method of performance evaluation. The discussion will then
be brought to the application of public value theory in an arts organizational context
and how public value breaks down in the arts context into instrumental and
intrinsic benefits that are provided by the arts. From there, the concept of cultural
value as a larger umbrella valuation term will be discussed in addition with the idea
of aesthetic welfare as a part of intrinsic and instrumental benefits of the arts, and the transitive relationship between public benefit, public value, cultural value, and intrinsic and instrumental benefits of the arts will be illustrated.

While a professor at Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government, Mark Moore (1995) created the concept of public value as a new theory for public managers. Moore determined that there were two issues being faced in public management:

1) That the public managers were creating agendas for organizations without questioning what policies should be or what overall achievements the organizations should aim for and therefore were not as effective as they could be and

2) New management theories did not suffice to account for differences and similarities between the public and private sectors.

Moore developed his concept of public value to assist public managers in making decisions to remedy these issues. Public value borrows from traditional business managerial practices. Public value is to the public sector as shareholder value is to the private sector. While private sector works to maximize shareholder value, public sector works to maximize public value (Keaney, 2006). Using the theory of public value within the context of public management was a way to focus the efforts of the public sector organization.

So what really is public value? A working definition for the purpose of this research is that public value is a generally recognized benefit of the provision of a
service by stakeholders and providers. This definition encompasses both the desires of public managers to be affecting positive change and gives space to the public to generate the feedback necessary that the service is wanted and that their input will impact their services. Two approaches were the result of Moore’s new theory: Public value as a process and public value as a method of performance evaluation.

When looking at public value theory as a process, Moore (1995) discussed the uses of the theory of public value as a way to guide decisions of public managers. The process is fluid and always cycling. The view presented by Keaney (2006) in her literature review of public value concepts concluded that “ongoing deliberation between the organization and its various stakeholders that will help the organization allocate its resources and run its operations in a way that will create the most value. It is, therefore, not a state but a process, and because the external environment in which the organization is aiming to create value is constantly changing, so must the process of public value creation”. This process points managers in three directions:

1) Outward production of public value into communities

2) Up toward those in positions of authority who can provide legitimacy and support to the organization

3) Down into the set of actors the organization relies on to achieve the desired results. Energy in these directions transfers in reciprocal directions, allowing all of the pieces of the triangle interact and influence the other.
There is also the ability within the public value theory presented by Moore to be used as a method of evaluation, as public value is an end product of legitimacy and support as well as the operational capabilities of the organization. This idea has gained traction in the United Kingdom (Kelly, Mulgan, & Mueres, 2002). This application of the public value theory holds that public managers should understand the desired outcomes of the public to define goals. It is a concentration of Moore’s “Focusing out” direction of his strategic triangle. Additionally, the work of the Prime Minister’s Strategy Unit (2002) believes that public value is defined by how willing the public is to give up something in order to receive the service. When this relationship is constructed between the organization and the public, the services

---

Figure 1. Strategic Triangle (Keaney, 2006)
and outcomes are of high quality, and the trust of the stakeholders is retained to create the organization's public value. This also allows for a focus on measurement by the organizations. In the United States, this definition is often referred to as contingent value.

This focus on measurement has impacted public organizations and their programming and has major policy implications when organizations are evaluated by funders and government officials, as will be discussed in a later section of this portion of the literature review. When accounting for performance evaluation, Moore’s strategic triangle can be broken down into pieces that an organization can use for evaluation. Keaney (2006) outlined Moore’s triangle focused on aspects of pieces of management that could be measured, as is explained in the figure below.

Figure 2. Valuation aspects of the strategic triangle (Keaney, 2006).
It is important at this point to analyze what the literature says about the role of the public in this public value system. There is no real consensus reached by any of the pieces reviewed by this researcher other than the fact that the public does indeed play a role in the feedback loop of the public value strategic triangle.

Ultimately, the literature does conclude that public value theory establishes a framework with which public managers can balance managerial expertise as well as public interest (Moore, 1995; Kelly et. al, 2002).

**Public Value and the Arts**

Public value theory framework is applicable to the arts and arts organizations, as they face the same issues as other public sector organizations such as “relevance, equity, and accountability” (Keaney, 2006). In a major study by Moore and Moore (2005), public value framework was applied to state arts agencies and their benefits to their constituencies, connecting public value with arts activities. Additionally, RAND Corporation published a report discussing the multiplicities of the arts in society (McCarthy, Ondaatje, Zakaras, & Brooks, 2004). Both of these reports addressed the public value of the arts as being able to be broken down into two categories: instrumental benefits and intrinsic benefits.

Instrumental benefits of the arts include cognitive benefits, attitudinal and behavioral benefits, health benefits, community-level social benefits, and economic benefits (McCarthy et. al, 2004). These benefits achieve a greater purpose outside of the arts activity. The definition of the existence of these organizations as qualifying to be tax-exempt, 501(c)(3) organizations is that they fulfill an educational goal, an
instrumental benefit. These benefits are not always easily measurable, but they are measurable. As a result of the measurability of instrumental benefits of the arts, the focus of the use of public value is on performance evaluation of arts programming, especially from a funding perspective (Keaney, 2006). This focus, unfortunately leads to a concentration by the organization to provide outcomes from their programming of the instrumental benefits, leaving the intrinsic values to go ignored.

Intrinsic values are the immeasurable aspects of the benefits of the arts. Intrinsic values are also known as the art-for-arts sake argument (Moore & Moore, 2005). These benefits of the arts mean that the programming relates to the subjective experience of culture intellectually, emotionally, and spiritually (Holden, 2006). Intrinsic values, however, are at the core of any instrumental outcomes (McCarthy et. al, 2004). One cannot exist without the other. These values are explained in the framework presented by McCarthy et al (2004). The framework explains the various instrumental benefits and intrinsic benefits as they relate to the public and also private interests, as seen in Figure 3. The important aspect of this framework is that it also shows how the private and public interact, making the two even more difficult to separate.
Figure 3. RAND Framework for Understanding the benefits of the arts (McCarthy et. al, 2004)

Cultural Value

There is an additional value that needs mentioned when discussing the public value of the arts, and that is cultural value. Cultural value is a third model that is an organizing, explanatory framework that provides a language for organizations to express the value they create beyond the traditional social and economic outputs and outcomes, or instrumental values (Holden, 2004). Cultural value includes a multitude of additional assets such as “...aesthetic, spiritual, social, historical, symbolic and authenticity value” (Keaney, 2006). Additionally, “It incorporates ideas about pricelessness and also intrinsic value, the notion that assets are ‘worth’ something in themselves and independently of the human being who may value
them” (Keaney, 2006). Cultural value is a larger umbrella term used when discussing the benefits of the arts, but this model includes the concept of public value, but not from an evaluation or process perspective. Rather, cultural value serves to address the two views of public value holistically. This creates a transitive relationship between cultural value and public benefit with public value serving as the bridge between the two ideas.

**Aesthetic Welfare**

Beardsley (1973) outlines the concept of “aesthetic welfare” as a concept that is a basic educational goal. “Aesthetic quality”, according to Beardsley is a satisfaction generated by an exceptional visual experience. This “aesthetic” allows for a more pleasurable existence and is a responsibility of government when possible. An example of this would be the hiring of a designer for color swatch selections on a public rail transportation car. Overall, intrinsic values of artistic experiences increase the quality of life for an individual.

“The aesthetic welfare of a society at a given time consists of all the aesthetic levels of the experience of members of the society at a given time” (Beardsley, 1973). Access to art by the public facilitated by the government, or other publicly accountable official, such as a museum trustee, falls into Beardsley’s aesthetic welfare and therefore is a reason to support continued government funding for the arts. Aesthetic welfare is also a method of evaluating a decision when it comes to publicly access to artwork, Beardsley cites that an incidence of a collector holding a
piece of artwork in a vault significantly decreases the aesthetic welfare of the individuals of society, as they cannot see the artwork that is locked away.

**Concluding thoughts on Public Value**

When calling into question the ability and intention of private museums to create a public benefit, a framework must be developed to understand the benefits of the existence of these museums. Through an exploration of the literature, that framework can be constructed. There are many different ways to interpret the creation of a public benefit, but from an accepted policy and nonprofit management perspective, this is generally conducted through the usage and application of Moore’s theory of public value. Prevailing conclusions maintain that there is more than one acceptable way to apply public value theory to an organization (Keaney, 2006). Seeing as the private museum is a 501(c)(3) organization, it should be held accountable to the creating outcomes conducive to the generation of public value. Therefore, public value theoretical framework of the strategic triangle developed by Moore (2005) is an adequate framework to work within when discussing the generation of public benefit from the existence of private museums, as it is able to link public benefit to cultural value as well as the instrumental and intrinsic benefits of the arts.
Figure 4. Visualization of terms as they apply to public value
Museum Studies

The literature regarding the outlines of what a museum looks like as an organization is standardized within the field. For this analysis, *Museum Basics* by Ambrose and Paine (1993) served to provide a comprehensive view of the museum as a functioning organization. Specific pieces of the text, however, were highlighted for this literature review, as they will be referred to for the case study. Additional literature was also brought in to expand upon certain ideas, such as legal requirements (Lerner, 2012), founder dynamics (Kandel, 2009) and museum branding (Pusa, 2014).

**Legal Status and Management Structures**

“At its core, a museum is an educational organization. Its primary purpose is to collect objects deemed worthy of preservation and to instruct the public through the presentation of exhibits and other activities generated by critical collecting” (Lerner 2012).

The legal status of a museum creates its character from a legal as well as a managerial standpoint. Legal status of the organization determines what a museum can do, who is in control and accountable for actions of the museum entity, and how charitable gifts are received (Ambrose and Paine, 1993).

Public museums are organized as nonprofit corporations under the 501(c)(3) IRS code (Lerner, 2012). However, there is a difference in the legal status and management structure as well as board composition of a private collection museum and its public counterpart. Lerner in his comprehensive text *Art Law* gives
a thorough overview as to the legal IRS required structures and processes required of private collection museums. Private museums do qualify for tax-exempt status, and are organized typically as either a charitable trust, or most commonly, as a nonprofit corporation.

In order to receive a tax deduction for a charitable gift, it must be given to a classified 501(c)(3) organization. There is not as much of a deduction for gifts given to a private foundation as opposed to gifts given to a public charity (Lerner, 2012). Private operating foundations fall into a middle ground between public charities and private foundations in terms of organizational management. The treatment of donations, however, is similar to that of a public charity. As a result, private collection museums typically choose to become a private operating foundation.

When it comes to the management of these nonprofit organizations, there are two levels of management according to best practices (Ambrose and Paine, 1993). There is an administrative staff, responsible for day-to-day activities and accountable to the governing board as well as a governing board of trustees who can be responsible of the actions of the administrative staff and the needs of the community. This board can be a government agency, a preassembled council, or an assemblage of community stakeholders and players with an interest in the operations of the museum in the terms of a broader community perspective. In the case of the private collection museum, the collector whose collection is on display is a part of the board, and legally allowed to be the board president if he desires, as he is a major financial stakeholder in the institution (Lerner, 2012).
Also of importance to the management of a museum is the curation of the collection. Traditionally, public museums hire a curator that is in charge of making collection decisions based upon educational value of a piece of art to the collection. The private museum, however, the collector has final say on acquisitions, and the acquisitions are not always made with educational value of a piece as its main reason for acquisition. Many times, it is simply a matter of taste of the collector. In fact, only 10 percent of private museums employ a curator (Larry’s List, 2016).

The private museum has a separate level of administration, and that is the founder. In an observation by Gregory Kandel (2009), special attention was given to the impact that a founder and their vision has on a cultural organization. There are common features shared by institutions that are founder-led including challenges of feelings of ownership, board selection, inability or lack of expertise of direct management of the type of organization that they founded, feeling stifled from a staff standpoint, questions of motivation and collaboration from outsiders, and deep public association of the organization with the founder. Positive dynamics of the founder led organization are also present. Founders are often passionate about their purpose, and real charity occurs as a result of this passion. Excitement is also present as the organization grows, and innovation is high among the staff, the institution will reflect the strengths and weaknesses of the founder, and there is a powerful will for organizational growth and vitality from the founders’ perspectives. These dynamics do not always need to be accepted, but it is important to understand why these organizations can be resistant to change.
The Role of a Museum in its Community

As previously discussed in the definitions portion of this thesis, the definition of an art museum can be interpreted as a nonprofit institution that provides educational access to art work. However, the function of a museum in its community is so much more. The role of museums in society is broad in terms of their immediate and secondary benefits. Museums contribute to their local economies through tourism and job creation, provide cultural landmarks and a sense of identity for their communities, preservation and conservation of cultural heritage, opportunities for community involvement, and enhance the lives of visitors (Ambrose and Paine, 1993). The community of museums within a city is also important. Success of one museum benefits other museums by creating a culture for consumption (Pusa, 2014).

Museums also provide crucial education services, especially as the arts are being cut from public school program offerings. Their educational offerings are also instrumental to continuing education for adults in the community, and for schools to use in conjunction with their traditional curriculum. Most museums employ a designated coordinator or manager of educational programs within the museum to highlight the importance of their educational mission. Museum publications are also crucial for understanding the programming at these organizations (Ambrose and Paine, 1993). Private collection museums typically publish print materials that showcase the artwork on display in exhibitions and also provide background
information about the collection, or the art collector and his collecting process (Coetzee, 2004; Ibel, 2014; Plagens, P., Kertess, K., Hinds, K., & Margulies, 2008).

**Museum Administration**

In addition to a focus on education, public relations are essential to the success of a museum (Ambrose and Paine, 1993). Interactions with the general public, as well as media sources are included in public relations dealings at museums. These factors all play into the museum developing a reputation in its community.

In line with public relations, a museum’s brand is a crucial piece of its identity and comes to play in positioning the museum within its community. A museum brand can be known for its collection, for example, a museum that is a “museum of contemporary art” versus a “community museum” (Pusa, 2014). The brand of a museum is a key aspect that educates the public about the museum and also plays its part in attracting audiences. Contrary to the typical for profit attitude that marketing promotes brand awareness, museums use their branding to create audience awareness (Pusa, 2014).

Additionally, private collection museums have a very important piece to their brand that public museums do not typically concern themselves with, and that is the brand of their founder. The founders of a private collection museum are important aspects of this branding/museum identity, as it is their taste that curates the collection, showing art from one perspective. A museum’s building is also a part of
its’ brand component, as it is the physical structure that the organization and art collection lives within.

**The Private Museum Report**

Larry’s List is an art market industry knowledge resource that keeps track of art collectors of note and keeps its fingers on the pulse of the art world. It works to demystify the art market and get inside the minds of art collectors. It was no surprise that this organization also noticed, and subsequently published a report on, the boom in art collectors creating private museums (Larry’s List, 2015). In an age where transparency for nonprofit organizations is a high priority, the *Private Museum Report* comes at an intentional point in the timeline of the establishment of private collections.

In addition to basic demographic data about the collectors and their private museums, other statistics about the timelines of these organizations are also presented. 1 in 5 of every private collection museum opened within the last five years. 70 percent were founded after 2000 (Larry’s List, 2015). Out of 317 museums worldwide, that is an astonishing number and definitely a trend. It should be noted at this time, that Larry’s List declined the researcher’s request for raw data for the report. All observations are from the data available in the published report.

The Report mentioned that the private museum boom is not unique to the United States. There has been growth in these collector/collection-focused institutions all over the world, as seen by the report’s global mapping and census of
the private museums. The United States was 2\textsuperscript{nd} in terms of most private collection museums per country, with South Korea taking the number 1 spot.

The Report also looked at the broader goals and motivations behind the establishment of these collection museums. The goal of many of these institutions is to fill a perceived gap, that gap being a lack of access to contemporary art in communities. It is also a focus of these institutions to bring about appreciation of art. Missions of most of the museums include phrases that express the desire for the museums to be a venue for art, but also to support and enhance cultural landscapes of their respective cities and regions. Supporting this mission orientation is also the statistic that 59 percent of private museums are built in the places of their collectors’ residences (Larry’s List, 2015). In the United States, unlike other countries, the distribution of the museums is scattered across the country and not limited to only urban centers of culture. Additionally, this community-focused spirit is seen in the fact that many of the private museums offer free or reduced cost admission to certain groups that visit the museums.

When asked directly about the reasons the collectors had for opening their institutions, an astounding 92 percent of study participants said that it was for the “sheer pleasure of sharing art”. Other top reasons included that there were no museums showing contemporary art regionally. Interestingly enough, only 4 percent mentioned anything about the tax benefits that are received when your art collection is on loan to a cultural institution.
It is important that Larry’s List, a known art world resource, looked deeply at the content and value of these private collections. The quality of the art in these collections rival/surpass that of their publicly funded counterparts and have been recognized internationally. The number of visitors to these museums is nothing to shirk at either. Of the museums included in the report, the number of visitors equaled that of public institutions in similar geographic areas. 35 percent of the museums have more than 20,000 visitors annually (Larry’s List, 2015).

All museums included in the report supported additional programming, speaking to their commitment to education and appreciation. The most common types of activities that were presented by the museums were guided tours and artist talks. These programs align strongly with the educational missions of the museums.

The Larry’s List report pointed out two main issues in the private museum field:

1) There are distinctions between how a private museum can be defined in terms of how the institution is run and

2) There are different perceptions, interactions, and also conflicts due to the nature of private museums rivaling with public museums.

Something interesting brought about by the report was that collectors still engage with other institutions, showcasing their commitment to philanthropy as well as lending and donating works to other museums. There is also evidence to support that the amount of cooperative relationships between public and private
museums are on the rise. Additionally, private individuals donated 90 percent of art works held in public museums globally (Larry’s List, 2015).

The question that is burning at the back of the minds of most museum administrator’s minds is will the trend continue? The Private Museum Report seems confident that the number of private museums will continue to grow. American philanthropic spirit is cited as one of the main reasons that there will be a continued interest in establishing these museums in the United States. There is no indication as to what the future of these museums will be after the passing of their founder. The Barnes Collection in Philadelphia, one of the first private museums was fought over by family members, friends of the founder, and the state for a lengthy amount of time in court. The Guggenheim, also originally a private museum, now accepts other donations. What the emergent pattern will be for these newly founded institutions is still yet to be determined.

Tying It All Together – Preliminary Conclusions

This review of the relevant literature provided important background information that will continue to inform the discussion for the rest of this thesis. The private collection museum is an actual brick and mortar representation of the ideals set forth in this mix of literature.

As far as the philanthropic environment of the United States is concerned, there is evidence to support a boom in social conscience in the wealthier minds of the country, in line with their ancestors. Philanthropy trends support the boom in creation of these private museums, as Americans desire more private philanthropic
acts and philanthropists seem to face little public pushback from establishing their initiatives. It is the perceived responsibility of these individuals to support the cultural landscape (Larry’s List, 2015). The establishment of these organizations aligns perfectly with the American philanthropic spirit. It is the American art collector’s personal way of giving back to the community in a manner that the art collector is extremely passionate about, his art collection.

The manner is which the United States is concerned with philanthropy and the treatment of charitable donations falls into the realm of public policy. There is adequate evidence to continue to apply the theory of public value to the arts, and, for the purposes of this argument, to the arts institution known as the private museum. The ability to apply the public value framework to a nonprofit arts organization is open to multiple levels of interpretation within Moore’s original framework. Therefore, the ability of this framework to be applied across the arts organizational spectrum is present and will be utilized to the researcher’s full benefit. Moore's strategic triangle will provide a method of analysis for the case study portion of this thesis to see if public value is present in the case institutions.

At its most basic, the private museum is still a gallery where the public can view pieces of artwork. This is similar to public museums, but from this point, there is a much smaller list of similarities. There are discrepancies within the private museum and the public museum from both a legal and managerial standpoint. Most concerning, however, is the fact that there are discrepancies within the private museum field itself. They are not all even nonprofit organizations. Some are private
foundations, and others are public charities. There is a preference for the nonprofit organization, but the true motivations behind this choice are still unknown as far as the American collectors are concerned.

A focus on educational missions and provision of services is also present in the private museums similar to the public institutions. To what extent these organizations have impacted their communities is still in question and will be analyzed in the case museum in the later portions of this thesis.

There is a lack of this public benefit focus to the Larry’s List Report. While founder motivations were analyzed, little was noted about the way that the existence of private museums has actually impacted public museums and their communities.

In conclusion, there is no academic literature directly written on private museums. This literature review worked to bring together multiple perspectives that can be applied to the current private museum environment.
Chapter 3: Case Study of The Pizzuti Collection,
Columbus, OH

The Pizzuti Collection opened its doors to the public in 2013 in the newly renovated 90 year-old historic building formerly occupied by the United Commercial Travelers Insurance Company in the Short North Arts District area of Columbus (Pizzuti Collection 2015). The building itself stands resolute facing Goodale Park, a popular neighborhood green space. The front of the building displays large signage for the current exhibition and behind the front gate lays a sculpture garden that displays large works easily seen by passersby. This 18,000 square foot gallery space behind the historical façade is home to a large collection of contemporary artworks. The mission of the Pizzuti Collection is

“...to foster cultural understanding and educational exchange by championing a diversity of voices from around the globe whose work transcends, elevates the mind and expresses freedoms. We share the belief of our founder that art is fundamental to the individual and the cultural health of a community” (Pizzuti Collection 2016).

Founder Profile

Ron Pizzuti and his wife, Ann, are the collectors behind this organization. Ron Pizzuti collected coins when he was a child and he discovered a great joy in
collecting art as an adult. The Pizzutis were first drawn in to the world of contemporary art in a Parisian gallery when they saw the work of Frank Stella for the first time. The first acquisition that the couple would make was a Karel Appel print, purchased in 1972 at Eva Glimcher’s branch of New York's Pace Gallery in Columbus for $100 down and a $100/month payment plan (R. Pizzuti, personal communication, September 24, 2015).

They have collected artworks from all over the world and have displayed a distinct interest in Cuban art, which was showcased at the Collection in 2013 in their Cuba Forever exhibition. Their collection philosophy is simple, that philosophy is to collect with your heart, not your wallet (G. Pagano, personal communication, October 2014). This philosophy of passion for an artist and their work guides all of the Pizzuti Collection decisions, and as a result, a very particular taste element is present in the works that are presented at the Pizzuti Collection. Overall, Ron and Ann have amassed a collection of over 2000 works, much more than could be displayed in their homes or the locations of the offices of the Pizzuti Companies, the real estate development corporation owned by Mr. Pizzuti (Tully, 2014).

Ron and Ann’s interest in founding the Pizzuti Collection stemmed from realizing that they possessed a large amount of art that never saw the light of day, and decided it was time to share their collection. They chose to incorporate their own organization to show their art collection rather than donate it to a local museum. There was a desire expressed by Mr. Pizzuti to keep the collection together and show as much of it as possible at one time and stated, “the sum of the parts is
more important than the individual piece.” (R.Pizzuti, personal communication, September 29, 2015). The Pizzutis possess a distinct desire to get artwork out into the community and increase opportunities for art exposure in Columbus.

Also expressed was the great amount of personal reward experienced by the Pizzutis when they would see children marvel at the artwork. Parents of three children themselves, the Pizzutis have taken a particular interest in young, emerging artists, and supporting the young talent. “I don’t act my age because I am always with the kids (young artists),” stated Mr. Pizzuti. They enjoy nurturing the “kids” (R. Pizzuti, personal communication, September 24, 2015). The Pizzuti Collection as a venue presents an opportunity for emerging and established artists to be exhibited together (G. Pagano, personal communication, October 2014).

Regardless of age or level of notoriety, the Pizzutis take great pride in developing personal relationships with the artists that they collect (R. Pizzuti, personal communication, September 24, 2015). They also believe that it is one of the responsibilities of the art collector to generate exposure for the artists that they collect (R. Pizzuti, personal communication, September 24, 2015). Collecting an artist in depth is a particular interest of the Pizzutis (WOSU Public Media, 2014).

Mr. and Mrs. Pizzuti are also involved in other arts organizations in Columbus. Mr. Pizzuti is an Honorary Trustee on the Columbus Museum of Art’s Board of Trustees (Columbus Museum of Art, 2016). They are also donors to several other cultural organizations in Columbus. It is clear that the Pizzutis are invested in the cultural life and supportive of the vitality of the midwestern city. In summation,
a quote from Mr. Pizzuti about opening the Collection as stated in the Pizzuti Collection Power Philanthropy report generated by The Columbus Foundation (2014):

“During the last 40 years I have become passionate about contemporary art. What started as a personal passion for the art itself has grown into a lifetime commitment to bring world-class art and artists into our communities. We have a strong commitment to Columbus and we are bullish on investing in the neighborhood and the future of its art community. So, in 2013, after years of planning, we opened the doors of the Pizzuti Collection right here in our own backyard—a labor of love. I couldn’t imagine a better home for the collection. The Pizzuti Collection, established as a nonprofit organization, presents contemporary art. This venture is a unique opportunity in its distinct view and purpose: the only agenda here is to widen the reach of experiencing art. We are excited to share this with our community. While the art comes from our family collection, The Pizzuti Collection belongs to the community.”

Administrative Staff Overview

The Pizzuti Collection staff is small, as is consistent with the Larry's List report (Larry's List 2016). Their duties, however, are comprehensive in the day-to-day work of running the Collection. The head curator and executive director, Rebecca Ibel was a gallery owner for years in Columbus and already had a great relationship with the Pizzuti family. Assisting Ms. Ibel is Greer Pagano, the assistant
curator and Mark Becker, Deputy Director in charge of development initiatives. Mr. Pizzuti’s collection registrar is also employed by the Collection. Additional staff members include an operations manager, marketing and communications coordinator, program coordinator, and an education and outreach coordinator (Pizzuti Collection 2016).

**Governing Board**

At the time of their 2014 Power Philanthropy profile for the Columbus Foundation, the Pizzuti Collection had stated that they currently had five members on their board of trustees, of which 100 percent gave financially and 60 contributed in kind to the organization. The board also stated an impressive 100 percent attendance rating at all of their board meetings. Stated in their 2015 goals was to grow their governing board to ten members. As of 2016, they have met their goal of recruiting five additional board members (The Columbus Foundation, 2014). The board members, in addition to Ron and Ann Pizzuti and their son, Joel, all come from valuable backgrounds. There are other art collectors, area real estate developers, experienced board members of other arts agencies in Ohio, CEOs of corporate interests, and other local foundation CEOs present on the board (Pizzuti Collection, 2016). This growth and interest in growth of the governing board shows a distinct initiative and motivation of the Pizzuti Collection to garner more input from their community and utilization of local resources for financial support.

**Programs**
One of the crucial points to understanding what the Pizzuti Collection’s public value contribution to Columbus is taking a survey of their programming. The Pizzuti Collection, as a 501(c)(3) does require an educational reason for their existence, like most other arts organizations. While the Pizzuti Collection has only been open to the public since 2013, their offerings to the community are numerous and rapidly expanding. When first opened, viewing the Collection was by appointment only, but by the summer of 2015, the Collection was open Tuesday-Saturday, 11AM-5PM to the public. There are also standing weekend, docent led tours available. The sculpture garden is also available during these hours. There is a daily cost of admission, but students and children are always free admission. In addition to fostering art appreciation, there is a distinct air of fostering a spirit of art collecting as well present in their programming (The Pizzuti Collection, 2016).

The Pizzuti Collection opened their first public season with Cuban Forever, an exhibition of the Cuban artists in Ron and Ann’s Collection. The programming schedule is still relatively undetermined, but seems to have settled in as one major show per year, and then smaller single gallery shows in-between to act as filler while other galleries are being re-hung for upcoming exhibitions in the summer season. In their first season alone, the Collection welcomed over 5,000 visitors (The Columbus Foundation, 2014).

Through a grant from the Big Lots Foundation, the Pizzuti Collection was also able to open its doors one Sunday a month in 2015 for a free admission Family Day.
In addition to the usual tours, there were family focused group tours every hour and sketchbooks and scavenger hunts provided to guests.

The Pizzuti Collection has an active group of docents that provide their services for tours on weekends and during the weekdays for appointments and school groups. It is an excellent opportunity for motivated art lovers to engage deeper with artworks in a welcoming learning environment. During the summer of 2015, a junior docent program was started by the Collection with the assistance of a paid summer intern provided by a grant with funds from the Columbus Foundation. During a 12 week period the junior docents, who were aged 14-16 and students in the local Columbus City School District, learned how to give tours of the exhibitions, assisted in Family Day activities and learned other skills as part of the Central Ohio Workforce Investment Corporation’s Summer SOARHire program.

Also available to all community members is an art library. The resources found here are contemporary art books, journals, catalogs, and magazines that have been collected by the Pizzutis on their art-collecting journey. There are many difficult to find artifacts about many of the artists in the Collection, down to miniscule postcards from gallery openings. It is a rich resource of contemporary art history for the Columbus community. In addition to the library, the Pizzuti Collection publishes their own exhibition catalogs for each exhibition shown in the space. These catalogs provide another way for the artwork of the Pizzuti Collection to be disseminated into the community.
The Pizzuti Collection hires several interns on a semester-by-semester basis, as well as for the summer term. There are many opportunities to learn about the art world as well as the “behind the scenes” operations of an art museum on a smaller scale. Being a smaller organization, the internships are competitive, but provide valuable access for students and opportunities to gain experience in an arts organization environment.

Once a donor of a certain level, a donor has the opportunity to join the Pacesetters and/or the Salon Society. The Pacesetters is the Pizzuti Collection’s version of a young professionals group. This community of young collectors and art enthusiasts engage with art at the Collection and around the country through different events planned by the group members (Pizzuti Collection, 2016).

The Salon Society presents the option for donors to gather and appreciate art in a thought provoking and dialogue stimulating manner akin to the Salons of early 20th century Europe. Special opportunities to engage with the arts and artists of the Pizzuti Collection are available to members at this donation level. Also provided to members at this level are the opportunities to embark on special art collecting focused trips both domestic and internationally. Groups have travelled to Miami, Chile, and Cuba with Mr.Pizzuti and the curators to foster a deeper understanding of the art and art collecting process (Pizzuti Collection, 2016).

Due to the unique nature of the relationships that the Pizzutis have with the artists in their collection, this provides access to these artists for the community. Not only are the artworks brought to Columbus by the Collection, but also the artists
behind the artworks are able to come to the community. Beginning with their inaugural exhibition, the Collection has consistently offered artists talks by artists such as Michael Eastman, Sarah Cain, Titus Kaphar, and Omar Victor Diop (Pizzuti Collection, 2016). This brings another layer to their mission of stimulating dialogue and thought of contemporary artwork by bringing in international perspectives into the Columbus community.

Since opening their doors in 2013, the Pizzuti Collection has had a passion for bringing in school groups to view the Collection. In their first season, the Collection toured 18 school groups, a total of 500 area students through the galleries (The Columbus Foundation, 2014). Since then, tours of school children guided by staff and docents have come to the Collection almost weekly (M. Zuzik, personal communication, September 2015). The Collection has also offered an annual Educator Appreciation Month, where area educators can come and experience the exhibitions and hopefully consider bringing in their classes.

The Pizzuti Collection has recently begun to focus on expanding their educational offerings and programming. Beginning with the Columbus Foundation Summer Fellow in summer 2015, they hired the Fellow to work part time for the fall of 2015. In January, they welcomed their first full time Education and Outreach Coordinator, local Columbus artist, David Butler to really raise the bar of their educational offerings and initiatives.

Additionally, the Collection partnered with the Boys and Girls Clubs of Columbus to bring groups after school and during their summer camp programs to
tour the exhibitions. The tours were free to the groups, and the Clubs had funding for transportation to the Collection.

**Financial Health and Public Support**

From an accounting standpoint, the Pizzuti Collection is the 501(c)(3) private operating foundation that owns the building. The art collection is still owned by the Pizzuti Family and on permanent loan to the Collection (R. Pizzuti, personal communication, September 24, 2015). The Collection is also remarkably transparent. Much of their financial information including articles of incorporation, 990 forms, and sponsorships were either available directly on their website, or from other publicly available sources. Most of the expenses of the Collection are program related. In FY 2013, 63.8 percent of expenses were program related, 26.8 percent of expenses were administration and 9.4 percent went to fundraising (Columbus Foundation, 2014).

Individual support is a key component of the organization’s funding, and has an extensive membership program with different incentives at each level. In 2014, the Collection’s membership exceeded 500 members (The Columbus Foundation, 2014). Membership revenues have been steadily increasing since the Collection’s first reporting year. According to the latest form 990 PF, membership dues make up 37 percent of the Collection’s total contributed support (Internal Revenue Service, 2014). The largest individual contributor was clearly Mr. Pizzuti, also disclosed on the 990. The fundraising efficiency of the Collection is also .25, meaning that every dollar raised cost the Collection $0.25 in FY 2014. This can be explained however by
a push by the deputy director to increase individual contributions as the Collection gained more public awareness and support (M. Becker, personal communication, October 2014).

There are a number of corporate sponsors listed on the website that provide financial and in-kind support to the Collection. Larger corporations, such as Big Lots, Honda, and PNC have provided larger grants to support the Collection’s programming. The local arts council, The Greater Columbus Arts Council, also provides support to the organization. The Pizzuti Companies, Mr. Pizzuti’s business, also provides assistance to the Collection by sharing employees to assist in Collection administration. This in-kind support amount was disclosed on the 990.

Another key aspect of the Pizzuti Collection is its utilization and reliance on volunteers. The volunteers at the Pizzuti Collection are a necessary aspect of their programming, as the actual administrators are few in number. These volunteers assist in event programming, like the Artist Talks, and events such as member openings of exhibitions.

**Community Impact**

The remodel and use of the old office building that now houses the Pizzuti Collection was just the first in terms of the $59 million dollar development initiative in the Short North Arts District of Columbus that was a project of the Pizzuti Companies (Duffy, 2012). There have been numerous other business investments in the Columbus area that also reflects the more corporate side of the Pizzuti family, but these investments still incorporate the art that is so dear to the family.
In the past five years, there has been the development of a boutique hotel, The Joseph, that also showcases artworks from their collection, and guests in the hotel receive complimentary admission to the Pizzuti Collection. The hotel also shows the artworks of the Ohio Portfolio, 31 works commissioned by Ron from 15 artists. Additionally, the rooms of the hotel are artist focused and showcase works that were commissioned and also submitted from Ohio artists (Eckert, 2015). The Joseph Editions, an art gallery that sells prints of the Ohio Portfolio artists, is another project of the Pizzuti’s. Finally, the main offices of the Pizzuti Companies have been relocated to the Short North area as well.

The Collection did not start the art revolution that occurred in the trendy Short North Arts district, but it certainly fits the scene. The development of the Short North started in 1970 with developers, The Wood Companies, taking interest in the area and gained momentum in 1986 when the Mayor decreed the area a neighborhood revitalization initiative (Duffy, 2012). Since then, the Short North has become home to boutique shops, unique dining experiences from cheap eats to the gourmet, and a smattering of art galleries. The Pizzuti Collection does not sell artworks, but the addition of the Collection to the arts scene in the area does not go unnoticed.

**Conclusion and Application of Moore’s Strategic Triangle**

From the gathered information, an analysis on the Pizzuti Collection’s public value, and overall effectiveness as an organization, can be evaluated. Even as a
relatively young arts organization, the managers are clearly on the right path in terms of public managing principles.

The case for support and the authorizing environment of the Collection, also known as the organization’s legitimacy is present (Moore, 1995). The Collection has strong relations with individuals as evidenced by their growing membership base and volunteers, and also support from corporate and local government interests. The Collection is open to the public frequently and advertises with local media to bring in guests. There have also been a number of stories about the Collection and the Pizzuti Family in the media, as was source material for this case study. Relationships with government regulators and reputation with civil society actors is another area where the Collection holds true as well. On the Collection’s website, The Columbus Foundation CEO, Doug Kridler, gives a recommendation for the Collection and the CEO of the Greater Columbus Arts Council, Tom Katzenmeyer, also gives glowing reviews as to the value of the Collection to the Columbus arts scene and the community (Pizzuti Collection, 2016).

Operational capacity of the Pizzuti Collection is also at a high level as evidenced by their knowledgeable staff and governing board and their transparency from a financial standpoint. Their growth in programs and memberships also presents a strong case for a productive and efficient organization. The Pizzuti Collection is the first organization of its kind in the Columbus area, making it a local innovator for the kinds of programs that are presented. Support from public sources is, again, present and strong, indicating high morale from supporters.
Finally, the organization’s public value is also present. The mission of the Collection and vision of the founder are present in all aspects of the organization. While there is not yet presently a strategic plan in place, that is to be expected as the organization continues to find it’s footing and understand what it is truly capable of accomplishing (The Columbus Foundation, 2014). The linking factor at the Pizzuti Collection is clear in the organization’s tag line, “Contemporary art that feeds the spirit, challenges the mind, and stimulates thought” (Pizzuti Collection, 2016). All of the goals, activities, outputs, and outcomes that are intended and occur are present in the way that the Collection operates. The outcomes that are actually created from the Pizzuti Collection activities, can be seen on a Saturday afternoon roaming the Collection as visitors peruse the galleries, engaging with the artworks and engaging with each other, or listening to a group of school children ask their docent a question about a piece of artwork. The art is in the community and the public is engaging with it (The Columbus Foundation, 2014). Further research still needs to be conducted on what the exact outcomes of the programming are, but for the purpose of this study, the fact that the art that had, previously, only been seen by the few is now available to be seen by the many in a local community, is evidence of the increased aesthetic welfare of this community. There is no numerical value that can be placed on the importance of that experience.

The Pizzuti Collection’s strategic triangle is satisfied by the activities that they are currently conducting. It is a well-balanced triangle, which is impressive for an organization that has only been in existence a few short years. All of the pieces of
Moore’s triangle fit nicely together for the institution and it will be very interesting to see how the Collection continues to grow. While this generation of public value is not intentional as far as being an apparent focus of the management, the value is being generated.
A previous collection facility for confiscated goods once used by the Drug Enforcement Agency has been home to the contemporary art collection of The Rubell Family Collection (RFC) since 1993 (Rubell Family Collection, 2016). The RFC has 45,000 square feet of gallery space at their disposal to display their large collection of artwork in Miami’s Wynwood Arts District. The warehouse feel has been kept in tact, some markings on the poured concrete floor still remain, and the safe is even used as a gallery (Coetzee, 2004). In 1994, along with their son Jason, the Rubells opened the Contemporary Arts Foundation within the museum. Opening the foundation allowed the RFC to expand to a more public focused, educational mission model for the contemporary art museum (Rubell Collection, 2016). In 2000, the surrounding land around the warehouse was purchased as well to create an additional 14 galleries, nearly doubling the space for the massive collection and a storage facility for the works when not on display (Coetzee, 2004). Also included were a two-story arts library and a home for Don and Mera, the heads of the Rubell family.
The resulting model has been heralded as the “Miami Model”, “whereby private collectors establish a new, independent form of public institution” (Miami Art Scene, 2015). Today, the RFC contains 6,800 artworks from 831 artists (Solway, 2014). The collection is continually growing and consistently referred to as one of the most important private collections of artwork in the world (Coetzee, 2004). According the their 2013 Form 990, the Rubell Family Collection serves two charitable services: 1) To operate and exhibit the Rubell Family Collection of Contemporary Art on loan as well as private and other museum collections at its primary location and 2) participate in formal education of art and art history students through classes conducted at the foundation by local high schools, colleges, and universities (Internal Revenue Service, 2013).

Founder Profile

Don and Mera Rubell began collecting art in 1964, shortly after their marriage (Rubell Family Collection, 2016). At the time, Don was an obstetrician, and Mera, a school teacher (Solway, 2014). Contemporary art was the focus of their art collecting, as it was a much more affordable option than the Old Master paintings and, according to Don Rubell, contemporary art “...is much more relevant to their time” (Coetzee, 2004). Their home at the time was in New York. This is also where they raised their two children, Jason and Jennifer, who were often brought along by their parents on their visits to galleries and museums. Growing up in the Rubell family, disposable income was not spent on houses or clothes, but on art (Coetzee, 2004).
After the purchase of Clemente’s *Creation*, the Rubells “truly felt like collectors” (Coetzee, 2004). As the collection grew, the quality of work collected also grew. Eventually, space in the family home was becoming limited. Jason Rubell, now a prominent art collector himself, opened his own art gallery in Miami, and his parents and sister soon followed to begin a hotel development business (Coetzee, 2004). The Rubell family, now free from the inflated rent market of Manhattan, was also able look for a permanent home for their art collection as well. They desired to “live with their art” (Coetzee, 2004). Mera Rubell was quoted saying “There was a time when many of our larger pieces were in storage. We had no relationship with them” (Coetzee, 2004).

Since the opening of the publicly available gallery in 1996, the RFC has maintained the same style of collecting, and continues to collect artists that have affected them and collect several pieces typically during an artist’s career. When asked why they collect, their response is, “They can’t not” (Coetzee, 2004). The most important aspect of collecting to the Rubells is that they continue to collect and be engaged in the world and with artists (Coetzee, 2004). Historical context is important as well. Mera Rubell hypothesizes showing a Koons next to a Picasso, and how they have the freedom in having their own space to show the artwork to do just that and what kinds of new thoughts that could bring to the art community (Coetzee, 2004).

Collecting for the Rubells is a family affair. Their two children, Jason and Jennifer, were brought along to galleries and auctions since they were young and are
also involved in the collecting process. Today, no purchase is made without a consensus from Don, Mera, and Jason (Solway, 2014). The Rubell family collects art that they feel “challenges” or “disturbs” them, art that they love or “is beautiful even if not in the traditional sense” (Coetzee, 2004). While the family technically owns the artworks, Don Rubell states that

“...the art we own is not really ours: it belongs to the public and it is selfish to keep it in hiding. We always opened our home to collectors, artists, and critics, but a public facility made it possible for a much broader audience to interact with the art. We could also have donated our collection to museums, but a lot of our collector friends have done that, and more often than not, seventy-five percent of what they give is hidden away in storage. Having our own exhibition space is a tremendous luxury. We can see our collection all the time, and so can other people” (Coetzee, 2004).

**Administrative Staff Overview**

Similarly to other private collection museums, The Rubell Family Collection is a small staff that consists of seven team members. While they do have a museum educator on staff, it is worth noting that the RFC does not employ a development officer position. Another unique vacancy in the RFC staff is that there is no curator. The exhibitions are selected and set by the director, Juan Roselione-Valadez (Pupo e Silva, 2010).

**Governing Board**
As a private operating foundation, the board of the RFC is made up mainly of family members. Don, Mera, Jason and Jennifer sit on the board of trustees, as does Jason’s wife, Michelle. Additionally, the director of the RFC, Juan Valadez, also sits on the board. Mark Coetzee is director and curator of the Zeitz Museum of Contemporary Arts Africa, a private collection museum located in Cape Town, South Africa. Other board members include accountant, Barry Brant, and Miami businesswoman, Liliana Zarif (Internal Revenue Service, 2013).

Programs

The Rubell Family Collection is open December through May, Wednesday to Saturday. Tours are available by appointment. The opening hours accommodate the busier tourist seasons in Miami. The biggest exhibition season opening always coincides with the beginning of Art Basel, a winter art fair in Miami held during the first week of December (Rubell Family Collection, 2016). In 2015, it was estimated by Mera Rubell that there were 40,000 visitors, 20,000 of those visitors were during Art Basel Miami Beach (Rodriguez & Wooldridge, 2015). These exhibitions are drawn from the collection of the Rubell’s, containing pieces collected from artists’ shows, but also from pieces that the Rubell’s have commissioned. These shows can be the first major exhibition for a young artist and, therefore, extremely important in the career trajectory of the emerging artist (Solway, 2014). As a result of the relationships formed by the Rubells with their collected artists, the RFC also hosts artist talks in the gallery space. A recent innovation, conceived by Jennifer Rubell
was their “Pillowtalk” series with artists. Instead of a traditional lecture style artist talk, the artist and guests interacted in a living room type set up (Solway, 2014).

After the expansion of the RFC in 2000, the original art library expanded as well. The library contains over 40,000 volumes and catalogues collected by the Rubells on their travels. Also contained in the library are the published catalogues from the Rubell’s exhibitions. These catalogues accompany each exhibition with pictures of artworks included in the show and special essays and interviews for educational consumption by the public. This two-story library connects the home of the Rubells to the gallery (Solway, 2014). The library has been used by art scholars from around the world for research purposes (Rodriguez & Wooldridge, 2015).

Additionally, the Museum has a close partnership with the Miami-Dade County schools and frequently organizes field trips to the RFC for the schools. According to the RFC website, “thousands” of local school children tour every year. Local colleges and universities also make use of the galleries and library resources that are offered by the RFC. Another available resource is the offering of internships to college students. Last year, Mera Rubell was recognized for her work with the public schools by being awarded the 2015 Sara T. Maddox Support of Art Education Award by the Dade Art Educators Association (Rodriguez & Wooldridge, 2015).

The other largest programming of the RFC aside from its gallery exhibitions is its artwork loan program. The artwork of the Rubells is currently being shown all over the world through their loaning program. This is an enormous benefit to museums that cannot purchase contemporary art due to their own financial
constraints. It is also not always just single pieces being lent to other public institutions. The exhibitions are routinely turned into travelling shows that tour all over the world. This program of the RFC provides a great deal of access to the artwork collected by the Rubell’s, as the art is not geographically bounded.

**Financial Health and Public Support**

As far as financial reporting for the RFC is concerned, the only available information came from the IRS mandated form 990 PF of the organization. These forms are made available on Guidestar, which is not a requirement, but does contribute to the organization’s transparency. For FY 2013, the RFC reported program expenses as 80 percent of all expenses, and there was not a reported fundraising expense. The administrative expenses were not directly listed, but by looking at the administrative salaries and compensations, that was 40 percent of the total expenses for the RFC in 2013. By making administrative expenses separate from the programming expenses, the total programming expense then becomes 50 percent of the organization’s total expenses for 2013 (Internal Revenue Service, 2013).

High-level donations were included in the 990 form for the FY 2013 outside of the Rubell Family. These donors were mostly corporate supporters including The Rubell’s hotel business, Albion Associates (another hotel business owned by the Rubells in the Miami area), Illy Café, and Pierre Jouet Champagne (Internal Revenue Service, 2013). The situation remains the same for FY 2012, with the largest contributions coming from larger corporations, including Bank of America (Internal
Revenue Service 2012). Event rental income is also listed as an area of earned income. There is also mention of a large donation of artwork by a California artist (Rubell Family Collection, 2011). As far as actual public support from individual donors, corporations, or grants from other cultural organizations, there is no donor recognition anywhere on their website or any information, really, as far as giving to the organization is concerned. The 990 forms do, however, list contributions made to the organization. This leaves the exact nature of their public support from a financial perspective rather ambiguous. That being said, however, the RFC did report that 36 percent of their revenue for FY 2013 was from direct contributions, so it is still a publically funded organization according to nonprofit best practices.

The Rubell Family Collection was included in the recent Senate Finance Committee’s request for financial information from private operating foundations that run private art museums. In a report for the Miami Herald, Mera Rubell was quoted, “I like knowing that Sen. Hatch knows we exist. I think it’s fabulous. We get to tell him about everything we do!,” (Rodriguez & Wooldridge, 2015). While the information may not be easily accessible in terms of how it is reported, clearly the Rubells are not concerned and do not feel any wrongdoing in their financial management of the organization.

**Community Impact**

The RFC was just the beginning of Miami’s ascent from a marginal regional arts center to a place of national, and even global, interest on the art world map. The RFC was also responsible for being an impetus of the cultural genesis of Miami’s
Wynwood District. What was once considered a “dangerous” neighborhood of the Floridian city, Wynwood has undergone a complete transformation because of the visual arts explosion in the area.

The RFC and the Rubells were instrumental in bringing the world acclaimed Art Basel art fair to Miami Beach (Solway, 2014). Mera, herself, organized the trip of Miami city officials to the Swiss arts fair and toured the Art Basel organizers around the city of Miami (Solway, 2014). Now in its thirteenth year, the art fair draws thousands to the Miami area, pouring tourism dollars into the city. The presence of Art Basel has also spurred the growth of other art galleries and arts destinations in Miami (Alvarez & Melnick, 2011).

Another lasting impact of the RFC was to fill a gap in the presence of contemporary art in the community of Miami. Miami did not have an art museum until 1952 and the collections were not the greatest, according to local sources (Plagens, 2013). There were almost no publicly available artworks in the Miami community. The publicly subsidized, Miami Art Museum ran into financial troubles during its remodels in the early 2000s and since accepting a generous donation from a real estate developer, is now the Perez Art Museum that still lacks an acceptable permanent collection by the art museum standards (Plagens, 2013). The Rubell Family Collection started an arts accessibility renaissance for the city. As their collection took off, other area collectors also made note and opened their own “Miami Model” institutions. As a result, Miami now boasts four private collection
museums that are consistently ranked among the top private museums in the world (Pupo e Silva, 2010).

Current interests of the Rubells include opening another location in the Southwest area of Washington, D.C. From an interview for the National Endowment for the Arts, the Rubells state that D.C. has all of the ingredients for an artist community. “Art creates community, for them and for us” (Beete, 2011).

**Conclusion and Application of Moore’s Strategic Triangle**

When taking into context the gathered information on the RFC, an analysis on the generation of the public value of the RFC can be assessed. The information will now be broken down and categorized according to Moore’s strategic triangle for assessment.

When considering the expanding support and authorizing environment for the Rubell Family Collection, it is not immediately evident that there is a representation of public interest. The Rubells opened the RFC on their own originally and only later opened the Contemporary Arts Foundation to expand their educational mission. There is not a great deal of public information available on who exactly funds the programming of the RFC. Nor is there an ask for volunteers on their website. The RFC is, however, an extremely visible organization in the cultural arts landscape of Miami, and its presence has seemed to become generally accepted by the public. The Rubells have cooperated with the Senate Finance committee investigation, but the fact that they were included in the investigation leads to some considerations that the organization might not be viewed in the best light from a
government perspective. It will be interesting, to say the least, to see what is the result of the findings of Sen. Hatch’s investigation. The Rubells are darlings of the media. There was no shortage of newspaper, magazine, and other agency publications available on the family, their art collecting practices, and the RFC. Credibility with civil society actors can be seen in the Rubells’ relationship with the local government in terms of the cultural revitalization of Miami and the Wynwood neighborhood. In order to get permission to host an art fair from the city, Art Basel needed a liaison, and the Rubells provided that link for Miami and the art fair.

As far as building operational capacity is concerned, the RFC is the innovator of the Miami Model. The way that their organization is run has been at the front of museum scholars’ minds since the creation of the model. Other private collections look to the RFC as a model for their organization and other public museums look to them as an outsider, but one that could be learned from. The RFC has operated at similar staff levels for extended periods of time, and not much has changed due to the involvement of the family when it comes to the staging exhibitions or collecting the artworks themselves. Not enough information was sufficiently gathered to discuss financial integrity of the RFC, as they are not the most publicly transparent organization in that regard, but they will give the information when asked, as seen in their cooperation with the Senate investigation and participation in other publications. Morale as far as the family is concerned is unwaveringly positive and optimistic as seen in their interviews. The presence of the RFC in the Miami community opened up a world of possibilities for partnerships and other private
collection museums to flourish as well as the number of artists, and gallerists, and other business owners who now call Miami their home due to the increase of business brought by the presence of Art Basel in the area.

The overall generation of public value by the RFC is present. While there is not necessarily a given public mission statement of the RFC, the Contemporary Arts Foundation does present an extension and intention of an educational mission. Community recognition for the contributions that the RFC has made to the Miami public schools is also present. While it seems that expansion beyond Miami might be on the horizon for the Rubell Family, the value of the Collection being in circulation through their loan program also contributes significantly to their educational mission by providing access to their artwork for students all over the country. Their outcomes might not have necessarily been intended, but the Miami arts community, and the national arts community in general have benefitted from the presence of the RFC. This Miami Model pioneer opened the doors for other collectors to pursue similar establishments and their charitable loaning of artwork has generated immense amounts of access to contemporary art for the public that most publicly funded museums cannot present to their constituents.

The Rubell Family Collection and their corresponding Contemporary Art Foundation is the originator of the Miami Model. It can be seen from the collected data that the organization satisfies the strategic triangle requirements for effective management in their own manner. Being the originator of the model, the organization sets the standard so to speak that many other private collection
museums base their organizations on. Their success as a 20 something year long standing cultural institution in the Miami area proves that the model is sustainable given the right conditions.
Chapter 5: Cross-Case Analysis

According to Creswell (2007), “Case study research is a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a bounded system (a case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information...and reports a case description and case based themes”. The information has been collected in the previous chapters and now will be examined in terms of themes as identified in the cases and compared to bring about a discourse of inquiry about the “Miami Model” private collection museum. These themes of analysis are not to be used for generalizing beyond these cases, but assist in understanding the complexity of their environments in relation to each other. A cross-case analysis is useful to discover what themes exist between the two cases and how the themes can be applied to learn more about private collection museums (Creswell 2007).

For the purposes of this thesis, the two case studies of the Pizzuti Collection and the Rubell Family Collection offer much information in their narratives to explore and contextualize in terms of each other to make observations about the private collection museum as a cultural institution. While it should be acknowledged that each museum has its own unique nature and qualities due to the characteristics of their founders, there are some similarities and differences that are important to
make note of between the two museums. This cross-case analysis of the cases will provide further information needed to make conclusions about defining characteristics of private museums, or “Miami Model” institutions and determine their generation of public value for their communities. It is also beneficial to contextualize the information from the case studies within the broader information made available by the Private Art Museum Report (Larry’s List, 2016).

Founders Profile Analysis

The characteristics of the founders of both the Pizzuti Collection and the Rubell Family Collection are rather similar. From the collected information, it was learned that both sets involve a family unit that does the actual collecting (Rubell Family Collection, 2016; Pizzuti Collection, 2016). The heads of these households are middle-aged and involved in real estate development (Duffy, 2012; Rubell Family Collection, 2016). This suggests the founders value the aesthetic welfare of their communities from a business related perspective by making areas more livable and more desirable to be developed, but also from a personal standpoint. The collectors desire to live near their collections and have a stake in the neighborhoods because their art inhabits the areas.

Both sets of founders approach collecting from couple centered perspective. Interviews given by the families discuss the involvement and importance of their partners in the opening of their collections and their collection process. There is also familial involvement in the additions of artworks to the collections. The Rubell family collects as more of a committee, while the Pizzuti family seems to be more
patriarchal in their collection decisions. The involvement of the founders’ children is also important to note. The children of each family also collect art or are artists themselves. It is clear that opinions of family members matter greatly when it comes to actual collection decisions (R. Pizzuti, personal communication, September 24, 2015; Coetzee, 2004). This is an interesting situation, as typically founders of private museums are men (Larry’s List, 2016). By including their partners and families in the collections, and listing their partners as founders for their institutions sets both of these private museums outside of that trend.

There is also the number of works collected to be considered. In sheer number of pieces in the Collection, the Rubell Family Collection is larger in number than the Pizzuti Collection, however, the ratios of square footage of the galleries to the number of artworks are relatively the same, 2,000 works: 18,000 square feet for the Pizzuti Collection, or .11, and 6,800 works: 45,000 square feet of the Rubell Family Collection, or .15 (R. Pizzuti, personal communication, September 24, 2015; Coetzee, 2004). Considering that the Pizzuti family began collecting eight years later than the Rubell family, it is possible that the gap might get closer as time wears on as both of the families are still actively collecting artwork.

Contemporary art is also the focus of both families’ collections. This seems to be due to the fact that the art works were financially accessible at the beginning of their collections (R. Pizzuti, personal communication, September 24, 2015; Coetzee, 2004). They are also both very invested in supporting emerging artists, visiting studios, and staying ahead of the trends of contemporary art so to speak. Both
families are also very verbally supportive of the importance of the contemporary artist as a voice in today's society. They seek works that are challenging and artists with unique voices (R. Pizzuti, personal communication, September 24, 2015; Coetzee, 2004). Based on their collecting practices, it seems that they do not have endless capital, like the tech billionaires so to speak, and they do not look for a quick turn around to make a profit off of their acquisitions. Rather, they spend their money wisely and, instead of investing in masters, support the new and exciting. They are today's Medici and Esterhazy families.

Both the Rubell family and the Pizzuti family are invested and involved in the communities that their collections are located in. For the Pizzuti family, their involvement in Columbus has been a very long-term relationship. Columbus is where they raised their family and began their art collection. The Pizzutis are also heavily involved in other nonprofit organizations in Columbus. Their names appear on donor recognitions for CAPA Columbus and ShadowBox Live Theater. Mr. Pizzuti's name also appears on the Columbus Museum of Art's Honorary Board. While the Rubell family did not move to Miami until after their children were grown, they became involved once they had settled in the community. This is evident in their spurring of the Miami city officials and the Art Basel committees that Miami should be the home of an outlet of the Art Basel Fair (Solway, 2014). Establishment of the private museum in their community of residence is consistent with the global private museum trend (Larry's List, 2016).
Motivations for opening the collections are also similar it seems. There is a passion for contemporary art present in the sentiments of both sets of founders. Public access to the artworks they have collected was cited as an important reason to establish their museums. The Rubells and the Pizzutis both cited the basement problem of museums not being able to display the majority of their artwork and also museums not being as dedicated to the collections “as a whole” (R. Pizzuti, personal communication, September 24, 2015; Coetzee, 2004). It is important to these collectors that their collections remain intact, so handing over the reigns to a museum for exhibitions does not sound appealing to them.

The years of establishment of these institutions straddle the boom line of 2000, as established by The Private Museum Report (Larry’s List, 2016). The RFC, founded in 1992, was the first example of a private museum of this model in the United States, or the trendsetter, and the Pizzuti Collection, being established in 2011 makes it a trend follower.

**Private Collection Management and Governance Analysis**

The management and governance aspects of the Pizzuti and Rubell Family Collections seems to be the areas where there is the most difference between the two collections. While both collections present themselves as open to inquiries about their organizations, this researcher had more experience with the story of the Pizzuti Collection due to the availability of class visits and lectures to the Collection as a result of the location of the researcher. While the Rubell Family Collection did not respond to requests for interviews, they mention that they often tour groups of
schools and another graduate student was able to gain access to their administration for an interview a few years back (Pupo e Silva, 2010; Rubell Family Collection, 2016). However, as far as information collection for the management and governance was concerned, this data was collected from publicly accessible means, the websites and 990s of the organizations to learn about their management and governance strategies.

As far as the direct day-to-day administration structures of both organizations are concerned, the collections are very similar. They both employ a relatively small and contained staff. The Pizzuti Collection, however, employs curators and personnel who are concentrated in development related tasks such as donor solicitation and grant writing. The Rubell Family Collection does not employ anyone in either of those categories. Both collections employ staff that have direct responsibilities of marketing for the organizations and they both employ staff that focus on the educational programming, meeting the IRS requirements of the organizations’ missions (Lerner, 2012).

In terms of the governing boards of the organizations, the collections differ again in their strategies. The board of the Pizzuti Collection is slightly larger, with ten members and the Rubell Family Collection board is comprised of eight members (Pizzuti Collection, 2016; Internal Revenue Service, 2013). The Pizzuti Collection also underwent a board recruitment period so they must be looking to expand their board reach for some broader, strategic, organizational purpose. Board composition is also interesting. The Rubell board is comprised of four Rubell Family members, an
international art curator, and the other members who appear to have business interests in Miami related to the same business interests of the Rubells. There is a much broader larger sea of knowledge to fish from in terms of the interests represented on the board at the Pizzuti Collection. As the board culture of 100 percent board financial participation is already active, this will also provide them with a broader network of potential donors and broaden their draw in terms of public support.

**Programming Analysis**

In terms of programming offered by each collection, the offerings are very similar. Both provide exhibitions open to the public, offer libraries to their communities, and provide access to the artists in their collections in terms of events like artist talks. Both of the organizations also publish exhibition catalogs to commemorate their exhibitions. The Rubell Family Collection is only open to the public December through May, and the Pizzuti Collection is open year round (Pizzuti Collection, 2016; Rubell Family Collection, 2016).

The Rubell Family Collection’s season opening coincides with Art Basel, and the Pizzuti Collection does not have an art fair in the area to align their programming with. Tourism is not seasonal in Columbus, Ohio like it is in Miami, Florida, so it makes sense for the RFC to only be open seasonally. The RFC only being open for a select part of the year does not seem to make a difference as far as attendance at the institution is concerned. The RFC welcomes an estimated 40,000 visitors yearly, with 20,000 of those visitors viewing the galleries during the week of
Art Basel (Rodriguez & Wooldridge 2015). The Pizzuti Collection reported 5,000 visitors in their first season, but that is only their first season with limited hours of operation (The Columbus Foundation, 2014). Serving an audience larger than 20,000 puts the RFC in the top 35 percent of attendance amounts at private museums (Larry’s List, 2016). As time wears on and awareness increases in Columbus and within the art collecting community, that number of visitors will likely increase as well, especially since there is a large amount of media coverage about the Pizzuti Collection (The Pizzuti Collection, 2016).

There are a few programs offered by the Pizzuti Collection to the public that are not offered by the RFC. There was no mention from any of the sources about the RFC about free admission days similar to what the Pizzuti Collection has offered in the past. There was also no mention of a docent program or how to be involved as a volunteer at the RFC on their website (Rubell Family Collection, 2016).

Educational offerings are also part of the programming provided by each organization. The RFC and Pizzuti Collection employ staff that work exclusively with their educational programming and outreach. There are also internship programs available at each organization. Clearly, both organizations are meeting their educational mandates.

The Pizzuti Collection does not operate an extensive artwork loaning program like the RFC does. This might be due to the fact of the Pizzuti Collection’s dedication to Columbus and to increasing the local cultural vitality. That does not mean that there is less access provided to the Columbus collection, it just
concentrates the benefit of the collection to the Columbus community. The RFC has the ability for national, if not global impact of their art collection and this provides very important access to the communities that host their artwork by making a distinct impact in the amount of artwork available. These other communities might not have access to the works of a certain artist due to cost prohibition of acquisition, or the lack of availability of a private collector within their own locality.

The other additional program that is an important offering of the Pizzuti Collection is their membership program. The membership program provides another revenue source for the collection as well as offers different levels of access to the resources available at the Pizzuti Collection such as trips for the members (Pizzuti Collection, 2016). The presence of this membership program is evidence that there is public buy-in to the mission of the Pizzuti Collection.

It was also interesting to see the dedication to supporting individual artists that both families showcased in their collections. Both have commissioned artists for works and desire to bring artists to their communities. The Pizzuti family takes their art a step further, by incorporating selections from their collection into their business décor and in their art centric Joseph Hotel in Columbus. The Pizzutis have also generated commissions from Ohio artists for display in the hotel (Pizzuti Collection, 2016).

**Financial Health and Public Support Analysis**

Before the analysis begins, it is important to state that for the purposes of this analysis, the Contemporary Arts Foundation is the listing that the RFC files its
form 990 under, however, the financial data will continue to be referred to as the RFC when discussing information from the Contemporary Arts Foundation form 990.

There is a marked difference in the way that each organization reports its financial information. This is not uncharacteristic in the nonprofit sector, however, as there is room for interpretation as to how certain revenues and expenses are classified for financial reporting purposes, as the IRS does not mandate it. Information from the RFC could only be gathered from the 990, but the Pizzuti Collection also had additional reporting requirements from their local community foundation’s donor resources. This report gave a more detailed breakdown of revenue and expenses than the instructions for reporting requirements on the 990 (The Columbus Foundation, 2014). As a result, a more in depth analysis could be conducted of the financial picture for the Pizzuti collection as opposed to the information available from the RFC as they had no other additional reporting requirements.

There are some important differences to make note of regarding the amounts of public support that is received by these private museums. The first major difference was the presence of a membership program at the Pizzuti Collection (Pizzuti Collection, 2016). This is a direct source of revenue for the Pizzuti Collection, and it signals opportunity for the public to be involved and also experience some perks by supporting the mission of the organization. While Mr. Pizzuti is still listed as the largest contributor to the Pizzuti Collection on the 2013
form 990, there are not large sums of contributions from corporations as there is on the RFC form 990 (Internal Revenue Service, 2013). Any corporate gifts to the Pizzuti Collection are also acknowledged on their website, unlike the RFC (Pizzuti Collection, 2016; Rubell Family Collection, 2016).

In terms of the breakdown of expenses for each organization, as mentioned earlier, each organization reports slightly different in terms of expense and revenue classifications. The largest example of this is that the RFC, in order to make some numbers work out, must report their administrative salaries and compensation as program related, otherwise, the percentages do not add up, as can be seen in the table below. Another financial point of interest is the wide variation of revenues seen on the Pizzuti Collection Form 990 from 2013 to 2014 in the amount of a little more than six million dollars. As can be inferred from the schedule of contributors and the time of the Form 990, this is most likely the gift of the building to the Pizzuti Collection from him (Internal Revenue Service 2013; Internal Revenue Service 2014). The financials of the RFC seem to have remained more or less consistent over the last two years of Form 990s available (Internal Revenue Service 2012; Internal Revenue Service, 2013). Both organizations reported increases in program related expenses for the last two years of publicly available Form 990s, signaling continued growth of the programs at the organizations.
Table 1. Expense Classifications for the Rubell Family Collection and The Pizzuti Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expense Type</th>
<th>Pizzuti Collection Expenses Reported FY 2013 (% of expenses)</th>
<th>Rubell Family Collection Expenses Reported FY 2013 (% of expenses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>86 (50 if admin fees taken out of program expense amount)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no direct data available from the 990s to be able to analyze the financial public support in terms of charitable gifts made to either organization, as Private Operating Foundations form 990-PF does not have a section where they break down contributions according to category (charitable gifts, grants, etc.). What is available, though, are the amounts given by the highest percentage contributors, and their income producing activities schedules. For both organizations, the highest contributor was the founder, or the founder's business interest. Both collections also reported revenues from special events, but the Pizzuti Collection did not have the exhibition fees, program fees, or shipping reimbursements that were reported by the RFC. Rather, they had membership fees to include, which the RFC did not
Community Impact Analysis

The Pizzuti Collection and the RFC have both had distinct impact in their respective cities. While the research gathered cannot point to a causation relationship of arts led revitalization in the neighborhoods where the collections are located, there is a correlation between the amount of arts activity in the cities and the location of the collections. The establishment of the RFC in the Wynwood neighborhood and the bringing of the Art Basel art fair to Miami contributed to the growth of arts activity in the neighborhood. The Pizzuti Collection, on the other hand was established in a neighborhood that was already in the process of its arts cultural revitalization.

Both of the collections inhabit revitalized locations, the RFC within an old Drug Enforcement Agency warehouse, and the Pizzuti collection in an old insurance office building (Pizzuti Collection, 2016; Rubell Family Collection 2016). Both of the founders of the collections are involved in real estate development, so the creation of the collections at their locations is a specialty of the families who founded the collections.

Generation of Public Value Analysis

Mission is key to the focus of an organization’s activities. The Pizzuti Collection has a stated mission statement, but the RFC does not (Pizzuti Collection, 2016). The RFC is able, however, to define their overall goals and charitable
activities, as evident from the 2013 990 form (Internal Revenue Service, 2013). Typically, private museums set goals to better “support or enhance a city or region’s cultural landscape” (Larry’s List, 2016). Both organizations complete requirements included in the strategic triangle for effective public management, which includes the successful generation of a public value (Moore, 1995). The organizations clearly have very high levels of capacity both organizationally and authorizing environment-wise, and this contributes to an equally high level of public value generation.

Comparison of authorizing environments of the two collections yields results that represent the different interests of the two collections. The Pizzuti Collection seeks funder diversification from multiple revenue streams including individual, corporate, foundation, and government funding sources (The Pizzuti Collection, 2016; M. Becker, personal communication, October 2014). The RFC does not appear to be seeking this type of diversification. The largest organizations that have contributed to the RFC all appear to be corporate donors. From the information available, the RFC does not offer memberships or seek donations from individuals (Internal Revenue Service, 2013; Rubell Family Collection, 2016). The RFC also does not solicit volunteer assistance for their organization. Visibility and legitimacy with the public is an area where both of the organizations excel, and as a result they also exhibit high levels of media relations. Relations with government regulators are not explicitly stated by either collection, but the Pizzuti Collection has received funding from local organizations like the Greater Columbus Arts Council and the Columbus Foundation (Pizzuti Collection, 2016). While it could be interpreted that the RFC did
not have positive government relations by being included in the request for information from the Senate investigation committee, the RFC did comply and report the requested information and was happy, even, to provide information for the investigation (Rodriguez & Wooldridge, 2015).

Observations about the organizational capacity of the organizations yielded similar results. Levels of innovation within each of the organizations are extremely high. The RFC was the innovator of this “Miami Model” institution, and the Pizzuti Collection is not a carbon copy of the RFC, but has innovated in its own to expand their programming in a way that made sense for the community that they inhabit. The staff levels are also relatively small for an organization that accomplishes so much programming. The board compositions are also still relatively small and close knit for the size of the organizations, as they do have operating budgets slightly under the million-dollar mark. Morale among the organizations staff also seems high and optimistic. This is encouraging to see in an older organization such as the RFC and equally encouraging to see in a younger organization. There seems to be much optimism in the future of the organizations and they truly believe in the work that their organizations are accomplishing in their communities. This work is visible in the community through the revitalization of neighborhoods and adding to the cultural vitality of smaller arts communities and turning them into larger landmarks on the arts world map.

There is also public value generated by the existence and operation of these collections. The access of the local communities to contemporary art is markedly
increased due to the presence of these collections in their communities. While neither organization has a posted strategic plan, they do have missions and/or goals that they set out to accomplish. Both of these mission and goal statements relate to exposure to contemporary art for the communities that founders call home. The educational mission is viewed as slightly separate from the Rubell Family Collection through their establishment of the Contemporary Arts Foundation, but the RFC and the Contemporary Arts Foundation are inextricably linked, one could not exist without the other. While the Pizzuti Collection is not incorporated in this nature, their mission is present in all of their programming. Art critics and community leaders alike have praised both collections for their contributions to their communities.

It is interesting that both private collection museums generate similar levels of public value because of the marked age difference and length of time that the organizations and families have been present in their communities. While it was not a focus in this study, the length of time that a collection is present in a community does not seem to impact the generation of public value. Both Collections present their artworks in their community, and, in the case of the RFC, the artwork even impacts other communities around the world (Rubell Family Collection, 2016).

The Pizzuti Collection and the Rubell Family Collection satisfy the requirements of the strategic triangle and generate public value for their respective communities. Clearly there are positives externalities generated by these collections that affect the greater local communities of Miami, Florida and
Columbus, Ohio. Through an analysis of the various pieces that make these organizations what they are including their founders, management and governance, program offerings, financial and public support and their generation of public value, it can be seen that the collections are much more similar than they are different. While this is to be expected since the RFC is considered the example “Miami Model” institution and collectors seeking to establish their own collection often look to this model, there is room for innovation and organizational learning as time passes and the individual founders can tailor their institution as needed. Innovation is present in the Pizzuti Collection’s case to adapt to the needs of the Columbus community as opposed to the Miami community. Overall, however, the basic premise of a private collection “Miami Model” institution is the organizational standard framework followed by these two organizations.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

Throughout this thesis, two private collection museums, The Pizzuti Collection and the Rubell Family Collection, were analyzed as case studies. The case studies attempted to compare the two organizations in terms of the profiles of their founders, their management and governance strategies, the programs that they provide to their communities, their financial health and amount of public support, their levels of community impact, and finally their ability to generate public value. This information was gathered from publicly available sources so as to study the organizations from a public, rather than insider, perspective to gather what opinion the general public might also gather from what they see of these institutions. The conclusion of this thesis will discuss the results of the case studies and their cross-analysis and relate the results to the broader field of museum studies. Discussions on public value will also come into play as the answers to the originally proposed research questions are also discussed. In conclusion, the answers to the questions will be synthesized to discuss broader implications that arise from the existence and operations of these private collection museums.

As discussed in the introduction, my central question is: What is a “Miami Model” institution, or private museum and how does this institution fit into the
existing visual arts museum organizational paradigm? This question has two parts that were looked at over the course of this research:

- What is a “Miami Model” institution, or private museum and
- Where does it fit into existing paradigms?

**What is a “Miami Model” Institution, or Private Museum?**

To answer portion 1, there were three larger conceptual questions:

- Why does the private collection exist?
- What do the organizational frameworks of these organizations look like and how do they operate? And
- What is their relationship with their founders?

From the data gathered in the case studies, it seemed that the quotes from the founders as to why they decided to open their collections filled some type of perceived gap in the current lay of the museum land in their respective communities. Both collectors cited that they did not want to break up their collections in donations to museums for fear of the pieces being separated. They viewed their collections as a whole, rather than separate parts, and it was important to them that their painstakingly gathered collections, assembled over the course of forty or more years, remained in tact. They also wanted their pieces to be displayed. They felt that traditional museums lacked the space to accommodate the showing of their pieces, and they did not want their pieces sitting in a museum basement for years on end, never seeing the light of day. Other mentions and surveys of the areas before the addition of the private collection museums to their respective cities noted
a perception of a lack of access to contemporary art in the communities where these
two collections reside. This makes the existence of the collections logical, really.
There is a gap of access to contemporary art and a gap in ability of public
institutions to display art in the way that the collectors desired. Having the means to
do so, the collectors took matters into their own hands and opened their own
institutions to fill these perceived gaps.

Concerning what the organizations look like from the management and
governance aspect, they are relatively similar in structure and operations to their
public museum counterparts, just on a smaller scale. The organizations both have
the standard board and administration, if their administration is to be quantified, it
would be considered smaller than the average public museum, but, to be fair, the
private museums are smaller in budget and scope of offerings. Does this mean that
they will always be this size? Maybe, but there is also potential for growth as the
organizations age. These are relatively young organizations compared to their
public counterparts in their respective cities.

The relationship of the founders to the organization is a key aspect to their
management and governance as well as to the overall vision of the organizations.
Obviously, the organizations in question would not exist without the art collection of
the founders. As a result, there is a close relationship with the founder and the
organization. The founders and their families sit on the governance boards, and also
have control, to an extent, in the day-to-day operations of the organizations. For
example, the Rubell family curates their own shows in conjunction with their
executive director. They make the call as to what is shown in their space. The Pizzuti Collection is a bit more hands-off it would seem, as Mr. and Mrs. Pizzuti are not actively making curatorial decisions, but the Pizzuti Family is still a stakeholder that must be satisfied by the organization, and has a final say in operations.

One additional question that has been added to this conversation as a result is what the extent of founder’s syndrome might be in these organizations. Only time will most likely tell, but if these collection museums follow suit with the private collection museums such as the Frick or Guggenheim museums that also began as private collections, then their legacy will live on beyond the life span of the founders, but that must be a conscientious choice that will need reflected in the governance of the organization as the founders age.

**Where does the Private Museum Fit in Existing Paradigms?**

Moving on to answer portion 2, the following subquestions arose:

- What public value do these museums provide?
- What existing frameworks for understanding museums do these organizations fit into?

As the research progressed, it became clear that public value of the collections would be an effective way to gauge their worth to their communities. While public value, and the strategic triangle are concepts typically applied to government agencies, it has been previously applied to state arts councils, and therefore can be transferrable to other arts organizations, and should be transferred. The concepts of the strategic triangle translated quite well to gauging
the effectiveness of the factors at play within the case museums and understanding the operation and worth of these organizations. This application of public value to a private nonprofit will be extremely useful to the museum studies field moving forward in an age where organizations need to validate their existence and public services provided to continue to maintain their nonprofit status. The strategic triangle exposes management strengths and weaknesses and lets organizations see how they generate public value. This will better allow museum administrators to tell their stories to public supporters and government funders. This tool should absolutely be used by arts organizations that benefit from any type of public funding.

From the understanding of public value as interpreted for this study, both organizations generated public value. There was not enough evidence from the literature to say that one organization can provide more public value than another organization, as the concept has not been quantified. It is enough to say that public value is generated to satisfy Moore’s strategic triangle. More research could be conducted to determine if comparison between organizations is appropriate on the basis of public value generation. It would also be interesting to compare the public value provided by a private museum with the public value provided by a public museum to see if there are differences or similarities. It was never explicitly determined that the organizations are managed or governed with this public value concept at the forefront of their strategies. The fact that the public value was present was purely coincidental, and unintentional to the knowledge of this
researcher. This creates the question of what would these museums look like if public value was a part of their management strategies?

When looking at a “framework” for understanding museums, this research considered an existing framework to be the legal structure, or the 501(c)(3) designation that is possessed by organizations. There are legal mandates that organizations possessing these qualifications must comply with. This includes the law that the 501(c)(3) must have a board of directors and comply with reporting requirements. In possessing this classification, the private museums, as operating foundations, fill out the Form 990 PF, rather than the standard Form 990 that exists for public charities. The private museums in this study were found to comply with these legalities.

**Procedural Questions**

Digging deeper, the procedural questions that were explored in this study included:

- What were the policy windows, gaps in services perceived, and/or other environmental factors that pushed for the creation of a private museum?
- How do the founders describe their experience of starting these institutions and their continued role within the organization?
- How do administrators of these institutions describe their experiences and their relationship with their founder?
- How does the general museum administration field view these institutions?
What are the perceived differences between a public, collecting museum and a “Miami Model” museum?

Is there a difference in experience that a guest has in a “Miami Model” institution?

What are the benefits that access to contemporary art provides to the public?

Are these institutions even able to be considered “institutions”? Or are they still formalizing?

There were no directly evident policy windows impacting the formation of private museums in the United States. If anything, the diagnosis might be a bit of “keeping up with the Joneses” occurring between the art collectors in the United States, and around the world. These art collectors know each other and are consistently ranked in “Top” lists in the industry. It might have begun with a perception of a gap in access of contemporary art in the communities where the collectors reside, but that does not validate the existence of the private museums in areas that already have booming contemporary art scenes, like New York. Cleary a perceived gap in service was not the only reason for establishing these collections.

With the speed of information sharing today, it would seem that the trend has arisen as word of success of these establishments spreads around the world. There was almost a ripple effect in the establishment of collections in the United States. The Rubell Family Collection opened in the late nineties, and other area collectors seemed to follow suit. Word spread around the country, and now private museums are popping up from coast to coast in the US. If there was to be a
comparison, this popularity could be likened to the popularity of establishing a family foundation among the tech billionaires, beginning with Bill and Melinda Gates, and now, Mark Zuckerberg and his wife have established their own family foundation. It might even be a possibility to say that this “trend” among art collectors might become permanent as time wears on.

Concerning the relationship between the founders and administrators, this study was inconclusive. There was not much publicly available information on this topic. Quotes that were collected in this study did not seem to address any of the inside workings of the day-to-day operations of the organizations. Further research should be conducted to gain access to the founders and their administrators to see what the answers to this question might be. There were quotes collected from the founders that described their experiences as to why they established a private collection instead of donating to the local public museum, and the answers dealt with the “basement problem” that many museums today are experiencing.

Collectors want their collections to remain together and to be shown together. This is a restriction on a gift that museum administrators are wise not to accept. While some compromises have been reached, such as the existence of loan programs that the private museums participate in, and the donation of entire wings to a public museum to house collections, it is not likely that collectors of acquisitions numbering in the thousands of pieces will donate to a public museum if they seek a certain level of control over the museum donation. The private collection organization itself is the compromise here, the collector gets their tax deduction and
fulfillment of altruism, the public gets the art, and the museums do not need to worry about tricky donation restrictions.

While there was mention of a perceived threat to the museum community due to the existence of these private collection museums in a few of the editorial articles researched, the only negative opinions that were seen were the ones from said editorial pieces. There were some mentions in Pupo e Silva’s study of the organizations in Miami of hostility with the public museum, but there were other extenuating circumstances at play that influenced those feelings. In a community such as Columbus, where there is a thriving public museum with a significant collection of its own, there were no public statements made about the existence of another visual art institution in the area. Statements made by other Columbus public officials and policy influencers, not museum administrators, viewed the addition of the private museum as a positive for the community.

If there is a difference in visitor experience at these organizations, it is that the private museum is a smaller, more niche exhibition than what is experienced at a standard public museum. Public museums collect for educational purposes, and private collections show the pieces that they have purchased, which usually means that the collectors’ taste plays into what is available to be seen. While there are arguments as to why allowing the art collecting upper class to set “taste”, that was not a focus of this study. Rather, the focus for this study was that there was an expansion of access to contemporary art for the communities where the private collections museums reside.
While this research did not uncover any data that directly discussed the benefit of the access of contemporary art to these communities, it is worth mentioning the positive impacts that these collections have had on their neighborhoods. Both collection museums inhabit once down trodden neighborhoods. Their activity in their locations is an indication of cultural vitality. The Rubell Family Collection played an important role in bringing an internationally renowned art fair to the Miami area, leading to an art revival and increase in cultural tourism and industry to the area. The Pizzuti Collection brings another cultural destination to the Columbus art scene, the cherry on top, if you will, of the revitalization of the historic Short North Arts district in Columbus, signaling the maturation of the area as a wealth of art. Correlations, however, do not necessarily mean causation, but it would be neglectful to not discuss the role that these collections play in their communities.

In terms of the life cycle of these private collection museums, data indicates that it is safe to say that these organizations are either currently, or on their way to becoming institutions in their neighborhoods. There is a certain timeline that it seems is followed by these organizations, from inception to establishment, to sustainment, and finally to institutionalization. In Miami, for example, the Rubell Family Collection has become a cultural landmark and world famous for their exhibitions of their Collection. This is clearly the mark of an “institution”. While the private collection museums might not have the historical roots of their public counterparts, they can be adopted as an institution in their communities. There is an
associated longevity that is required before a collection museum might be considered an institution. Therefore, not all of the private collection museums will reach this stage of notoriety. There are other factors that contribute to the institutionalization of these organizations including the strength of the collection being exhibited. Not all art collections are capable of creating the buzz that the case organizations have generated. More research could shed light to the exact effects of time on these organizations.

**Private Collection Museums: More than a Trend**

The trend of establishing private collection, or "Miami Model" museums is not ceasing anytime soon. As the field is growing, there will be much to learn about these new institutions and to discover what can be learned from them in the future. This thesis only skimmed the surface of available knowledge on these organizations by studying two American private collection museums. The two private collection museums observed in this study are much more alike than they are different. Pizzuti Collection model might be considered an expansion of the Rubell originating Miami Model. The RFC runs more like a foundation, and the Pizzuti Collection more along the lines of a public charity.

This researcher's goal was not to determine if one organization generates more public value than the other, but rather to validate their existence by saying that the private collections museums do benefit their communities and contribute positively to the communities that they reside in. While it seems that some organizational activities contribute intentionally to the generation of public value,
there are also externalities that occur from the activities of these organizations that also generate public value. Research indicates that it is not reasonable to compare the private museum to the public museum, as their reporting requirements are different. If it is desired for them to have similar public programs and benefit to their communities, then measures should be put in place that they report in a similar nature to their public counterparts so that they will organize with that generation of public benefit in mind. Until that requirement is made, however, the fact that these organizations provide any benefit to their community is a positive externality.

The addition of these private collection museums to the encompassing museum field is an exciting development given the difficulty of public institutions to provide contemporary artwork due to the prohibitive cost of the contemporary art market. Therefore, the existence of these museums in communities, affects the surrounding cultural landscape as well. There may be a trend towards establishment of the private museum now, causing the field to explode, but over time, flawed business plans, weaker collections, and lack of sustaining support will most likely weed out some of the organizations. Public museums have nothing to fear from these organizations. Rather, the private museum makes the public museums’ lives easier by providing artwork loans and allowing them to focus on their collections rather than making sure that a donor is satisfied with the display of their painstakingly assembled personal collection. The addition of the private collection museum is a positive evolution within the current museum ecosystem.
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