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Abstract:
In the spring of 2009, Museum-Ed conducted a survey of the educational programming at art museums across the United States. Ninety-eight museums replied, answering questions on nine topics: tours; informal gallery learning; libraries in museums; community, adult and family programs; classes and other public programs; partnerships with other organizations; school programs; online educational resources; and social media. The 2009 survey expanded on a similar survey conducted in 2003 by Museum-Ed. The results from both 2003 and 2009 surveys are presented in this report, allowing a comparison in changes over time at U.S. art museums. Chief among the changes was a predictable increase in online resources and the usage of social media (which was practically non-existent in 2003). Other changes, such as a drop in the number of Community Advisory Boards, were unexpected, and invite further research. At the same time the 2009 U.S. art museum program survey was conducted, an identical survey of European museums was undertaken by Cora Steffen, a graduate student from the University of Lugano, Switzerland. Sixty-two European museums from 13 countries completed the European survey, and the results of the U.S. and European surveys are also compared in this report.
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Introduction
About the Survey
Between March and April of 2009, 98 art museums\(^1\) across the United States completed an online survey regarding the principal types of programs currently undertaken by their education departments. The 2009 survey repeated many of the questions that appeared in an earlier survey undertaken by Museum-Ed in 2003.\(^2\)

Both surveys asked museum educators what their museums participated in or offered in seven areas of programming: tours; informal gallery learning; community, adult and family programs; classes and other public programs; partnerships with other organizations; school programs; and online educational resources. The responses available to educators in 2009 were updated to include popular fill-in answers from 2003, as well as technology and social media (such as Twitter, Facebook, etc) that simply did not exist in 2003. In addition, a section was added in 2009 to ask educators about programs with libraries in museums. For many art museums, libraries have the potential to become sites for programming, especially if they are open to the public.\(^3\)

The 2009 survey was publicized through the Museum-Ed Discussion List and targeted emails to those museum education departments who had completed the 2003 survey. Both surveys used LimeSurvey, a free, open source survey tool that was hosted on the Museum-Ed Web server.

As in the 2003 survey, a broad range of museums responded to the 2009 survey: from small museums with only one part-time educator on staff to the Metropolitan Museum of Art with 65 full-time educators on staff. The median was four full time staff, one less staff person than the median in 2003. The size of the museums participating in the survey ranged from 5,300 square feet to five city blocks, and the size of the museums’ collections ranged from less than 100 objects, to six million objects (The National Postal Museum). The median museum collection size was 9,000 objects. The annual operating budgets of museums completing the survey ranged from $200,000 per year to $35 million per year (less than 2003’s 49 million). The median annual operating budget was $4,000,000. Annual visitors ranged from 6,000 to 4.5 million people, the median being 100,000 visitors.

---

\(^1\) See appendix 1 for a list of U.S. museums who responded to the survey.
\(^2\) The 2003 survey report is available at: [http://www.museum-ed.org/content/view/63/53/](http://www.museum-ed.org/content/view/63/53/)
\(^3\) See appendix 3 for a complete copy of the 2009 survey.
US and European Art Museums Compared

While U.S. art museums were responding to the 2009 survey, an identical survey of European art museum education programs was being undertaken by Cora Steffen, a graduate student from the University of Lugano, Switzerland. Sixty-two European museums from 13 countries completed the survey. Spain, Switzerland, Italy, England, and the Netherlands were home to most of these, which ranged from strictly fine art museums to historic homes with art collections. The number of educators at each institution ranged from zero to 25, with an average of seven people, and a median of two. The annual visitorship ranged from four million visitors (at the National Gallery, London), to less than 500. Square footage and annual budgets were hard to determine given various exchange rates and possible translation issues with units of measure.

It is important to remember when comparing the data from the US and European surveys that the number of museums that took each survey differed. Ninety-eight US museums completed the survey, while only 62 completed the European version. One US museum’s answer is equivalent to almost 1%, while the European museum’s answer is about 1.6%. This results in the individual European museums’ answers having a larger effect on the results than individual US museum’s responses.

It is also unknown to what extent translation difficulties affected the European survey’s results. The original survey was composed using terms common to American art museum education. It is not known whether these phrases are used in European art museums, or if the way questions were worded was clear to the non-American reader.

Notes and Limitations

The 2003 survey and the 2009 survey allow a comparison in changes in programs over time at U.S. art museums. It should be noted, however, that not all the museums responding in 2003 filled out the 2009 survey. Thirty-three museums responded to both the 2003 and 2009 surveys, and where it was appropriate their answers are compared. In the future, working toward a more consistent data pool will make comparisons more meaningful.

This report also compared large and small museums, and it should be noted that the number of education staff reported determined “large” and “small” museums. The ten museums with the most staff were classified as “largest” and the ten with least staff “smallest.” The museums were not classified by their budget, size, or visitors, or by the ratio of full-time educators to any of those numbers. However, 18 of the educators did not provide this information, potentially skewing the results. Another area that may have resulted in inaccuracies was the lack of a consistent format for how to report full-time and part-time workers. When this

__________________________

4 See appendix 2 for a complete list of European museums who responded to the survey.
information was reported, full-time staff was counted as one employee, and part-
time staff was counted as one-half. Whether this truly reflects the number of
hours they work per week is unknown.

The 2009 survey also included a question for every topic area which read as
follows: “In your opinion, will your museum’s commitment to [topic, such as
“Tours” or “Informal Gallery Learning”] increase, decrease, or stay the same over
the next 5 years?” Overall, respondents almost invariably chose “increase” as the
answer. It seems that very few of the respondents were able to anticipate any
cutbacks at their museums or within their programs. In future years, it may be
worthwhile to put a finer point on the term “commitment” by exploring different
types of commitment: budgetary, resource-based, staff, or philosophical.

At first glance, it appears that European museums had less educational
programming overall. It’s possible that museum education from country to
country in Europe may be different. Different terms, and different roles may be
assigned to museum education programs in different countries. In the future,
perhaps more country- or region-specific surveys could be developed to address
this, asking questions in terms and about topics that European museums’ self-
identify as important to their practice. Along with future European art museum
surveys, perhaps other countries such as Canada, Mexico and other South
American countries can be included. Ambitions for future surveys could also be
applied to the U.S., tailoring the survey to different types of art museums,
particularly those associated with colleges or universities. What are their
particular challenges and needs?
2009 United States Survey Results
Tour Programs in the United States

Over 90% of the museums indicated that they have group tours and specialized tours for school groups, similar to the 2003 survey results. Programs focused on training docents to conduct guided tours were the third most popular in both 2003 and 2009. More than half of the museums indicated that they have multiple-visit tours for schools, self-guided tours, specialized group tours for college students, and tours for groups with special needs.

The 2009 survey included several tour categories that were not included in 2003. The new categories were added after a review of the 2003 written responses under the “Other” category. The new categories included “Cell Phone Audio Tours,” “Tours with Hand-Held Devices,” “Private Tours,” “Specialized Tours for College/University Students,” and “Tours for Groups with Special Needs.” Written answers in 2009’s “Other” category decreased significantly after these additions.

Though the 2009 data may imply that fewer museums offer audio tours, a comparison of the percentage of museums offering audio tours in 2003 (54%) to the combined percentage of those offering audio tours and cell phone audio tours in 2009 (59%) shows roughly equivalent results. With the addition of the 2009 responses for hand-held devices (13%), there may be an increase in the availability of tour programming on personal technology (user-owned or not).
When the answers of the ten largest and ten smallest museums (as determined by number of staff) are compared, a different set of data is highlighted. Smaller museums lag behind in most of their tour offerings except “Specialized Tours for College/University Students.” This makes sense because eight of the ten smallest museums responding to the survey were associated with a college or university. Since the small museums in this comparison are mostly colleges, it is worth speculating that technology would be an appealing way for these museums to reach students. The survey results do not support this speculation, and so suggest that further research is appropriate in this area.

Informal Gallery Learning Programs in the United States
Informal gallery learning programs were identified in both the 2003 and 2009 surveys as areas in museum galleries where learning materials are provided. These areas could include activity centers for kids, an area to watch a film or video, or computer learning stations. Informal gallery learning programs may or may not be staffed. Informal gallery learning programs do not include didactic materials presented with works of art, nor do they include printed materials that can be defined as self-guides to museum galleries.

Most of the 2009 survey results were similar to 2003 in regard to informal gallery learning programs. Over half (55%) of the art museums surveyed in 2009 have
kids’ activity areas in their galleries. Seventy four percent have in-galler y educational programming for visitors, such as art carts for adult learners, reading rooms, learning resource areas, or films or video shown in the gallery.

In 2003, 45% of respondents classified their informal gallery learning programs as “Other.” In the 2009 survey a new category, “Education Galleries,” was added, referring to galleries or rooms entirely devoted to educational programming or exhibits. Thirty-eight percent of the museums surveyed in 2009 have education galleries. This reduced the percentage of museums that answered “Other” to 2%. Of these, one had an area to watch conservation in process, and the other offered a full-scale art studio that is open during museum hours.

In the 2009 survey, respondents were asked if their informal gallery learning areas included technology for use by visitors. The results show that about half of the museums with informal gallery learning areas include technology like computer stations, listening stations, or interactive games that utilize technology. The percentage of informal gallery learning areas that included technology was about the same for both large and small museums, refuting a common assumption that small museums are less able to install and support in-gallery technologies because of budgetary restrictions.
Libraries and Museum Educators in the United States
The 2009 Art Museum Education Survey included a section on libraries in art museums that was not included in the 2003 survey. Seventy-four percent of the respondents' museums had libraries, and 44% of the libraries were open to the public. Twenty-seven percent of the respondents said that their education departments participated in educational programming with or for the library, but the 2009 survey did not pose questions that might reveal what types of programming education departments are conducting in conjunction with their museum libraries.

A search through a 2002 survey of art museum libraries conducted by the Art Library Society of North America revealed numerous comments about libraries working with curators but only one instance of a librarian working with an education department. Curators, it seems, are often involved in all aspects of museum libraries—as collection consultants, exhibit developers and regular library users. In future surveys, it may make some sense to first ask educators if they themselves are users of museum libraries, a baseline we neglected to include in this survey.

---

Community, Adult, and Family Programming in the United States

In 2009, as in 2003, 100% of the museums responding indicated that they have some type of community, adult, and/or family programming. Family days remained the most popular community programs among art museums.

There was a small (11%) decline in visiting artist programs from 2003 to 2009. Areas other than education often arrange visiting artists, and education staff is responsible for programmatically tying into a visiting artist’s agenda, making it hard to say which department is ultimately responsible. Visiting artists could have been categorized as school programs instead of community programs, because some museums involve schools in these initiatives.

There was also a noticeable decline in “Community Advisory Boards,” from 73% in 2003 to 40% in 2009. This decline prompted further analysis of the data. Of the 33 museums that responded to the Art Museum Education Programs Survey in both 2009 and 2003, 24 had Community Advisory Boards in 2003. Over six years, ten of these museums dropped their community advisory boards. Five of the 33 responding museums created Community Advisory Boards. Thus in 2009, 19 of the 33 repeat responders still had (or had created) Community Advisory Boards, a 21% decline within that population.

As in other areas of the survey, the “Community, Adult and Family Programs” section of the 2009 survey included a category not in the 2003 survey. The new category, “Specialized Programs for Local Artists,” was added after a review of the 2003 written responses under the “Other” category. Written answers in the 2009 “Other” category decreased significantly after this addition. The 2% left in the “Other” category included specialized programs for university students (hosted by a university museum), and specialized programs for families that fell outside the definition of a “Family Day.”
When the responses of the ten largest and ten smallest museums that completed the 2009 survey were compared, the results followed general expectations based on budget, size of staff, etc. In the categories of “Specialized Programs for Teens” and “Family Days,” the low participation of the ten smallest museums can probably be attributed to the fact that the majority of those museums are associated with a college or university. “Evening Events for Adults,” a category defined as socializing opportunities open to the public including gallery crawls and singles’ events, was universally popular.
Classes and Other Public Programs in the United States

Different from community programs that offer informal learning conditions, “Classes and Other Public Programs” are defined as formal, structured learning situations, open to registrants rather than the drop-in museum visitor. Overall, programming in this category decreased in 2009. Whether this can be attributed to the drop in the median number of museum educators, a redistribution of resources to other programs, or simply that different museums responded in 2009, is unknown. As in 2003, the 2009 survey results showed lectures to be the most commonly offered type of public program at art museums, followed by classes specifically offered to teachers. Eighty-three percent of the art museums surveyed offer some type of teacher training program.

One art center pointed out that performances are often organized by performing arts staff and may not be included in an education department’s offerings, potentially skewing the answers to this question. Other museums offer classes through schools; for example, one art museum offers college credit for a museum-taught high school contemporary art history class. A few museums include art schools in their organizational structure, with classes offered through the school’s programming staff.

Based on the kinds of events that museums listed in the “Other” category in 2003, we added “Symposia” and “Travel Programs” to the 2009 survey. As with other questions on the survey, the “Other” category shrunk as a result.
Additional analysis of the “Classes and Other Public Programs” data based on comparing the responses of the ten largest and ten smallest museums reveals that smaller museums lag behind in all of the categories surveyed, with the exception of “Lectures” and “Classes for Kids” (such as Saturday classes or after-school programming). As in 2003, lectures remain the most often offered educational program in art museums, so it is no surprise that large and small museums alike offer lectures. “Classes for Kids” were only offered by 64% of all museums that responded to the 2009 survey, so it is surprising that small museums have a higher rate of offering (80%). Although, given their emphasis on education (eight of the ten smallest museums were associated with universities), perhaps this is not out of character.
Partnerships with Other Organizations in the United States
The 2009 survey results regarding art museum partnerships with other organizations were generally similar to those of 2003, with the exception of a rise in the number of partnerships with other arts organizations. Unlike 2003, in which 100% of the museums had partnerships, three of the museums responding to the 2009 survey had no partnerships. “Partnerships with Universities” overtook “Partnerships with K-12 Schools” in 2009 as the most popular partnership.

In 2009 “Partnerships with Libraries” was added as a survey option, and 47% of the museums responded that they partner with libraries. “Other” partnerships listed were with performing arts centers and a local county gifted student program. One distinct partnership was with the U.S. Department of Justice’s “Weed and Seed” program, which aims to “weed out” drugs and petty violence, and “seed” community involvement and support. The museum, as part of this partnership, offers free after-school art classes to at-risk elementary students.

When the subsets of the ten largest and ten smallest museums are compared, only one of the small museums has a partnership with a K-12 school. This may be explained by the fact that eight of the ten small museums are associated with universities, making them more likely to focus on their own college educational community and less likely to serve the K-12 community.
School Programs in the United States

Ninety-three percent of the museums that completed the 2009 survey reported that they offer K-12 school programs other than “Specialized Tours for School Groups.” This is down from the 100% response of 2003. The most popular school program offering was “Pre-visit Materials” (81%), which includes materials delivered in print or online, as well as pre-tour visits by museum staff or volunteers.

The number of museums providing materials for use in the classroom dropped by 25% from 2003 to 2009. Upon further analysis of the 33 museums that completed the survey in both 2003 and 2009, 32 of those museums offered classroom materials in 2003, while only 26 continue to today—a 19% drop. It is possible that this type of programming has not declined, but simply been moved over to the “Online Educational Programming” section of the 2009 survey under the category of “Online Activities or Lessons.”

Most of the other categories dropped only slightly from 2003 to 2009. The addition of the “Teacher Resource Room” and “Homeschool Programs” categories in the 2009 survey may account for the drop in responses to the “Other” category from 2003. One of the unique school programs mentioned in the 2009 survey was the Duval County Public Schools Visual Education Center, a lending library of posters and sculptures for teachers, which is housed at the Cummer Museum of Art and Gardens in Jacksonville, Florida.

Programs related to K-12 schools can be found in many other areas of the 2009 survey. As mentioned above, much of the audience that makes up group tours in art museums are K-12 students. Classes specifically for teachers are listed in the “Classes and Other Public Programs” section of the survey, and many museums operate advisory boards of teachers, reported in the section “Community, Adult and Family Programs.”
When the results from the ten largest and ten smallest museums are compared, very little is surprising considering the differences in budget and staff resources between large and small museums. However, the popularity of “Homeschool Programs” in the small museums may be significant, making it an appropriate area for further research.
Online Educational Programming in the United States

In 2009, 100% of art museums surveyed reported they have a museum Web site. Ninety-three percent of these museums offer online information about their education programs, a 2% increase from 2003. The percentage of museums that have their collections online (54%) has not changed since 2003. However, when the 33 museums that completed both the 2003 and 2009 surveys were compared, there was a 15% increase in “Collections Online.” The number of museums offering online activities or lessons increased 10% from 2003 to 2009.

Several new categories were added to the 2009 survey to reflect the changing online environment. The responses to these new options were significant: 29% of the museums that completed the 2009 survey offer online scheduling, 23% offer educational interactives and games, 13% offer personal collections (sets of images or information that could be saved for future use), 23% offer online exhibits, and 11% offer video conferencing and e-learning. In the comment area, three educators remarked that they have more extensive online outreach in development. The educators also listed other online programs their museums offer, such as online videos featuring artists, curators and scholars; a homework help site; and a special teen-oriented site.
When online educational programming of the ten largest and ten smallest museums was compared, there are few surprises. Web sites are now a ubiquitous aspect of any institution’s marketing, so both large and small museums reported having Web sites. However, more intricate endeavors—like online scheduling, online exhibits, or online activities and games that might utilize technology like Flash, suffer from the staff and budgetary constraints of a small museum.
Museums and Social Media in the United States
The 2009 survey included a section for online social media, a set of information that barely existed in 2003. Sixty percent of the respondent’s educational departments had Facebook pages, by far the most popular social media. Next were podcasts (32%), blogs (30%), Twitter accounts (21%), and MySpace pages (20%). Options for Flickr and YouTube were not included, but several educators wrote them in. Additional social media that educators entered under the “Other” field included video sites like Art Babble, Ustream.tv, and Voice Thread. Also listed were volunteer discussion boards and digital comment books.

The use of social media by the ten largest and ten smallest museums was compared. Facebook pages were popular with both groups, likely due to the ease of use and economy. Podcasts were one of the most popular ways to reach audiences for large museums, perhaps because of larger staff and budgetary resources.
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All U.S. Results
Viewing all of the data in one chart easily summarizes the results of the 2009 art museum education programming survey. Web sites remained one of the most popular offerings, but specialized tours for school groups displaced lectures as the other most popular program (when compared to the 2003 results).
2009 United States and European Art Museum Results Compared
Tour Programs – U.S. and Europe Compared

When the 2009 results from U.S. and European museums are compared, the majority of the results are similar. The categories in which U.S. and European museum’s responses were markedly different are: “Multiple Visit Programs for Schools,” “Docent/Tour Guide Programs,” “Cell Phone Tours,” and “Private Tours.”

It comes as no surprise that European museums hosted more private tours (defined as “tours offered to a private group by a paid guide not associated with the museum”) than U.S. museums, since they typically have fewer docents. Paid tour guides not directly associated with museums are much more common in Europe, versus volunteer guides who are trained by the museums they serve in the United States. This assumption is reinforced by the low percentage of European museums that have “Docent Tours,” which were defined as “formal programs to train docents or tour guides.”

The other significant difference between the U.S. and European results was the low number of museums with cell phone tours. In the U.S., cell phone tours are increasingly popular, whereas in Europe, this growth has not been paralleled. Nancy Proctor, of the Tate Modern in London, analyzed the reason for this difference in her 2007 report on mobile phone tours:

“The rapid growth of these applications in the U.S. compared to other parts of the world, including Europe (which has always benefited from a higher number of tourist attractions as well as a more developed cell phone usage), is mainly due to the presences of a more favorable business model. For example, in North America, most mobile phone users have contracts including free minutes and don’t pay roaming charges when traveling within the country [U.S.]. Most Europeans, on the contrary, have ‘pay-as-you-go’ plans instead of contracts for their mobile phones, leading to higher per minute call costs, even for local and ‘free’ numbers. Moreover, with higher percentages of foreign visitors, European museums know that greater numbers of visitors could incur high roaming fees to take a mobile phone tour.”

---

Varieties of tours that European museums listed in the “Other” category included: “VIP Tours,” tours for seniors, new mom/new parent tours for those with infants, tours in multiple languages, and audio tours specifically aimed at children.

Informal Gallery Learning Programs – U.S. and Europe Compared
The U.S. and Europe had roughly equivalent results for kids activity areas and education galleries. The U.S. had 11% more “In-Gallery Information Areas,” such as art carts for adult learners, reading rooms, learning resource areas, or films or video shown in the gallery.

When the percentages of museums that incorporated “Technology for Use By Visitors” were compared between the U.S. and Europe, U.S. museums generally had more technology available. The percentage of U.S. and European museums with education galleries was almost equal (40%), and in that case, about half of each of those museums had a technology for use by visitors.

Eleven percent of European museums reported having “Other” informal gallery learning programs, including reading rooms with art books for children, a laboratory, an art studio, and trails.
Libraries in Museums – U.S. and Europe Compared
European museums were more likely to have libraries, and if they did, the libraries were more often open to the public. Education departments collaborated more frequently with libraries in European museums than those in the U.S.
Community, Adult, and Family Programming – U.S. and Europe Compared

When the U.S. and European results for “Community, Adult, and Family Programming” were compared, the U.S. museums had more programming in nearly every area. The one significant exception was “Evening Events for Adults,” which 87% of European museums offered, compared to 76% in the U.S. This was the most commonly offered program in this category for European museums. U.S. museums’ most commonly offered program was “Family Days.”

U.S. and European museums offered statistically equivalent numbers of teen programs. Overall, U.S. and European museums offer similar variety and proportions of community, adult, and family programming, and it’s possible to assume their educational departments share the same goals, no matter the location.

Two museums in Europe that responded as having “Other” programming wrote that their programming included events for immigrants, such as “intercultural family days.” These two museums are clearly serious about their role as activists in their communities, although it’s possible other museums are doing similar programs and neglected to write it in on the survey.
Classes and Other Public Programs – U.S. and Europe Compared
The three most popular programs for U.S. museums were “Lectures” (96%), “Classes for Teachers” (83%) and “Performances” (77%). For European museums, the most popular were “Lectures” (84%), “Music,” “Classes for Kids,” and “Summer Programs for Kids” (all 74%). The biggest differences between U.S. and European museums were found in “Performances” (20% more for U.S. museums), “Travel Programs” (16% more for U.S. museums), “Classes for Teachers” (14% more for U.S. museums), “Lectures” (12% more for U.S. museums), “Films” (11% more for U.S. museums), and “Classes for Kids” (10% more for European museums).

It may be that European museums focus more on children individually, while U.S. museums prioritize reaching out to teachers, who in turn reach all of their students. This approach could be uniquely American, but that is for future researchers to determine.

It seems that a higher percentage of U.S. museums focus on having a wide range of programming (U.S. museums lead in films, performances, and travel, in addition to lectures, and classes for adults and teachers). Interestingly enough, both European and U.S. museum’s most commonly offered programs are lectures. For U.S. museums, this has not changed since the 2003 survey.
Partnerships with Other Organizations – U.S. and Europe Compared

On average, U.S. museums had slightly more partnerships than European museums (5.5%). In only one category, “Partnerships with Cities,” did European museums have a significantly higher percentage (37%, or 11% more than the U.S. museums). Roughly equivalent percentages of U.S. (64%) and European (65%) institutions partnered with other museums.

The category “Partnerships with Libraries” showed the largest difference between U.S. and European museums. U.S. museums had 21% more partnerships with libraries. However, the results from the survey’s question on “Libraries in Museums” shows that 8% more European museums have libraries, and 14% more of those are open to the public than in the U.S. Perhaps these factors lower European museums’ need to partner with outside libraries like those museums in the U.S.

The European museums who responded to “Other Partnerships” listed a variety of partners: a Finnish museum partnered with schools in Sweden, an Irish museum is a member of the Asia-Europe Museum Network, and a museum in Florence partners with the Italian Center for National Technological Research.
School Programs – U.S. and Europe Compared

As with U.S. museums, "Pre-visit Materials for Teachers" was the most popular type of school program for European institutions. "Post-visit Materials" and "Classroom Materials" were second-most popular, and 44% of both U.S. and European museums offered preschool programs. This was where the similarities ended however. Overall, U.S. museums provided a wider variety of educational materials for teachers and schools—with 25% more volunteers or staff in schools, 18% more classroom kits offered, and 13% more teacher resource rooms.

Twenty-eight percent of U.S. museums offer homeschool programs, 20% more than European institutions. Homeschooling is less common in Europe, in fact, it is illegal in Germany, so this lack of programs for homeschoolers is understandable.
Online Educational Programming – U.S. and Europe Compared

Equal percentages of the European and US museums surveyed had collections online. It could be argued that the two core online activities for art museums are a Web site and having some portion of their collections online. In these two categories, U.S. and European museums were virtually equal.

The area in which the U.S. and European museums differed most was “Online Activities and Lessons.” It is important to remember, that while the results shown here are true for the European museums captured in the survey, they are not true for all European museums. Future surveys that include more European art museums may prove this 2009 data incorrect.
Museums and Social Media – U.S. and Europe Compared
U.S. museums appear to use social media significantly more than European institutions. The European museums that chose “Other” wrote in YouTube and Flickr, as did their U.S. counterparts. Three educators wrote in Hyves, a Dutch website that is the equivalent of Facebook. According to a recent Businessweek article, Hyves has 5.7 million Dutch users, whereas Facebook in Dutch has only 858,000.\(^7\) It may be safe to assume that European museums using social networking sites might not be using those listed on the 2009 survey.

None of the European museums that responded to the survey used Twitter accounts. This may be due in part to a different cell phone billing structure, as was mentioned earlier with cell phone tours in the “Tour Programs” section.

Conclusion
The 2009 art museum education program survey was conducted at a very interesting time. Social media and online innovation have exploded onto the scene for museums and educators. In 2009, 60% of the respondents reported having Facebook pages for their museum, while the number of museums with Web sites remained the same between 2003 and 2009. Social media tools like Facebook and Twitter, which are free to use, don’t require the same amount of resources as creating Web pages, perhaps adding to their current popularity.

In the 2009 survey there was a noticeable decline in number of museums who had “Community Advisory Boards”—down 33% from 2003. When just the answers from the 33 museums that replied in both 2009 and 2003 were compared, ten of them had dropped their community advisory boards and five had created community advisory boards. Overall, there was a 21% decline in community advisory boards within the museums who responded to both surveys. Is it possible that the developing field of social media is supplanting community advisory boards as the way museums receive input from their community?

Other significant changes were found in the tour programs area of the survey. The number of museums who offered self guided tours rose to 78%, up 18% from 2003. Also, the nature of audio tours has changed significantly in the years since the first survey was conducted. In 2003, 54% percent of the museums surveyed offered audio tours. At that time, the only tours which involved handheld or personal technology were audio tours: Acoustiguide, Antenna, etc. Since then, the field has expanded to include cell phone tours, iPod tours, and other tours delivered via personal devices. In 2009, 54% of the museums surveyed had tours delivered with these kinds of technology: 33% reported having audio tours, 26% had cell phone tours, 13% had tours with hand-held devices, and many museums offered more than one of these.

Overall, the widespread adoption of new technologies seems to be impacting the ways in which museums, and particularly museum educators, are interfacing with their audiences. Simultaneously, these same technologies may be slowly transforming the mission, organization, and scope of museums themselves. These survey results are a small indication of the larger changes afoot. In the coming years we hope to glean a greater understanding of this new frontier.

Opportunities for Further Research
This report presents a broad brushstroke of art museum education programs and analysis of each survey program area. Relationships between program areas and correlations that include museum demographic information were not included in this report, but the authors invite anyone to pursue these further investigations. In the future, the museum education community may find it useful to survey other types of museums such as history, science and children’s museums. The authors of this survey hope that profiling the field of museum education can be an ongoing effort, and welcome input and collaboration from all aspects of the museum education community.
Appendix 1
United States Museums Participating in the 2009 Art Museum Education Programs Survey

*indicates museums who participated in the 2003 survey

1. The Albuquerque Museum of Art and History, NM
2. *Amon Carter Museum, Fort Worth, TX
3. Arizona Museum for Youth, Mesa, AZ
4. *The Art Institute of Chicago, IL
5. Art Museum of South Texas, Corpus-Christi, TX
6. Artpace San Antonio, TX
7. *Austin Museum of Art, TX
8. Baltimore Museum of Art, MD
9. Birmingham Museum of Art, AL
10. Cantor Arts Center, Stanford, CA
11. Columbus Museum of Art, OH
12. Cottonlandia Museum, Greenwood, MI
14. *Dallas Museum of Art, TX
15. Delaware Center for the Contemporary Arts,
16. DuPage Children's Museum, Naperville, IL
17. The Eric Carle Museum of Picture Book Art, Amherst, MA
18. Everson Museum of Art, Syracuse, NY
19. *Frist Center for the Visual Arts, Nashville, TN
20. Georgia Museum of Art, Athens, GA
21. Gilcrease Museum, Tulsa, OK
22. Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas at Austin, TX
23. Heritage Museums and Gardens, Sandwich, MA
24. Hillwood Estate, Museum & Gardens, Washington, DC
25. Hofstra University Museum, Hempstead, NY
26. Honolulu Academy of Arts, HI
27. The Hudson River Museum, Yonkers, NY
28. *Indianapolis Museum of Art, IN
29. Institute of Contemporary Art, Boston, MA
30. *Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, MA
31. *The J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, CA
32. J. Wayne Stark Galleries, College Station, TX
33. Jersey City Museum, NJ
34. The John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, Sarasota, FL
35. Kalamazoo Institute of Arts, MI
36. Kennedy Museum of Art, Ohio University, Athens, OH
37. Lauren Rogers Museum of Art, Laurel, MI
38. Leigh Yawkey Woodson Art Museum, Wausau, WI
39. Logan Museum of Anthropology, Beloit, WI
40. *Los Angeles County Museum of Art, CA
41. Louisiana State University Museum of Art, Baton Rouge, LA
42. Loyola University Museum of Art, IL
43. Mabee-Gerrer Museum of Art, Shawnee, OK
44. *Marianna Kistler Beach Museum of Art, Kansas State, Manhattan, KS
45. Maxwell Museum of Anthropology, Albuquerque, NM
46. Memphis Brooks Museum of Art, TN
47. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City, NY
48. Minneapolis Institute of Arts, MN
49. The Mobile Museum of Art, AL
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50. Montgomery Museum of Fine Arts, AL
51. Museum at FIT, New York City, NY
52. Museum of Contemporary Art
53. *Museum of Contemporary Art, Chicago, IL
54. *Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles, CA
55. Museum of Fine Arts, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL
56. *Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, TX
57. Museum of Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX
58. Mystic Arts Center, CT
59. Nasher Museum of Art, Duke University, Durham, NC
60. Nasher Sculpture Center, Dallas, TX
61. National Postal Museum, Washington, DC
62. Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City, MO
63. New Mexico Museum of Art, Santa Fe, NM
64. New York Public Library for the Performing Arts, NY
65. Newark Museum, NJ
66. Nora Eccles Harrison Museum of Art, Logan, UT
67. Orange County Museum of Art, Newport Beach, CA
68. *The Oriental Institute Museum, Chicago, IL
69. *Philadelphia Museum of Art, PA
70. *The Phillips Collection, Washington, DC
71. *Plains Art Museum, Fargo, ND
72. *Portland Museum of Art, ME
73. *Reynolda House Museum of American Art, Winston-Salem, NC
74. Roswell Museum and Art Center, NM
75. Salmon Ruins Museum and Research Library, Bloomfield, NM
76. Salt Lake Art Center, UT
77. *Seattle Art Museum, WA
78. Shelburne Museum, VT
79. Sheldon Museum of Art, Lincoln, NE
80. Sid Richardson Museum, Fort Worth, TX
81. Skirball Cultural Center, Los Angeles, CA
82. *Smart Museum of Art, University of Chicago, IL
83. *Smith College Museum of Art, Northampton, MA
84. *Smithsonian American Art Museum, Washington, DC
85. *Speed Art Museum, Louisville, KY
86. Springfield Museums, MA
87. Stark Museum of Art, Orange, TX
88. Susquehanna Art Museum, Harrisburg, PA
89. Tarble Arts Center, Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, IL
90. The Thomas Cole National Historic Site, Catskill, NY
91. *University of Michigan Museum of Art, Ann Arbor, MI
92. University of New Mexico Art Museum, Albuquerque, NM
93. University of Richmond Museums, VA
94. Vizcaya Museum and Gardens, Miami, FL
95. *Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, MN
96. *Walters Art Museum, Baltimore, MD
97. *Weisman Art Museum, Minneapolis, MN
98. *Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus, OH
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European Museums Participating in the 2009 Art Museum Education Programs Survey

1. The Albertina, Vienna, Austria
2. ARoS Aarhus Kunstmuseum, Aarhus, Denmark
3. Bonnefantenmuseum, Maastricht, Netherlands
4. Casa-Museu Dr. Anástácio Gonçalves, Lisbon, Portugal
5. CDAN (Centro de Arte y Naturaleza), Huesca, Spain
6. Center For Fine Arts, Brussels, Belgium
7. Centraal Museum, Utrecht, Netherlands
8. Cheltenham Art Gallery & Museum, United Kingdom
9. The Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Ireland
10. The Courtauld Gallery, London, United Kingdom
11. Crawford Art Gallery Cork, Ireland
12. Deutsche Guggenheim, Berlin, Germany
13. Dublin City Gallery, The Hugh Lane, Ireland
14. Dulwich Picture Gallery, London, United Kingdom
15. EACC (Espai D’Art Contemporani De Castelló), Castelló, Spain
16. Espoo Museum Of Modern Art, Finland
17. Museum Frey-Näpflin-Stiftung, Stans, Switzerland
18. Fundació César Manrique, Lanzarote, Spain
19. Galleria D’Arte Moderna Palazzo Forti, Verona, Italy
20. GAM (Galleria D'arte Moderna), Gallarate, Italy
22. Graphic Design Museum, Breda, Netherlands
23. Groninger Museum, Groningen, Netherlands
24. Guggenheim Museum Bilbao, Spain
25. The Hirschsprung Collection, Copenhagen, Denmark
26. Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen (Royal Museum Of Fine Arts Antwerp), Belgium
27. Kunsthall Rotterdam, Netherlands
28. Kunsthalle Zurich, Switzerland
29. Kunstmuseum, Thurgau, Switzerland
30. Kunstmuseum Stuttgart, Germany
31. Lady Lever Art Gallery, Port Sunlight, United Kingdom
32. Låsnmuseet Halmstad (The County Museum Of Halland), Sweden
33. Lewis Glucksman Gallery, University College Cork, Ireland
34. migros museum für gegenwartskunst, Zurich, Switzerland
35. Moderna Museet, Stockholm, Sweden
36. MUSAC (Museo De Arte Contemporaneo De Castilla Y Leon), Leon, Spain
37. Museo Cerralbo, Madrid, Spain
38. Museo Civico, Pistoia, Italy
39. Museo De Reproducciones Artisticas, Bilbao, Spain
40. Museo Internazionale Delle Ceramiche (MIC), Faenza, Italy
41. Museo Nacional Del Prado, Madrid, Spain
42. Museo Néstor, Canary Islands, Spain
43. Museo Vincenzo Vela, Ligornetto, Switzerland
44. Museu Nacional De Arte Antiga, Lisbon, Portugal
45. Museum Für Kunst Und Gewerbe Hamburg, Germany
46. The National Gallery, London, United Kingdom
47. National Gallery Of Ireland, Dublin, Ireland
48. Ordrupgaard, Copenhagen, Denmark
49. Örebro Läns Museum/Orebro County Museum, Orebro, Sweden
50. Palazzo Madama - Museo Civico D’Arte Antica Di Torino, Turin, Italy
51. Pinacoteca Cantonale Giovanni Züst, Ticino, Switzerland
52. Pinacoteca Comunale, Faenza, Italy
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53. Museum Het Prinsenhof, Delft, Netherlands
54. Ribe Kunstmuseum, Ribe, Denmark
55. Royal Academy Of Arts, London, United Kingdom
56. Sinebrychoff Art Museum, Helsinki, Finland
57. Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden, Germany
58. Temple Sagrada Familia, Barcelona, Spain
59. Uppsala Museum Of Art, Sweden
60. Van Gogh Museum, Amsterdam, Netherlands
61. Värmlands Museum, Karlstad, Sweden
62. The Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester, United Kingdom
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2009 Art Museum Education Programs Survey Questions

MUSEUM NAME:

TOURS:
Please select the types of tours available at your museum:
Check any that apply

☐ Group Tours
   (Public walk-up tours, family tours, special exhibitions tours, permanent collection tours with or without a theme, extended tours with activity provided)
☐ Specialized Tours for School Groups
   (Tours offered to school groups, with themes or as extended tours that include a hands-on component)
☐ Multiple Visit Programs for Schools
   (Multiple visit programs that connect with school curriculum, or series of tours on a specific topic)
☐ Specialized Tours for College/University Students
   (Tours with themes offered to college/university students, including extended tours that include a study collection or class assignment)
☐ Audio Tours
   (Antenna Audio, Acoustiguide, or other audio tour company for permanent collection or special exhibition where the museum provides the audio equipment)
☐ Cell Phone Audio Tours
   (Tours produced for cell phones by museum staff or outside development company)
☐ Tours with Hand-Held Devices
   (Tours produced by museum staff or outside development company with a component delivered on a hand-held audio-visual device)
☐ Self-Guided Tours
   (Printed materials or programs for self-guided groups, including families; for example, activity packs for children or students)
☐ Docent/Tour Guide Programs
   (Formal programs to train docents or tour guides, continuing-ed for docents or tour guides, training for docents or tour guides who specialize in certain areas)
☐ Private Tours
   (Tours offered to a private group by a paid guide not associated with a museum)
☐ Tours for Groups with Special Needs
   (i.e. tours for sight impaired, adults or children with developmental disabilities, or people with Alzheimer’s)
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☐ Other Tour Program
   Please describe below:

In your opinion, will your museum's commitment to tours increase, decrease, or stay the same over the next 5 years?
Choose one of the following answers

☐ Increase
☐ Decrease
☐ Stay the same

INFORMAL GALLERY LEARNING PROGRAMS:
Please select the types of informal gallery learning programs found in your museum:
Check any that apply

☐ Kids Activity Areas Programmed in Museum
   (Family centers or hands-on learning areas for kids)
   Includes technology for use by visitors: YES NO

☐ In-Gallery Information Areas for Visitors
   (Films, videos, learning resource areas, reading rooms, art carts for adult learners)
   Includes technology for use by visitors: YES NO

☐ Education Galleries
   (Galleries or rooms devoted entirely to educational programming or exhibits)
   Includes technology for use by visitors: YES NO

☐ Other Informal Gallery Learning Programs
   Please describe below:

In your opinion, will your museum's commitment to informal gallery learning programs increase, decrease, or stay the same over the next 5 years?
Choose one of the following answers

☐ Increase
☐ Decrease
☐ Stay the same

LIBRARIES IN MUSEUMS
Does your museum have a library?
YES NO
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If yes, is the library open to the public?
YES NO
Are users allowed to check things out of the library?
YES NO
Does your education department participate in educational programming with/for the library?
YES NO

In your opinion, will your museum’s commitment to their library increase, decrease, or stay the same over the next 5 years?
Choose one of the following answers

☐ Increase
☐ Decrease
☐ Stay the same

COMMUNITY, ADULT AND FAMILY PROGRAMS
Please select the community, adult, and family programming available in your museum:
Check any that apply

☐ Evening Events for Adults
   (Gallery crawls, singles events, socializing opportunities open to the public)
☐ Visiting Artists/Artist Residencies
   (Artists interacting with public groups over an extended period of time, or artists working in a gallery open to the public)
☐ Specialized Programs for Local Artists
   (Advisory boards, gallery programs that include local artists)
☐ Specialized Programs for Teens
   (Teen advisory boards, docent programs for teens, teens working as interns or in extended study programs in the museum)
☐ Community Advisory Boards
   (Groups advising on community concerns such as representing cultural areas, or teachers advising on school programs)
☐ Community Festivals
   (Art fairs, programs planned in conjunction with communities, performing arts events)
☐ Family Days
   (Events programmed throughout the museum specifically for families)
☐ Other Community, Adult and Family Programs
   Please describe below:
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In your opinion, will your museum’s commitment to community, adult, and family programming increase, decrease, or stay the same over the next 5 years?

Choose one of the following answers

☐ Increase
☐ Decrease
☐ Stay the same

CLASSES AND OTHER PUBLIC PROGRAMS
Please select the kinds of classes and other public programs your museum offers:

Check any that apply

☐ Classes for Adults
   (One or a series of classes for adults, hands-on arts classes, classes that require adults to visit several areas of the museum)

☐ Classes for Kids
   (One or a series of classes for kids, hands-on arts classes, classes for kids that are not connected to schools)

☐ Summer Programs for Kids
   (Summer camps, summer series classes, programs for kids only offered in the summer)

☐ Classes for Teachers
   (Teacher workshops, adult classes with teacher materials provided, teacher in-services, summer teacher institutes)

☐ Lectures
   (One-time or serial talks for adults on a theme, artist presentations, gallery lectures different from tours)

☐ Symposia
   (A collection of lectures, papers, essays on a particular subject for a scholarly audience, conferences, multiple speakers on one subject)

☐ Films
   (Film programs independent of exhibitions, feature films or series presented as an art medium)

☐ Performances
   (Performing arts groups connected with exhibitions, performing arts presented as part of a museum's program)

☐ Travel Programs
   (Trips to other locations that participants pay for, with educational programming provided by museum staff)

☐ Music
   (In-gallery live music, music series connected with exhibitions)
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☐ Other Classes and Public Programs
   Please describe below:

In your opinion, will your museum's commitment to classes and other public programs increase, decrease, or stay the same over the next 5 years?
Choose one of the following answers

☐ Increase
☐ Decrease
☐ Stay the same

PARTNERSHIPS WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS
Please select the types of organizations your museum partners with:
Check any that apply

☐ Partnerships with Cities
   (Tours of cities or architecture that are conducted outside of the museum, city tours that include the museum as a stop)

☐ Partnerships with Other Museums
   (Multi-museum programs, art/science/technology/library or history museum partnerships, partnerships with children's museums)

☐ Partnerships with Libraries
   (Programming that incorporates community library resources and/or staff, including technology projects)

☐ Partnerships with Universities
   (Teaching partnerships that use the museum as a college classroom, museum educators or curators serving as adjunct college faculty)

☐ Partnerships with Schools
   (Formal agreements with school buildings, districts or states, museum programs delivered in schools)

☐ Partnerships with other Arts/Cultural/Community Organizations
   (Programming that incorporates other community or cultural organizations and their resources and/or staff, including technology projects)

☐ Other Partnerships
   Please describe below:

In your opinion, will your museum's commitment to partnerships with other organizations increase, decrease, or stay the same over the next 5 years?
Choose one of the following answers

☐ Increase
SCHOOL PROGRAMS
Please select the kinds of resources your museum offers to schools:
Check any that apply

☐ Pre-Visit Materials for Teachers
   (Materials delivered in print or online to prepare school groups for their visit, pre-tour visits from volunteers or museum staff)

☐ Post-Visit Materials for Teachers
   (Follow-up materials, activities, etc. delivered in print or online)

☐ Classroom Materials
   (Slide sets, CD Roms, videos, classroom posters offered for loan or purchase, educational materials online)

☐ Classroom Kits or Trunks w/Objects
   (Classroom kits with objects and sets of multimedia offered for loan or purchase)

☐ Volunteers or Staff in Schools
   (Volunteers or museum staff working with school staff or in classrooms, presenting programs not connected with a tour)

☐ Video Conferencing with Schools
   (Distance learning programs using technology, classroom lessons delivered via video conferencing)

☐ Teacher Resource Room
   (A dedicated space within the museum with hours open for use by teachers and other education professionals)

☐ Preschool Programs
   (Classes, workshops, tours or activities designed specifically for pre-school children)

☐ Homeschool Programs
   (Classes, workshops, tours or activities designed specifically for a homeschool audience, either in the museum or as print or online resources)

☐ Other School Programs
   Please describe below:


In your opinion, will your museum's commitment to school programming increase, decrease, or stay the same over the next 5 years?
Choose one of the following answers

☐ Increase
☐ Decrease
☐ Stay the same
ONLINE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING
Please select the types of online educational programming your museum offers: 
*Check any that apply*

- □ Web Site
  (Museum Web site maintained and updated by museum staff or contractor)
- □ Online Information about Education Programs
  (Information on museum Web site about educational programming including schedules, calendars, registration for events, etc.)
- □ Online Scheduling
  (Software that allows users to register for or schedule tours or classes or order resources from the education department)
- □ Online Activities or Lessons
  (Lesson plans, activities, curriculum resources for teachers and students available online)
- □ Online Interactives and Games
  (Educational programming designed to be experienced online, using Flash, Pachyderm, etc. to create an interactive environment)
- □ Collections Online
  (Museum objects available online for viewing, information systems with online versions, collection catalog available for browsing or searching)
- □ Personal Collections
  (Users of online collections may save sets of images and/or information for future use)
- □ Online Exhibits
  (Exhibitions delivered online, designed to complement gallery exhibits or be stand-alone online exhibits)
- □ Video Conferencing and E-Learning
  (Real time connection to off-site classrooms or other learning environments via video conferencing, or classes, lectures or other programming offered to off-site learners via e-learning platforms)
- □ Other online educational programming
  Please describe below:

Does your museum education department produce or participate in producing:
- □ Blogs
- □ Podcasts
- □ Twitters
- □ MySpace Pages
- □ Facebook Pages

*In your opinion, will your museum’s commitment to online educational programming* increase, decrease, or stay the same over the next 5 years?
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Choose one of the following answers

☐ Increase
☐ Decrease
☐ Stay the same

Please comment on this survey

Optional

The following questions are optional:
Your Name
Optional
Your Title
Optional
Number of Education Department Staff

Museum Annual Operating Budget

Size of Collection (# of objects)

Total Square Footage

Annual Visitors to the Museum

Onsite

Online