

*This essay by Maxwell L. Anderson is part of an important and expanding conversation about museum goals and values. The opinions expressed are the author's. Responses are invited; please e-mail the Getty Leadership Institute at [gli@cgu.edu](mailto:gli@cgu.edu).*

## METRICS OF SUCCESS IN ART MUSEUMS

**Maxwell L. Anderson**

*Research Affiliate*

Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies

Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs

Princeton University

America's largest art museums are the primary tourist attractions in many cities; in 2002 they drew some 100 million visitors, more people than attended sporting events. Museums care for billions of dollars of artworks, stage ambitious exhibitions that can define the season of even a major metropolis, and help anchor a community's pride of place. The boards of major art museums tend to be composed of each community's wealthiest and most powerful leaders. "Signature" museum architecture is sought by city planners and promoters as ardently as sports stadia, and, in many other ways, art museums are perceived to be indispensable amenities in any given urban or regional setting.

The picture is one of impressive wealth, power, and privilege harnessed in service of the public interest. Yet all is not well in the art museum profession. Within the confines of their boardrooms, American art museums today are beset as never before by disagreement about their priorities. Those without such a debate are most likely unclear about their real contributions to society. This paper is intended to offer a partial remedy for uncertainties within the largest museums by suggesting ways of identifying and measuring institutional success. I hope in turn that museums of all sizes may find value in the prescriptions offered.

The root of the problem is that there is no longer an agreed-upon method of measuring achievement. Half a century ago, art museums were largely measured by a yardstick comparable to that applied to libraries of the time: the size and importance of their collections. But today, the original mandate of art museums, to collect, is for the most part overlooked in informal rankings of museums.

The difficulty in measuring success in art museums today stems in part from the fact that, over the last generation, art museums have shifted their focus away from collection-building and toward various kinds of attention to the public—without balancing these two imperatives and without a consensus on what constitutes best practices in the latter. The shift is in many ways salutary, shining light, as it does, on resources that were formerly dedicated to a preserve of the affluent but are today used in service of public education and experience. Stephen Weil has posited that social “outcomes” are what matter for museums—“having some positive impact upon [an] audience.”<sup>1</sup> He also observes that there are many different purposes that different art museums may see themselves fulfilling—making the goals of this paper all the more challenging. His optimistic assessment is that museums must now compete with each other not for the best exhibitions and the highest attendance but, rather, to “make a difference.” While that is a worthy goal, in order to get there we first need to give art museum leaders the tools to measure such outcomes—as well as the steps they must take to achieve them. Without such tools, directors will continue to be rewarded only for excelling in conventional activities—what Weil calls “outputs”—as opposed to outcomes.

---

<sup>1</sup>Stephen Weil, “Are You Really Worth What You Cost, or Just Merely Worthwhile? And Who Gets to Say?” *Assembly 2002, Museum Trustee Association in collaboration with the Getty Leadership Institute*, [www.getty.edu/leadership/downloads/weil.pdf](http://www.getty.edu/leadership/downloads/weil.pdf), p. 7.

Notwithstanding the media's eagerness to monitor foot traffic (the mother of all outputs) as if it were the most meaningful indicator of a museum's health, admissions income only provides an average of 12-15% of major art museums' revenue. Despite the fractional role of admissions income in overall revenue, case law in California and Texas has now established that traveling exhibitions are unabashedly commercial activities, and that exhibition catalogues are commercial publications.<sup>2</sup> This development presages a new era of scrutiny of museums' activities, with an eye toward further reducing or eliminating their tax-exempt status. Museum stores pay Unrelated Business Income Tax, or UBIT, on the sale of that portion of their product line acknowledged to have no educational value. Since Senate Finance Committee hearings on abuses in non-profits began in June 2004, there looms the likelihood of increased regulation and requirements for broader financial disclosure. More specifically, the possibility arises that exhibitions with primarily commercial rather than educational intent will be treated like merchandise with logos: perfectly reasonable features of a not-for-profit, but with their admission income subject to sales tax.

### **The Need for Metrics**

While many challenges beset art museum leaders today, finding a way to measure performance is accordingly among the field's most urgent. A downward trend in arts funding is accelerating, while freshly expanded facilities are requiring more revenue. Funders—ranging from government agencies to corporations, foundations, and individuals—are now demanding proof that their past support has been effective.

---

<sup>2</sup> United States District Court, Central District of California, *Maria V. Altmann, Plaintiff, vs. Republic of Austria, et al., Defendants*, CV 00-8913 FMC (AIJx), filed May 4, 2001: "The Gallery also engages in commercial activity by publishing its guidebook that is available for purchase in the United States," p. 24. Also United States District Court, S.D. Texas, Houston Division, *Magness vs. Russian Federation*, No. CIV.A.H-97-2498, 1999 WL 495915: "Defendants have engaged in 'commercial activity' by selling admission licenses to United States citizens," p. 5.

Without generally accepted metrics, arts organizations will have more and more trouble making a case for themselves. Michael Janeway, the former director of the National Arts Journalism Program at Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism, "is worried that foundation support for the arts will not recover, even if their endowments do. 'They all want to say the market improvement will improve their endowments and lead to more grants, but they're all under pressure from their boards to show more bang for the buck, to show measurable results,' he said. 'It's going to be harder for them to measure results in our field.'"<sup>3</sup>

Individual funders, who founded America's art museums and who remain their greatest hope as the tradeoffs of earned income become manifest, are more demanding of such proof as well. Self-described "venture philanthropists" are just as determined to measure the value of their investment in non-profits as they are in venture capital investments. This new generation of arts patrons, including influential collectors and trustees from the world of business, has an increasingly large share of attention in museum boardrooms.

A shared definition of success in art museums has never been more pressing. Because so many definitions have proliferated over the last generation, it is increasingly difficult to measure performance; a recent search on Google for sources including the phrases "success" and "art museums" yielded 105,000 results. Thirty years ago the Smithsonian made a valiant effort to measure the effectiveness of museum education.<sup>4</sup> Since then, there have been as many definitions of success as there are art museums—a

---

<sup>3</sup> Stephanie Strom, "Soft Financing Causes Arts Groups to Make Hard Choices," *The New York Times*, June 19, 2004.

<sup>4</sup> C.G. Screven, *The Measurement and Facilitation of Learning in the Museum Environment: An Experimental Analysis* (Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C. 1974). Among its suggestions was to consider introducing "a bank of five or ten separate cassettes within the exhibit itself, with automatic-stop, endless-loop features. Corresponding plug-in stations in front of each display could allow each visitor to plug in earphones...and receive individualized... questions..." p. 19.

fact that frustrates directors and can lead trustees and the press to reward the most easily measurable features of a museum instead of its most important features, which are the hardest to measure.

Merriam-Webster defines success as “to turn out well” or “to attain a desired object or end.” A secondary definition is “the attainment of wealth, favor, or eminence,” which has, in the case of art museums, leapfrogged over the original two definitions. This paper seeks to further define, and make a case for the preeminence of, the first two definitions. And to suggest some ways in which professional and volunteer art museum leaders can come together in defining the goals of their institutions.

I will concede certain biases. I believe that art museums are first and foremost educational institutions. By that, I mean that they are to their detriment places that privilege entertainment over learning. I further believe that the rewards of acquiring, caring for, publishing, interpreting, and displaying an art museum’s permanent collection are more significant and longer-lasting than those of staging temporary exhibitions. And lastly, I believe that those museums that attract ample contributed income are healthier and artistically freer places than those that rely too extensively on earned income from tickets, merchandise, and events.

### **Today’s Trinity of Success Factors in Art Museums**

There are three primary indicators of success in the nation’s largest art museums today: the number and marketability of major shows, the number of visitors, and the number of members.

#### ***Exhibitions***

While special exhibitions produce the most press and the most public excitement about art museums, they increasingly result in red ink; distraction from the core

educational and collections-focused missions of art museums; and an unsustainable dependence on quick fixes rather than long-term planning.

Museum leadership tends to focus its energies on exhibitions because they are newsworthy, give the impression of competitive advantage, create opportunities for entertainment, and drive lower-level membership sales. Chief financial officers feel the pressure from above to quantify exhibitions in glowing financial terms. The attendance at shows is the first statistic reported, echoing reports of ticket sales of first-run movies on the local news every Monday evening. However, unlike Hollywood movies made by public companies that must report the real costs of making a film, museums are not obligated to do so and rarely provide the real costs of staging an exhibition.

Standard exhibition budgets cover the direct costs of major shows: researching, insuring, packing, shipping, installing, promoting, and revealing their contents on opening night. At the end of the day, it is the rare exhibition that results in a surplus, if one factors in the in-kind and indirect costs. The indirect costs of major shows can be very significant. From the percentage of time spent on shows by the best-compensated staff, to the opportunity cost of neglect of the permanent collection's needs, to the short-term surge in overtime and in part-time staff to handle visitor services, registration, marketing, and events, to the exhibition catalogue, which is carried on an accrual basis over at least two years and generally sells to only 5-8% of the attendees, there are pots of red ink throughout the museum that are never counted in the same breath as the direct costs. Like the exhibition catalogue, unsold merchandise from the shop stays on palettes at the loading dock and is subsequently written off by auditors within the merchandising operation, rather than set within the context of the exhibition budget. There are, happily, many major exhibitions that achieve both worthy educational goals and robust financial returns. But escalating costs often exact compromises with regard

to which works can afford to be borrowed, while the line items for marketing and promotion are becoming sacrosanct. And therefore dedication to the exhibition's stated purpose is incrementally sacrificed for the pursuit of a large audience.

### *Attendance*

While attendance numbers of art museums are reported, admissions income is not. The results can falsely imply that a crowded lobby signals a financially robust museum. Everyone likes to see a museum engaging the public. But a large proportion of those attending are members who in effect paid a deeply discounted ticket through their modest annual gift; those with passes, discounted promotional coupons, group rates; schoolchildren with minimal or no fees; reciprocal members from other institutions; party-goers at special events; those simply dining or browsing the museum shop; and many more who drive down the actual-per-capita-ticket-sold to a fraction of its advertised price. Many of these may visit a museum or exhibition multiple times, rendering the total attendance number an inaccurate reflection of the number of individuals who visited, and therefore making that number of relative value.

Furthermore, attendance numbers are unaudited. Art museums are therefore tempted to round up their reported attendance for various reasons. These might include influencing the amount of public support awarded to a museum, seeking a competitive advantage with peer institutions, or falling victim to the premise that unless attendance is growing each year, the museum must be stagnant.

### *Membership*

A third misconception about art museums is that lower-level memberships are both a measurement of a museum's importance to a community as well as necessary to

improve the bottom line. Lower-level memberships are indeed eagerly sought by art museums, but are often loss-leaders in financial terms. A \$35 annual membership often ends up costing the museum money, after factoring in dedicated staff, marketing, events, printing, postage, and foregone admissions revenue. Only at levels of \$150 and above do most museums begin to realize any *net* return from members. But it is easier to recruit the \$150 member from the \$35 member than starting out cold turkey at the higher amount, which is why museums promote membership. Furthermore, the number of members is a closely watched statistic among peers, because it is believed to reflect the relative clout of a museum with respect to the size of its market.

It is telling that the number of active members rises when special ticketed exhibitions attach high prices, and drops off when there is no sense of urgency to belong. The membership rolls therefore grow in direct proportion to occasional events rather than reflecting loyalty to a museum and, by virtue of price point, are driven not by a philanthropic impulse but by a bargain-hunting one. It is therefore misleading to view ample membership rolls as proof of a museum's robust service to a community.

### **New Ways of Measuring Success**

So the number of big shows, visitors, and members—three of the leading indicators of success in art museums today—provide at best highly problematic metrics and, at worst, deceptive ones. Which leads us to ask: why then are these the indicators that so many turn to in evaluating museums? It's because they resemble denominators of more familiar markets (like feature films), are easy to document and report, and may be presented in a positive light. But professional museum leaders can, by working together, make a persuasive case for new metrics of success that more accurately measure their museum's long-term health and relative standing.



In order to be worthy of adoption, these new metrics must have three attributes.

They must:

- be directly connected with the core values and mission of the art museum;
- be reliable indicators of *long-term* organizational and financial health; and
- be easily verified and reported.

Museum leaders must make a case for their institutions without turning first to the number of shows, visitors, and members—because these numbers may only seem to represent success. The job of museum administrators must be to diagnose the underlying health of their institutions and not simply recite statistics that may be ephemeral or unrelated to the overarching performance of an institution.

### **Defining Appropriate Metrics**

The following aspects of a museum’s identity fit the three criteria for appropriate metrics (i.e., mission-focused, long-term, and verifiable):

1. Quality of Experience
2. Fulfillment of Educational Mandate
3. Institutional Reputation
4. Management Priorities and Achievements
5. Caliber and Diversity of Staff
6. Standards of Governance
7. Scope and Quality of Collection
8. Contributions to Scholarship
9. Contributions to Art Conservation
10. Quality of Exhibitions
11. Facilities' Contribution to Core Mission

An objective assessment of these eleven features of an institution’s activities—both its “output” and its “outcomes”—can be very revealing about any gaps between a

museum's stated mission and its performance. This in turn can lead to a review of institutional priorities and the reallocation of resources to address these priorities.

## 1. Quality of Experience

The hardest measurement of a museum's success is in some ways the most important: the quality of the visitor's experience. Calibrating the "resonance and wonder" of artworks, as Stephen Greenblatt called these two different experiential responses, is notoriously hard to pin down.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, the survey questions that can shed light on the quality of experience are unscientific, and subject to the power of suggestion by the interviewer. Nevertheless, it is this first category that will prove most significant in assessing how well the museum is serving its audience. Questions in this category consider the character of a visitor's response to the collection, her or his retention of information, predictions of future behaviors occasioned by a visit, and a segmentation of the public served by the museum. In addition, the museum should attempt to gather responses that rank the museum against other resources in the community, and explicit reactions to museum offerings of one kind or another.

A museum's responsibilities to its public are many, and its success in fulfilling them is notoriously hard to quantify. The correspondence of visitor demographics with the demographics of the local population would be useful in pursuing a more representative result. One could continue not with the number of members but with the average number of visits by its members. As opposed to attendance, it would be useful to know the number of visitors who paid full or discounted admission to the

---

<sup>5</sup> Stephen J. Greenblatt, "Resonance and Wonder," in *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture* (New York and London 1990), pp. 161–183.

permanent collection or special exhibitions. If the museum has no admission charge, then the number of visitors to the galleries (as opposed to the lobby, restaurant, gift shop, or party spaces) would be revelatory. The average length of a museum-Web-site visit and the number of hours that galleries are open to the public are also indicators of success in the quality of the experience offered.

## **2. Fulfillment of Educational Mandate**

A subset of the category above is how well the museum is serving its educational mandate. This should begin by publishing the percentage of key education department managers' time allotted to researching and measuring the effectiveness of its interpretive philosophy. The number of schoolchildren visiting museums in organized groups is a basic measurement. The number of permits issued for sketching in those galleries is telling, as are the number of lectures on art historical topics, the number of attendees to lectures, the number of artworks from the collection illustrated on the museum's Web site, and the amount of income earned from tuition-based programs.

## **3. Institutional Reputation**

There are many ways of measuring an institution's reputation. Few of them are quantifiable. But there are some telling ones. We may begin with its local reputation. The number of volunteers who give five or more hours a week is an important imprimatur. Those museums with a large number of volunteers, taking into account as appropriate the population of their Metropolitan Statistical Area, may fairly be assumed to enjoy the strong support of their community. Gaps between a museum's reputation and its goals may be gauged by annual market research of the number of survey respondents who can articulate the museum's core mission—and whether their response is in sync with the stated mission. In addition, it is telling to establish the

percentage of respondents who enjoyed the experience of the art museum and who had a greater appreciation of specific artworks or movements, an improved understanding of why some artworks are more valuable than others, and a desire to return to the museum in the not-too-distant future.

Moving from the local to the national and international, another measure of success is the total number of museum visitors in out-of-state tour groups. Such groups are likely to seek out destinations with significant reputations and to eschew those with more modest reputations. In addition, the amount of print and electronic correspondence received by a museum is an indicator of its throw-weight, and, still more precisely, the total number of complimentary letters and e-mails says something important about an art museum. In a global sense, the number of mentions of the museum on Google is a blunt but statistical measurement of that museum's reputation. For example, in two Google searches as of this writing, one can examine the results in two major cities, New York and Paris. The Metropolitan Museum of Art yielded 1,150,000 mentions, the Museum of Modern Art 817,000, the Guggenheim Museum 607,000, and the Whitney Museum 301,000. A search for the Louvre yielded 1,620,000 hits, the Centre Pompidou 483,000, the Musee d'Orsay 242,000, and the Musee Picasso 26,000. In each case this relative ranking seems intuitively in line with the girth of each museum's reputation.

#### **4. Management Priorities and Achievements**

By holding up a bright light to the performance of the museum's professional leadership, we should know the percentage of goals accomplished from the most recent strategic plan, compared with the plan's forecast. Also to be documented is the percentage of budget cuts achieved through strategic reductions in select activities, as

opposed to across-the-board cuts. Another indicator of success is the number of balanced budgets over the last five years. To understand the administration's priorities, we should know the respective percentages of the budget related to art purchases, curatorial activities, and conservation. To measure its achievements in the eyes of its peers, it is important to know, over the course of the last five years, the dollar amount of awards from government agencies or foundations that are chosen by peer panels.

### **5. Caliber and Diversity of Staff**

The caliber of a museum's staff begins with the number of curators and educators on the payroll as a percentage of its total staff size. For larger institutions, no less telling, again in the sphere of peer adjudication, is the number of qualified applicants for the most recent curatorial opening. It is important to know the percentage of employees from minority groups who manage two or more staff members.

### **6. Standards of Governance**

Measuring the standards of trusteeship at museums is essential in understanding how well the museum can be expected to fulfill its mission. It would be revelatory to conduct an annual assessment of the percentage of trustees who can articulate the museum's core purpose—and how it has been advanced over the course of the last year. Another important statistic would be the percentage of trustees who can articulate the division of responsibilities between the board and the director, citing instances in which that division was tested over the last year. The percentage of operating expenses paid from endowment proceeds is an unflinching measurement of the board's attention to a museum's long-term health. Any amount below 20% may

reveal a short-term mindset. The percentage of revenues from contributed income is also essential to understanding how much pressure is applied to the staff to make up a shortfall through earned income. Measurements of the board's makeup are also essential: How many trustees have donated works of art or a sum equal to or greater than 1% of the museum's operating budget over the last five years? How many are members of minority groups? How many are members of other art museums?

### **7. Scope and Quality of Collection**

The traditional measurement of an art museum's stature is by the quality of its collection. It is hard to measure quality, but not hard to count how many works of art were lent to how many peer institutions—a key measurement of the collection's quality in the eyes of experts—along with the percentage of the exhibitable collection this number of works represent. Less compelling evidence, but important nonetheless, are to be found in the number of artworks in the museum's most significant art collection and the number of artworks in the collection on display.

### **8. Contributions to Scholarship**

Achievements in research and publishing are traditional bellwethers for institutional leadership. It would be helpful to quantify the number of articles by staff published in peer-edited scholarly journals; the number of collection catalogues in preparation and for how many years; the number of curators with adjunct appointments at universities; the number of curators delivering lectures at scholarly conferences; and the number of bound volumes in the library.

### **9. Contributions to Art Conservation**

For those museums with conservation departments, the number of full- and part-time conservators on staff, hours worked per year, the number of publications by conservators, and the number of works treated are critical factors in assessing how a museum is addressing the needs of its core asset—its collection. For those with only part-time or consulting conservators, the statistics above are just as significant.

#### **10. Quality of Exhibitions**

The habit today is to gauge exhibitions by the number of visitors overall. Instead, exhibitions should be judged by the degree to which they contributed something: the number of museum-published catalogues over 75 pages in length over the last five years, the number of exhibitions with one-third of the works on its checklist having never been shown together before, the number of exhibitions highlighting ten or more works in the permanent collection, the percentage of total exhibitions presented that were organized by the museum, and the number of exhibitions organized by the museum that are traveling to other museums nationally and internationally over the next three years.

#### **11. Facilities' Contribution to Core Mission**

Large expansions have, for some time now, been considered achievements in and of themselves. But vast halls, corridors, and architectural conceits may do nothing to advance the mission of an art museum. Instead museums should reveal two key statistics: the percentage of the total building size devoted to permanent collection galleries and the percentage of the total building size devoted to special exhibitions. Sculpture gardens, delightful as they can be, should be measured separately.

\* \* \*

Using these eleven categories, art museums can make a better case for their fulfillment of a mission and contributions to a community. Measuring museums as prescribed above will produce neither a comprehensive nor a scientific result. But institutions stand to learn a great deal about themselves by answering these questions. And, should the questions be answered by a critical mass of museums, the profession may learn a great deal. More importantly, it may not be too much to hope that these metrics might then help shape both institutional priorities and the assessment of museums by key stakeholders in the future.



## **Metrics of Success in Art Museums**

© 2004 Art Museum Network

***This survey is intended to help evaluate an art museum's success in fulfilling its mission, rather than to help measure its size or the extent of its efficiency or entrepreneurship. Unless otherwise noted, answers should quantify results over the museum's last complete fiscal year.***

***\*One asterisk denotes those questions that require annual market research through a survey.***

***\*\*Two asterisks denote those questions whose answers should be evaluated on a two- to three-year cycle, rather than annually.***

### **A. Quality of Experience**

Percentage of survey respondents who feel that a visit to the museum resulted in:

1. *An intangible sense of elation—a feeling that a weight was lifted off their shoulders\**
2. *A greater appreciation of specific works of art or a period or movement\**
3. *An improved understanding of why some artworks are more valuable than others\**
4. *A desire to return to the museum in the not-too-distant future\**
5. *Ranking of museum as a significant asset among local community members\**
6. *Ranking by local artists as important to them in their work or life\**
7. *Ranking by schoolteachers as important to them (a) in the classroom or (b) as an extracurricular activity\**
8. *Percentage of visitors surveyed one week after visit who can recall three or more artworks that affected them\**
9. *Ranking by nearby colleges and universities as an important resource for instruction\**
10. *Average length of time spent by visitors in front of ten significant works in the collection\**
11. *Average length of time spent by visitors in a noteworthy gallery\**
12. *Percentage of visitors feeling that didactic/educational aids (a) improved their appreciation of art works or (b) detracted from their appreciation of artworks\**
13. *Percentage of visitors who would rank visit as exceeding expectations\**
14. *Percentage of non-members who visited the museum three or more times in one year\**
15. *Percentage of visitors describing themselves as likelier to attend another art museum because of their visit\**
16. *Extent of alignment of visitor demographics with demographics of local population\*\**
17. *Average number of visits by each: (1) individual/family member; (2) corporate member\*\**
18. *Number of visitors who paid full or discounted admission to the permanent collection or special exhibitions\*\**
19. *Total number of visitors to the permanent collection or special exhibitions\*\**
20. *Number of unique users to museum Web site\*\**
21. *Average length of museum-Web-site visit\*\**
22. *Number of hours open to the public\*\**
23. *Amount spent on institutional evaluation\*\**

### **B. Fulfillment of Educational Mandate**

1. Percentage of key education department managers' time in their job description allotted to researching and measuring the effectiveness of its interpretive philosophy
2. Number of permits issued for sketching in the galleries
3. Number of schoolchildren who visited the museum last year in organized tours
4. Number of lectures on art historical topics for adult audiences at the art museum last year
5. Number of attendees at lectures
6. Number of artworks illustrated on museum Web site
7. Earned income from tuition-based programs

### **C. Institutional Reputation**

1. Total number of volunteers working more than five hours a week
2. Total number of visitors from out-of-state tour groups
3. Total number of (1) emails; and (2) letters received commenting on the experience of the collections or exhibitions\*\*
4. Total number of complimentary (1) e-mails; and (2) letters received commenting on the experience of the collections or exhibitions\*\*
5. Level of buzz: Number of mentions of the museum on Google\*\*
6. Number of consumer "impressions," measured by circulation of printed media and viewership of electronic media\*\*
7. Percentage of survey respondents who can articulate the museum's core mission\*
8. Percentage of survey respondents whose articulation of the museum's mission is aligned with that of the actual mission\*

### **D. Management Priorities and Achievements**

1. Percentage of goals accomplished from most recent strategic plan
2. Percentage of budget cuts achieved through strategic reductions in select activities vs. percentage achieved through across-the-board cuts
3. Percentage of budget directly dedicated to programs (labor and non-labor expenses)
4. Number of years with a balanced budget over the last five years
5. Percentage of budget spent on purchase price of acquisitions over the last five years
6. Percentage of labor budget related to curatorial activities
7. Percentage of budget related to the library
8. Percentage of budget related to conservation
9. Percentage of budget related to education
10. Amount spent on curatorial travel paid out of non-exhibition budgets
11. Total dollar amount of support from peer-panel-awarded government grants
12. Total dollar amount of support from foundations for non-capital expenses

### **E. Caliber and Diversity of Staff**

1. Number of full-time curators
2. Number of full-time staff with Ph.D.s in art history
3. Number of qualified applicants for the most recent curatorial opening
4. Number of full-time educators
5. Percentage of employees from minority groups managing two or more staff members

#### **F. Standards of Governance**

1. Percentage of trustees who can articulate the museum's core purpose—and how it was advanced over the last year\*
2. Percentage of trustees who believe in a clear division of responsibilities between the board and the director and staff and can articulate those boundaries in relation to decisions made over the last year\*
3. Percentage of operating expenses paid from endowment proceeds
4. Percentage of contributed income in operating revenues
5. If appropriate, percentage of operating budget provided by parent organization
6. Amount of endowment restricted to art acquisitions
7. Total number of trustees
8. Number of trustees with art collections valued at \$1 m or above
9. Number of trustees who have donated works of art to the museum in the last decade valued at \$5,000 or more
10. Number of trustees who have donated a sum equal to or greater than 1% of the museum's operating budget in the last five years
11. Number of trustees on or off standing committees who have helped evaluate the caliber of art storage, conservation, the museum library, or other non-exhibition cost centers in the last year
12. Number of trustees who are members of other art museums nationally or internationally
13. Number of artists on the board
14. Number of trustees from minority groups

#### **G. Scope and Quality of Collection**

1. Number of artworks in the museum's most significant collection (e.g., European paintings, American paintings, European sculpture, European decorative arts, African art, Pre-Columbian art, etc.)
2. Number of artworks in the museum's next most significant collection
3. Number of accessioned works on display
4. Percentage of works on display from the museum's most significant collection
5. Number of works loaned to other art museums last year
6. Percentage of the total collection's exhibitable works lent to other art museums last year
7. Percentage of objects deemed worthy of display
8. Number of institutions to which the museum lent artworks last year
9. Number of artworks acquired in the last year (through gift, purchase, or bequest) in each of the three largest categories of artworks (e.g., European paintings, prints, American decorative arts)
10. Number of new artworks commissioned last year (where applicable)
11. Insured value of acquisitions made last year
12. Total number of accessioned works in the collection
13. Total amount of insurance carried on collection

14. Percentage of estimated collection value covered by insurance

#### **H. Contributions to Scholarship**

1. Number of articles published by full-time museum staff in panel-edited scholarly journals (cite each instance)
2. Number of collections catalogues in preparation and for how many years
3. Number of collections catalogues published with new editions in the last five years
4. Number of curators with adjunct appointments at universities
5. Number of curators' panel-selected talks at scholarly conferences last year
6. Number of bound volumes in library

#### **I. Contributions to Art Conservation**

1. Number of full-time conservators
2. Number of part-time conservators and hours per year
3. Number of works treated in the last year
4. Number of conservators' panel-selected talks at scholarly conferences last year
5. Number of conservators' articles in panel-selected publications

#### **J. Quality of Exhibitions**

1. Number of exhibitions with museum-published catalogues of 75 pages or longer staged over the last five years
2. Number of exhibitions presenting 30 or more objects of which more than 33% have not been shown together before
3. Number of exhibitions highlighting ten or more works from the permanent collection
4. Percentage of total exhibitions presented that were organized by the museum
5. Number of exhibitions organized by the museum that are traveling to other art museums internationally now or over the next three years

#### **K. Facilities' Contribution to Core Mission**

1. Percentage of total building size dedicated to permanent collection galleries (cite sculpture gardens separately)
2. Percentage of total building size dedicated to special exhibition galleries (cite sculpture gardens separately)