



Loud and Clear: A Study of the Challenges and Successes in Marketing University Art Museums and their Programming to University Students

Citation

Hankes, Bethany. March 2015. Loud and Clear: A Study of the Challenges and Successes in Marketing University Art Museums and their Programming to University Students. Master's thesis, Harvard University.

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:17370717>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

Loud and Clear

A Study of the Challenges and Successes in Marketing
University Art Museums and their Programming to University Students

Bethany Hanks

A Capstone in the Field of Museum Studies
for the degree of Master of Liberal Arts in Extension Studies

Harvard University
Extension School

March 2015

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Background.....	3
Research.....	8
Survey Results	11
University Art Museums and University Students	11
Marketers at University Art Museums.....	16
Analog Materials.....	17
Digital Media	20
Word of Mouth and Other Strategies.....	22
Best Practices	24
Analog Materials.....	24
Digital Media	26
Email.....	26
Social Media	28
Word of Mouth	33
Programming.....	35
Conclusion	36
Appendix A.....	39
Appendix B	43
Works Cited	53

List of Tables

Table 1. Student Body Size at Respondents' Parent Colleges and Universities.....	10
Table 2. Importance of Students as a Constituent Group	12
Table 3. Museum Activities Offered to Students.....	13
Table 4. Levels of Satisfaction with Student Attendance at Extracurricular Events	14
Table 5. Levels of Satisfaction with Student Attendance During Regular Business Hours, Outside of Class and Events.....	15
Table 6. Department(s) in Charge of Marketing to Students.....	16
Table 7. Analog Materials Used to Market to Students.....	18
Table 8. Perceived Effectiveness of Analog Marketing Materials	18
Table 9. Digital Media Used to Market to Students	21
Table 10. Perceived Effectiveness of Digital Marketing.....	21

Introduction

University art museums and galleries have returned their focus to campus constituents after years of courting outside audiences (Bradley). By rewriting their missions to once again emphasize teaching and engagement, these museums put a premium on getting students into the museum through classes. Yet, what about students as active constituents *outside* of class?

Academic art museums offer enriching programs, enjoyable events, and access to stimulating collections. Still, these museums struggle to get students in the door. As campus art museums strive to fully meet their missions of teaching and enrichment, they must broadly reach out to and involve students. Creating effective marketing materials and establishing strong lines of communication will help university art museums do just that.

Creating this flow of communication is not easy to accomplish though; reaching university students through any mode of marketing can be difficult. Large numbers of curricular and extracurricular organizations at colleges and universities want to connect with students and attract them to events and programming (Andring). Due to the high level of competition for students' time and attention, which is already constrained due to students' classwork and employment, marketing materials flood both the real (i.e. analog) world and the digital world at campuses (King 26). In the analog realm, posters are often displayed en masse with many other posters, making it difficult for students to easily identify events relevant to them. Posters often get damaged, or covered over by other posters, again decreasing their effectiveness. In the digital realm, students receive large to excessive numbers of emails daily, most of which go unread due to students' limited time and attention. Additionally, accessing student email addresses outside of

those who choose to join a museum's email list is often nearly impossible (Northington). Using social media channels to promote museums and their programming can be just as challenging; student use of and interest in various social media platforms varies depending on trends and individual taste (Lenhart et al. 2-4). These challenges are compounded by the fact that museum staff are often overburdened with many tasks and have limited time and funding to complete their work (Tobelem 302; "Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students"). What is more, staff members tasked with marketing to students may not be trained in marketing practices, or they may not be fully up to date on best practices ("Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students"). These numerous challenges create significant hurdles in effectively marketing academic art museums and their programming to students.

The relationship between a university art museum and university students is a singular one. The many articles and books on museum marketing practices do offer some applicable guidance for these museums. However, there is little known or written about regarding this specific relationship, and the lines of communication between the two parties. Consequently, this research includes a survey of university art museums and galleries around the United States to find out who, or what department, is in charge of marketing the museum and its programs to students, which analog and digital methods are used, which methods are most effective, and how various methods are evaluated. This information will be combined with research on best practices for using digital marketing methods to reach individuals in the 20-35 age range (millennials). Also, museum marketing practices at civic art museums will be researched. This information will then form a set of basic guidelines for university art museum staff in effectively and efficiently marketing their museums, events, and programs to university students.

Background

In order to understand the importance of communication between the two parties, one must first understand the current dynamics of their relationship. The relationship between college and university art museums and galleries (here after referred to as “university art museums” for simplicity) and college and university students (here after referred to as “university students”) is better than it has been in years. Between the 1970s and 1990s, the viability of academic art museums was being called into question as financial resources were becoming scarcer at many U.S. universities. Due to financial constraints, campus art museums turned to their local, external communities for funding. This in turn redirected the mission of many museums to serving public audiences. After two decades, the practice of focusing on external audiences while being physically located on a college or university campus came into question. The Andrew F. Mellon Foundation was one of the first to do so publicly. Through its landmark College and University Art Museum (CUAM) grant program, the Mellon Foundation urged campus art museums to shift their focus back to education, and serving their campus-based communities (Bradley).

Over the next 15 years, the Mellon Foundation supported 18 university art museums in the United States. The Foundation’s two specific goals were: 1) fostering organizational changes that would enable better collaboration between museums and faculty, and 2) strengthening museums’ focus on education (Goethals and Fabing 1). In the grant program’s summary report, the authors note that there was “a dramatic and positive increase in academic involvement” at 13 of the 18 originally supported museums. As successful initiatives at the 13 Mellon-supported university art museums were carried out, staff from the grant-supported museums shared their experiences with other members of the field. The noticeable positive effects of strengthening

relationships with campus constituents, and shifting the focus of museums' missions to teaching, rippled across the university art museum field. The program is still cited as being one of the greatest influences on university art museum management in recent times (Goethals and Fabing 2; Shapiro et al. 10; Bradley; Jandl 121). In fact, most recent articles and reports on the topic of academic art museums highlight the importance, or even primacy, of campus constituents.

Considering this, it is no surprise that teaching is the primary mission of many university art museums today. Yet there is a paradox in this situation. These museums are looked to as sites for untraditional modes of instruction in atypical classroom settings, yet the primary way that they reach and engage university students is through the traditional mode of classroom instruction. This is actually a limitation for university art museums as they strive to educate and engage broader types and numbers of students. Zoe Mercer-Golden, a then-senior at Yale College, reflected on this issue in a March 2013 blog post for the Center for the Future of Museums. She stated:

[Yale] students rarely make use of [the Yale University Art Gallery's] collections unless formally taken to a museum for class or [are] required to visit in order to complete an assignment. The few that go willingly and often are usually, like myself, majoring in a field directly tied to museums (art history, anthropology, archaeology, classics) or are student employees. ("Students in the Museum: From Inside the Ivy Covered Walls")

Carol Glesne, an independent researcher, visited seven museums in the U.S. that were deemed by The Kress Foundation to be exemplary models of these types of institutions. Through interviews with both students and museum staff, Glesne repeatedly heard that getting students into university art museums, especially those students not studying art or art history, was an ongoing challenge (Glesne 6). Staff at university art museums surveyed by the Cultural Policy Center at the University of Chicago for the report "Campus Art Museums in the 21st Century: A Conversation" also cited similar difficulties with their student bodies (Shapiro et al. 10). The

assumption that holding classes in university art museums breeds better engagement and broader interest within the student body is strongly countered by these reports.

In order for museums to fully meet their mission foci of teaching and engagement, these museums must aim to broaden their reach to other students on their respective campuses. A number of university art museums around the country have adopted new programs with this aim in mind; their efforts will be discussed later in this paper. Yet even with inventive programming on offer, it is still difficult to get students to attend (Glesne 6). There are, indeed, many constraints on students' time that prevent them from attending programming at their university art museum. Yet, it is important to remember that before a student can even decide whether to attend an event or not, they must first know about it.

Capturing the attention of a student through any form of marketing media is a challenge equal to that of getting a student to physically go to their university art museum. The challenges vary with different types of media, but the two core issues are those of irrelevancy and oversaturation. The issue of irrelevancy relates to what forms of media students access and pay attention to, and which forms they do not. In the analog, or non-digital world, some of the media options for marketing include chalking (writing advertisements in chalk on sidewalks or on classroom blackboards), hard copy mailings, posters, and ads in newspapers or magazines ("On-Campus Event Promotion Guide"). All of these options are viable, but do students pay attention to analog forms of marketing? In Achieve Guidance's 2012 Millennial Impact Report, only 18 percent of respondents said that they would prefer to learn about nonprofits through print media (Feldman et al., "2012" 5). In the 2013 Millennial Impact Report, there is no discussion of traditional, analog media (Feldman et al.). Using analog forms of marketing is still a common practice at university art museums, but university students are becoming more reliant on digital

media for information gathering and sharing. University art museums should, therefore, evaluate the level of effectiveness of each analog medium they employ. Doing so will help museum staff know if they are getting students attention. If not, staff can, then, consider whether practices should be changed, or if a particular marketing medium should be dropped from the portfolio of marketing materials.

In the digital realm, the issue of irrelevancy relates to millennials' use of different platforms. These platforms include email, weblogs (blogs), and social media channels such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. It may seem that millennials' interest in different social media sites varies almost daily. However, a comparison of data and anecdotes in the Pew Research Center's report "The Demographics of Social Media Users – 2012" and their report "Social Media Update 2013" suggests that there are consistently high usage levels of Facebook and Twitter, and Instagram to a lesser degree, by this age group (Duggan and Brenner 1-8; Duggan and Smith 1-2). Blogging is the one digital activity that has seen a consistent decrease in millennial participation over recent years. In a 2010 report published by the Pew Research Center, it was noted that just fifteen percent of millennials blogged, a nine percent decrease from 2007 (Lenhart et al. 2). Therefore, university art museums should analyze how their university's students use different social media platforms and determine which platforms generate the most engagement. These museums may find that certain platforms are favored, or barely used, by their students (McGough and Salomon 285).

Email may be one of the most unexpectedly challenging forms of marketing to use in reaching university students. In the 2013 Millennial Impact Report, over 65 percent of respondents received email from one or more nonprofits, and in the 2012 version of the report, 47 percent of respondents stated that they would prefer to learn about nonprofits through email

(Feldman et al., “2013” 16; Feldman et al., “2012” 5). Additionally, university students have cited email as their preferred method of receiving information and updates (Northington). Yet, anecdotal evidence from students suggests that email may be an almost irrelevant form of communication. Erin Northington, Student Outreach and Programs Coordinator at Harvard Art Museums, spoke to numerous undergraduates at Harvard College, and was told by many of them that they receive so many emails a day (sometimes numbering over 100) that email was not a viable format for them to receive information from the Museum (Northington). This not only begs the question of the relevance of email as a form of marketing, but also the issue of oversaturation.

Oversaturation of digital media is a concept familiar to many in the United States. In July 2012, Nick Bilton of the *New York Times* penned an opinion piece aptly entitled, “Life’s Too Short for So Much Email.” His opening line reflects how overwhelming email often feels to many Americans: “Just thinking about my email inbox makes me sad.” Bilton states that he receives 6,000 or more emails per month, which is likely more than most, but he does cite a study that asserts that the average number of emails sent and received by corporate employees on a daily basis was 105 (Bilton). Considering that being a student is a basically a job, one that requires large amounts of frequent communication, it is no surprise that email oversaturation is common to students as well. In fact, receiving nonprofits’ emails too frequently was the most annoying email habit cited by individuals polled in the 2013 Millennial Impact Report.

Communication is important, but oversaturation will simply overwhelm and annoy constituents.

Oversaturation happens in the analog world as well. Posters are the clearest example of this; anyone who has been in a college campus center has seen the densely packed poster boards, filled with advertisements from campus groups. Overlapping posters crammed together create a

visual cacophony; students just passing by will unlikely be able to spot events that would be of interest to them. Also, if posters visually compete with one another too much, some students will simply avoid looking at them all together. Yet, as with email, posters are one of the most common forms of analog marketing media used by university art museums (“Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students”). Museum staff should evaluate the effectiveness of posters and other analog materials to determine just how effective they are. Once levels of effectiveness are gauged, then staff can focus their energies on creating the materials that best capture students’ attention.

Research

As can be seen, there are many challenges inherent in marketing museums and their programming to students. Adding to these challenges is a dearth of research on exactly what materials museums’ use for marketing, and how effective these materials are in engaging students. Considering this, a survey of individual staff at university art museums around the United States was conducted to find out who at different museums is in charge of marketing to students, what forms of media do they use, how staff gauge the level of impact of various media, how satisfied they are with different materials, and what other methods are used to attract students to their museums. The survey was administered with SurveyMonkey (Appendix A), and was sent via email to individual staff members at 67 university art museums and galleries around the country. Individuals that were contacted included staff in marketing departments, educational outreach coordinators, and general administrative staff (if no marketers or outreach coordinators positions existed at the museums). The list of museums and galleries to be contacted began with

suggestions from university art museum professionals. Additional museums were chosen for inclusion based on various reports and projects, including museums that participated in the Mellon Foundation's College and University Art Museum grant program, and the Samuel H. Kress Foundation's project "The Campus Art Museum: A Qualitative Study." Other museums were chosen based on articles written by museum staffers (Hammond et al.; Kass and Allmendinger). Museums were also picked by searching top ranking universities and colleges around the United States, and individual searches based on university type and geographic location within the country. Responses were hoped for from three types of universities (public, private, art school), various student body sizes (ranging from less than 2,000 students to over 30,000 students), and all the geographic regions in the U.S.

Out of the 67 university art museums and galleries contacted, 29 responses were received (a response rate of 43.2 percent). Though the survey was anonymous, responses from the individual emails that were sent to museum staffers suggest a broad representation of different geographic areas. The type of university that respondents' museums were affiliated with also distributed satisfactorily; 50 percent of respondents' museums were located at private universities, 32.1 percent at public universities, and 17.86 percent at art schools. Additionally, student body size at parent universities was sufficiently broad, as shown in Table 1 on the following page.

Table 1. Student Body Size at Respondents' Parent Colleges and Universities

“Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students,” Survey, *SurveyMonkey*, Beth Hanks, 21 Sept. 2014. Web.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
2,000 students or less	10.3	3
2,000 - 5,000 students	27.6	8
5,000 - 10,000 students	13.8	4
10,000 - 20,000 students	10.3	3
20,000 - 30,000 students	13.8	4
over 30,000 students	24.1	7

Though the response rate to the survey was quite high, the survey was still limited in its scope. In Glesne's study, she cites the 2000 book *Art on Campus: The College Art Association's Official Guide to American College and University Art Museums and Exhibition Galleries*, in which the authors number these institutions at 700 (Glesne 4). Considering this, survey responses account for only about four percent of university art museums and galleries in the U.S. That being said, this information has never been collected before. This foundational compilation of data will be highly useful in determining common marketing challenges and successes for this group of museums.

The survey provided excellent information on the materials academic art museum staff currently use. However, it is helpful to analyze the information within the frame of civic museum marketing best practices. In order to do this, books, articles, and other sources (including blog posts and conference presentations) will be referenced for best practices for marketing civic museums. Authors referenced will include current practitioners, such as Sree Sreenivasan, Chief Digital Officer at the Metropolitan Museum in New York City. Though the nature of constituent relationships differs at civic museums, museum staff at these institutions use many of the same

tools to market their organizations to their constituents as do university art museums. Their experience will provide insight on general best practices.

Additionally, the survey results must be compared to best practices for marketing to millennials. Reports from research firms will be the most instructive on this topic. Of primary interest is the annual Millennial Impact Report. This report covers data collected from annual surveys of millennials on how they prefer to interact and communicate with nonprofits. Detailed information on millennials' preferences regarding email and social media communication will be particularly useful. Also of interest are reports by the Pew Internet and American Life Project. The Project routinely gathers data on varied aspects of Internet use in the U.S., often focusing on how millennials currently use and favor different social media platforms. These reports, in conjunction with the aforementioned research, will inform suggestions on how university art museums should craft their marketing in content, format, and frequency.

Survey Results

University Art Museums and University Students

The first six questions in the survey focused on how campus art museums regard, and cater to, university students. Questions 1 and 2 provided quantitative data on the responding art museums, and were discussed in the Research section. In Question 3 of the survey, respondents were asked to rate the importance of students as a constituent group at their museum. All but one of the 29 respondents rated students as somewhat or very important (Table 2). The 28 respondents covered the three given types of universities (art school, public, private) and the entire range of student body sizes (less than 2,000 students to over 30,000 students). The one

rating of “somewhat unimportant” came from a museum at a private university with 2,000-5,000 students. This data supports the earlier proposition that university art museums have returned their focus, in large part, to university students.

Table 2. Importance of Students as a Constituent Group

“Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students,” Survey, *SurveyMonkey*, Beth Hanks, 21 Sept. 2014. Web.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very important	75.9%	22
Somewhat important	20.7%	6
Neutral	0.0%	0
Somewhat unimportant	3.5%	1
Not at all important	0.0%	0

Responses to the fourth question affirm the high estimation of students. Respondents were asked about what activities students participate in, or programs they attend, at their respective museums (Table 3). Looking at the results, almost all respondents provide extracurricular activities for students. These include both learning-based activities (e.g. lectures and workshops) and social interaction-based activities (e.g. openings and galas) Additionally, almost all responding museums provide paid positions and internships, with slightly fewer providing volunteer positions. A smaller percentage of museums also run student guide programs and student advisory boards. Two museums noted additional activities in the comments, which mainly dealt with membership programs for students.

Table 3. Museum Activities Offered to Students

“Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students,” Survey, *SurveyMonkey*, Beth Hanks, 21 Sept. 2014. Web.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
volunteer positions	65.5%	19
internships	86.2%	25
paid positions	96.6%	28
student guide program	58.6%	17
advisory board	65.5%	19
extracurricular, learning-based activities (e.g. lectures, workshops . . .)	96.6%	28
extracurricular, social activities (e.g. openings, galas . . .)	89.7%	26
Other		2

When the data was analyzed by school type, it was noted that the five responding art schools provided, on average, fewer of the opportunities for students. Considering the small number of responses from this group, though, it would be unwise to generalize this result as true for all art schools in the U.S. Responding private universities on average offered four of the five given opportunities, with only three of the 14 providing only two opportunities. Responding public universities offered, in general, the same number of opportunities for students as private universities. Therefore, student body size did not seem to influence the number of opportunities offered by academic art museums. This data confirms museums’ high valuation of students as constituents; otherwise these museums would not offer multiple student opportunities.

Though university art museums create and run a variety of programs for students, the previously noted dissatisfaction with student attendance (Glesne, Shapiro et. al) was affirmed by the responses to Questions 5 and 6. In Question 5, respondents were asked to rate their museum’s satisfaction with student attendance at extracurricular events (Table 4). A slight majority of respondents (51.7 percent) replied that their museums are somewhat satisfied or very satisfied

with student attendance at these events. That being said, an only slightly smaller percentage of respondents (44.8) rated their museum's satisfaction as neutral or somewhat dissatisfied, with one individual choosing "not at all satisfied."

Table 4. Levels of Satisfaction with Student Attendance at Extracurricular Events

"Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students," Survey, *SurveyMonkey*, Beth Hanks, 21 Sept. 2014. Web.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very satisfied	6.9%	2
Somewhat satisfied	44.8%	13
Neutral	17.2%	5
Somewhat dissatisfied	27.6%	8
Not at all satisfied	3.5%	1

Levels of satisfaction were even lower with student attendance during business hours (outside of class and events). As seen in Table 5 on the following page, a significant number of respondents (48.2 percent) replied that their museums are somewhat dissatisfied or not at all satisfied with attendance during business hours. Smaller segments of respondents stated that their museums are either neutral (20.7 percent) or somewhat satisfied (27.6 percent) about attendance, but only one respondent said that their museum is very satisfied.

Table 5. Levels of Satisfaction with Student Attendance During Regular Business Hours, Outside of Class and Events

“Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students,” Survey, *SurveyMonkey*, Beth Hanks, 21 Sept. 2014. Web.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very satisfied	3.5%	1
Somewhat satisfied	27.6%	8
Neutral	20.7%	6
Somewhat dissatisfied	31.0%	9
Not at all satisfied	17.2%	5

The mixed levels of satisfaction apparent in these results also appeared in some of the responses to the last question of the survey, which asked for any additional comments on the overall topic. One individual stated that, “[Marketing] is extremely challenging. [Students] only come to the exhibits if their teacher makes them or for parties.” Another respondent relayed, “It’s not easy to capture the free time of college students when you are in a city with so many other offerings.” A third respondent said, “Our students interact with the Museum often during the day, so it is unclear how willing they are to spend more time in the evening. Qualitative data suggests students could be much more engaged in the Museum outside of class, but we have had difficulty building that community connection.”

This last response in particular supports the previous assessment of the university art museum—university student relationship. The relationship has indeed advanced and improved, yet there remains room for improvement. These museums are obviously creating opportunities for students to engage with their respective museums. Yet the rates of satisfaction with student attendance confirm that simply creating these opportunities is not enough. Additionally, the data suggests that classes and programming held within the museum do not translate into students’

widespread knowledge of, or interest in, their university art museum. Therefore, students must be actively pursued. Doing so requires strong lines of communication and effective marketing.

Marketers at University Art Museums

Before discussing how to make those strong lines of communication, it is important to know who is responsible for this task. Question 7 of the survey asked respondents just this. An overwhelming majority of the respondents replied that both the marketing and education departments are tasked with marketing to university students (Table 6). Marketing departments were solely tasked with the job at five of the responding institutions. Education departments were solely tasked with the job at one museum. Two of the responding museums do not have a particular department in particular tasked with the job, which may mean that these museums are so small as to not have departments. One respondent reflected on a similar situation at their organization; “We have no full time marketing position at our museum. Each staff member takes on part of the marketing responsibilities.”

Table 6. Department(s) in Charge of Marketing to Students

“Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students,” Survey, *SurveyMonkey*, Beth Hanks, 21 Sept. 2014. Web.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Marketing department	17.9%	5
Education department	3.6%	1
Both	71.4%	20
None of the above	7.1%	2

What this anecdote and the response data show is that marketing responsibilities are shared among individuals and departments at these museums. This can be either a boon for effective marketing or a challenge. Shared work can mean less work for each individual. Yet, shared work also means that the work is no one's primary concern. Marketing then becomes an add-on activity to already full workloads. Additionally, maintaining a consistent voice or brand can be more challenging as more individuals are involved. This is especially true when not all of the individuals tasked with marketing responsibilities have backgrounds in marketing. Varying levels of knowledge of and experience with marketing practices can impact effectiveness, timeliness, and the ability to respond appropriately to constituents through different channels of communication.

Analog Materials

The types of materials, or media, used by those individuals in charge of marketing at university art museums are usually in one of two categories: analog or digital. Analog media is that which is distributed and consumed outside of digital technologies. Media in this category includes newspaper advertisements, postcards and other hard copy mailings, posters, and chalk advertisements written on sidewalks or classroom blackboards. Survey respondents were polled on which of these media they use in marketing to university students (Table 7). Most of them use a combination of posters, hard copy mailings, and ads in their college newspapers. Used less frequently are chalk advertisements, printed campus event calendars, and ads on the student radio station (the latter two submitted in the comment field). The data here shows that most university art museums are using one or more forms of analog marketing media to connect with

students. Yet as is seen in Table 8, respondents do not rate these forms of marketing as being highly effective.

Table 7. Analog Materials Used to Market to Students

“Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students,” Survey, *SurveyMonkey*, Beth Hanks, 21 Sept. 2014. Web.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Ads in the college newspaper	57.1%	16
Postcards, flyers, or other mailings	71.4%	20
Posters	85.7%	24
Chalkboard advertisements (handwritten advertising blurbs written on chalkboards in classrooms)	14.3%	4
Other (please specify)	25.0%	7

Table 8. Perceived Effectiveness of Analog Marketing Materials

“Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students,” Survey, *SurveyMonkey*, Beth Hanks, 21 Sept. 2014. Web.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very effective	14.2%	4
Slightly effective	42.9%	12
Neutral	28.6%	8
Slightly ineffective	14.2%	4
Not at all effective	0.0%	0

An analysis of responses for each answer listed above provided a greater understanding of what is and is not impacting the ratings. Levels of perceived effectiveness did not coalesce around university type or student body size. For example, in the group of respondents under “slightly effective,” five of the respondents were at public universities, five were at private universities, one was at an art school, and one was at an institution the individual categorized as a university and art school. In the group that chose “neutral,” five respondents were at private

institutions, two were at art schools, and one was at a public university. The type of university distributed similarly for respondents in the “very effective” and “slightly ineffective” groups. Broad distribution of student body size was also common to every group. For example, in the group that chose “slightly ineffective,” there were two universities with student body sizes of 2,000-5,000 students, one university with 20,000-30,000 students, and one university with 30,000 plus students.

Perceived levels of effectiveness also were not influenced by which individual or department(s) was in charge of marketing to students. The vast majority of respondents task both their marketing and education departments with marketing to students, so it is no surprise that individuals at these institutions showed up in every answer group. What was surprising was that ratings of effectiveness did not increase at museums where only the marketing department markets to students. These museums rated the effectiveness of their analog media as neutral overall, with one rating it slightly effective and one rating it slightly ineffective. The respondent whose museum tasks only the education department with marketing rated their analog media as slightly effective. The two respondents who chose “none of the above” in the question on departments in charge of marketing chose “neutral” and “slightly effective” in reply to the current question. So effective marketing to students does not appear to be affected by what department is tasked with the responsibility.

The only variable that had a noticeable impact on ratings of effectiveness was the number of media used. For three of the four respondents that chose “very effective,” and seven of the twelve respondents that chose “slightly effective,” respondents’ marketers were using three or more different forms of analog media to reach students. Conversely, for those that chose “neutral,” only two of the eight respondents used three or more forms, with the majority (four)

using two forms of analog media. For those that chose “slightly ineffective,” three of the four respondents were using only one form of analog media. It is clear that the perceived effectiveness of analog media rises as more forms of media are employed.

It is important to note the difference between perceived effectiveness versus actual effectiveness. Survey respondents were asked how they measure the effectiveness of their analog marketing methods (Appendix B, Question 10). The majority of responses cited attendance at events as their primary measure of analog marketing effectiveness. A slightly smaller number of respondents cited using informal surveys and interviews, and a minority stated that they do not or cannot measure the effectiveness of this form of marketing. Out of these measures, only surveys and interviews provide quantitative data on the actual effectiveness of analog marketing media. Using attendance as a measure of the effectiveness of analog marketing media is incongruous, as it only provides data on the number of attendees, not from where the attendees learned about the event. So, when examining the previous ratings of effectiveness, one must keep in mind that those ratings are perceived and not based on quantitative data.

Digital Media

Digital is the second main category of media used to market academic art museums and their programming to university students. This category includes email, social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and blogging. Survey respondents were polled on which media they use at their museum (Table 9). All but two respondents completed the question, and almost all of them use Facebook, Twitter, and email for digital marketing to students. Instagram, blogging, YouTube, and museum websites were all less frequently used (the latter two platforms

were identified in the comment field). Additionally, one individual shared that their museum does not use any of these methods (Appendix B, Question 11). Respondents rated the effectiveness of digital marketing media as being slightly better than that of analog media, as seen in Table 10.

Table 9. Digital Media Used to Market to Students

“Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students,” Survey, *SurveyMonkey*, Beth Hanks, 21 Sept. 2014. Web.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Email	96.3%	26
Facebook	100.0%	27
Twitter	88.9%	24
Instagram	55.6%	15
Blog	44.4%	12
Other (please specify)		6

Table 10. Perceived Effectiveness of Digital Marketing

“Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students,” Survey, *SurveyMonkey*, Beth Hanks, 21 Sept. 2014. Web.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very effective	32.1%	9
Slightly effective	42.9%	12
Neutral	17.9%	5
Slightly ineffective	3.6%	1
Not at all effective	3.6%	1

After analyzing and comparing responses in each answer option group, no discernable trends were identified. Ratings of effectiveness did not coalesce around university type, student body size, the number or type of departments in charge of marketing, the number or form of digital media used, or how effectiveness was measured. For example, the individual who chose

“slightly ineffective” uses all of the listed forms of digital media. Both their marketing and education departments are involved in outreach to students. Students are considered to be very important as a constituent body. Yet, the respondent rated both their analog and digital media to be “slightly ineffective.” Another public university with the same number of students (over 30,000) employed the same media and departments at their museum, and rated both their analog and digital media as “very effective.” The only difference between the responses the two individuals provided was that the second university actively involves students in the museum’s outreach.

Word of Mouth and Other Strategies

As one can see, both analog and digital forms of marketing provide various challenges and levels of success. Though not asked about directly, the only method of marketing that received uniformly high praise from survey respondents was word of mouth. It may seem strange to think of word of mouth as a method, but consider the structures of student networks at universities. As one respondent stated in the comment section for question eight, “if [a student’s] friend or group of friends will be in attendance, the likelihood of [the student’s] own engagement increases” (Appendix B, Question 8). University students are, in general terms, a more social and networked group than almost any other university art museum constituent group. Therefore, using the network inherent within a body of students is key in reaching broader numbers of students.

The importance of word of mouth was emphasized in response to Question 14, “Are there any other strategies used by your museum or gallery to engage university students?” (Appendix

B, Question 14). Eleven of the 21 responses cited using either students or faculty members to inform other university students about the museum. These examples of word of mouth were casually and formally constructed. Concerning faculty, some university art museums simply asked them to make announcements about events and exhibitions. More formally, some museum staffers worked directly with faculty members to encourage, or require, student attendance at exhibitions and events. Concerning students, most respondents' museums take a middle-ground approach. Museum-employed students and student advisory committees are formally tasked with generating positive word of mouth for the museum. This activity then happens in a range of forms, from casual, personal conversations to formal, museum-sanctioned digital marketing and outreach. One respondent highlighted a particularly robust student-based outreach program:

We employ three student coordinators who manage our outreach efforts to our student group. All students of the college are offered free membership in our Student Friends of the Art Museum, they simply have to supply us with their name and college email address. The student coordinators maintain a listserv of current student members -- which at present totals roughly 1,100 -- and they send email blasts to the listserve the day before or day of a student event . . . (Appendix II, Question 14)

Another respondent presented a similarly striking use of student-to-student marketing:

We make a practice of directly reaching out to individual students and student groups with expressed interest in topics related to our current projects and exhibitions. Our Student Advisory Board is a great sounding board for ideas that we hope to market to students. The group is also especially helpful in actively engaging and partnering with other students and institutions on campus on its own. The students are very dedicated to the mission of the Museum, and sometimes individually seize opportunities on behalf of the group when they see a great one arise. The students will also keep us abreast of changes in digital and social media trends, at least on campus. (Appendix B, Question 14)

Not all forms of word of mouth generation need to be as sophisticated as the two previous examples. Robust programs such as these require time, energy, and oversight from museum staff.

That being said, word of mouth should be a tool all campus art museums use for connecting with the wider student body.

Another method of attracting students was also apparent in the anecdotes provided to Question 14, and Question 15, “Please leave any other comments of related anecdotes about your experience in marketing your museum, or gallery, and its events to students” (Appendix B). Many of the respondents cited student-focused or student-created programming as a way of getting university students into the museum. This is not a marketing method per se, but the prevalence of museums’ consideration and attention to student interests in regards to programming was noteworthy.

Best Practices

There are many marketing materials available to university art museums for promoting themselves and their programming to students. The perceived effectiveness of a these materials does not vary according to student body size, the type of college, or who is in charge of marketing to students. Therefore, increasing effectiveness depends on: 1) understanding how students consume information, and 2) knowing how to use chosen marketing materials for maximized reach and minimized effort. The following suggested best practices relate to both.

Analog Materials

As seen in the survey results, the perceived effectiveness of analog marketing materials at individual museums varied. The only practice that bolstered ratings of effectiveness was using

more forms of analog materials. Unfortunately, the survey results do not include enough information to firmly state whether this is a perception or a reality. Respondents may perceive that using greater numbers of materials is more effective simply due to volume: the more material dispersed, the more likely it is that students will see it. Yet this may also be a reality for university art museums. In the context of marketing to university students, most university art museums operate in a closed environment. Museum staff only need to distribute analog marketing media around the university campus to reach students. This is unlike marketing to almost any other constituent group, at any type of museum. Consequently, it may indeed be a best practice for university art museums to use a greater number of analog marketing materials. It is understood, though, that adding another form of analog marketing media creates an incurred expense for museums, in both production costs and staff time. Therefore, museums should weigh available funds and staff time against the number and type of analog media used to market to students.

Additionally, introducing or augmenting measures of effectiveness will help staff appraise their current efforts and make any necessary changes. This is certainly a difficult task, as obtaining feedback on analog media is not nearly as easy as obtaining feedback on digital media. Yet using informal surveys and interviews with students, as suggested by survey respondents, is the easiest method of obtaining this information. Another feasible method is asking students how they heard about an event when signing in, or signing up for an email list at an event. However museums choose to capture this data, obtaining and analyzing it will help staff determine where their energies are best spent.

Digital Media

The effectiveness of digital media used by university art museums is equally unaffected by the size of the parent university, university type, or who is in charge of creating and dispersing the media. The only practice that impacted effectiveness ratings was the involvement of students in both the planning and implementation of marketing. In addition to involving students, museum staff should determine what social media channels are used most heavily by students at the university. Doing so will help staff focus their efforts on platforms where students are the most active and attentive.

Email

Email is a challenging but important tool in reaching university students. One of the main challenges is getting students to simply read emails sent by their campus art museum. As previously mentioned, Erin Northington at the Harvard Art Museums received conflicting feedback on email. An individual from the Harvard communication office shared that students favored email over any other form of communication. Yet, Northington heard directly from students that they receive too many emails and rarely have a chance to read emails from the museum (Northington). This is a frustration common to many attempting to reach students via email. No university art museum should discount email completely though, as there are ways of making the media more effective.

Northington provided an excellent example of how she met the aforementioned challenge. Upon realizing that undergraduate students were difficult to reach via email, she connected with members of the museum's Student Board who also represent each of Harvard's undergraduate

houses. Houses at Harvard are multi-functional dormitories intended to cultivate deep social and intellectual connections between students (“Student Life”). By tasking a student from each house with emailing their cohorts about the museum and its programs, Northington is able to increase her reach and create greater engagement. This example reflects the importance of creating student-to-student word of mouth, and the importance of collaborating with “trusted resources.” By partnering with trusted campus resources (i.e. a group or individual that aggregates and disseminates information related to students), in promoting to the museum and its events to students via email, academic art museums can improve the effectiveness of their email communications.

Other important areas of consideration are the content and structure of emails sent to students. The 2012 and 2013 Millennial Impact Reports provide sage advice on these components. The authors polled millennials on what information they prefer to receive via email. The preferred types of information were news items (65 percent), event notices (61 percent), and opportunities for involvement with the organization (47 percent). Also, while it may be tempting to include all of the information related to an event or an opportunity within an email, brevity is key. Otherwise, one risks overwhelming email recipients and turning them off from reading any additional emails from the organization (Feldman et al., “2012” 8). Instead of including paragraphs of text, museum marketers should consider providing links to full stories or event listings, and a simple calendar of events (Feldman et al., “2013” 16). By crafting an email that is easy to scan, with information that is to the point, students will be more likely to absorb information relevant to them. Of equal importance is including a “call to action,” or a statement that motivates students to participate in a specific activity. This could include attending an event, volunteering for the museum, or sharing information about the museum with their friends.

Providing opportunities for engagement and involvement via email will make students more likely to open and read emails going forward.

One habit that is sure to irritate students is sending emails too frequently. In both the 2012 and 2013 Millennial Impact Reports, survey respondents highlighted their annoyance with receiving emails from organizations too often (Feldman et al., “2013” 16; Feldman et al., “2012” 8). Some respondents even stated that they would begin automatically deleting emails from an organization if they received too many emails in short intervals (Feldman et al., “2012” 8). The reports’ authors do not define “too frequently,” but academic art museums should appraise the frequency of their email communications to students. Additionally, if students also receive emails from other departments in the museum, it is essential to coordinate the timing of emails.

Though email may have its challenges, one of its major benefits is the ease of assessment. Built-in assessment tools are standard to many web-based email platforms now. These platforms include services such as Constant Contact, MailChimp, and ActiveCampaign. After sending an email to a contact list through these services, one can usually track the number of opens, forwards, clicks, and social shares (“Track Your Results”). This data is tremendously helpful for measuring engagement created via an email. The downside to these services is that they do cost money, and therefore may not be feasible for all university art museums.

Social Media

Social media platforms are free, expedient ways to connect with students. Facebook is one of the best platforms to use for promotion. Its variety of features allows marketers to disseminate information simply and quickly. While most marketers at university art museums use Facebook, it is worth looking to civic museums to compare the use of the platform. Sree

Sreenivasan, Chief Digital Officer at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (the Met), is an excellent source for such information. He frequently shares his presentations and strategies on his social media pages. In his slides for the October 2014 Museum Ideas conference, he provided lists of content used on the Met's social media platforms. Content posted on the Met's Facebook page included; exhibition listings, event and programming announcements, museum news, collection highlights, artist birthdays, blog posts from the main website, and links to their other social media channels (Sreenivasan). By using such a variety of content, the Museum's page stays fresh, and followers are given plenty opportunities to engage. Anyone who has "liked" (done so by clicking the "Like" button on a Facebook page) the Met's Facebook page can easily scan all of the provided information for posts that are relevant to them. It is also important to note that almost all of the content the Met posts can be pulled from other existing sources at the Museum. In following the Met's lead, university art museums can diversify their postings and make their pages more dynamic.

Additionally, campus art museums should "like" the pages of partner student organizations, university departments, and programs. By creating digital connections with partner organizations, museums can broaden their reach to a wider student audience. Students who "like" the page of a partner organization may see the museum in the automatically generated list of other suggested pages to "like." Also, if it is comfortable and appropriate to do so, museums could ask partner organizations to share posts from the museum's page on the organization's page. Doing so would spread the museum's message even further, in a fast and simple way. Managing a Facebook page does not have to be an onerous task; it does require thoughtfulness regarding the type of content shared, and how to use the platform expeditiously.

Outside of the ability to quickly and easily share information, Facebook also offers analytic tools that allow university art museums to track engagement. There are two tabs on the backend of Facebook that are of note; “Activity” and “Insights.” The Activity tab allows museums to see exactly who has been active on their page through “likes,” comments, and shares. This information not only provides data on who is engaging with the page, but at what times. As Facebook’s News Feed is a constant stream of information from many sources, it is worth knowing at what time of day, and which days of the week, students are most active on one’s Facebook page. Timing posts to correspond with peak usage hours will increase engagement. The Insights tab provides quantitative data on “likes,” “reach,” “visits,” “posts,” and “people.” This information requires tracking, and a deeper understanding of statistical data. Yet it is highly useful information for university art museums that want to measure their effectiveness in reaching students on Facebook.

Twitter is not used as universally as Facebook, by museums or students, but it is an excellent platform for building relationships with students, and disseminating information rapidly. The types of information shared on Twitter mirror those shared on Facebook, and can also include “live tweeting” from events (Sreenivasan). Twitter is an information conduit the same as Facebook, but Twitter requires more personal engagement from the account manager(s). Twitter, at its worst, is used to post impersonal bits of information with no follow up to replies or questions (Feldman et al., “2012” 12). Instead, museum marketers who aim to engage students on Twitter should post varied information with frequent use of photos, hashtags, and mentions of other organizations.

Twitter also has an analytic tool for users, accessible at <http://analytics.twitter.com>. Though not as robust a tool as Facebook’s analytic pages, the information available here allows

museums to track activity around their tweets and followers. Though more qualitative in nature, tracking hashtags (the symbol “#” followed by an acronym, word, or phrase) and retweets (re-postings of tweets by other individuals) related to events and programming may be more informative (“Using Hashtags on Twitter,” “FAQs about Retweets (RT)”). Doing so would supply data on whether students are actively connected to a museum’s Twitter page. It would also show what types of information garner the most engagement by students. This would help marketers either refocus their efforts, or reinforce practices that are already working.

University art museums and students use Instagram to a much lesser extent than Facebook or Twitter. However, it is an excellent tool for marketers looking to create engagement with students. Sreenivasan, in the previously mentioned presentation, shared a list of image categories that the Met posts on its Instagram. These images included artwork from the collection, views of both permanent and temporary exhibitions, event photos, photos of the museum’s architecture, and historical images (Sreenivasan). The variety of images highlights the museum itself, its collections, and its programming. For university art museums not already posting such a diverse array of images, they may want to expand their shared content. Doing so informs and familiarizes followers. This can create better engagement with students who are already interested in the museum. For those students unfamiliar and curious about the museum, Instagram can be a way for them to enter into the museum virtually before doing so physically. This makes visiting the museum for the first time less intimidating and more attractive. Instagram does not provide any back-end tracking mechanisms, so museums should track the number of “likes” and the use of hashtags to monitor student engagement.

There are a number of other platforms that university art museums use to market themselves and their programming to students, including YouTube, Google +, and various

blogging sites (“Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students”). With the large variety of platforms available, university art museums must choose which platforms they use by considering current students’ online activity and available staff time. These museums should all be using at least one platform, as social media offers the ability to be more nimble and expedient in marketing to students. The built-in structures of these websites allow marketers to move quickly past design (e.g. consider the time spent designing an email template, or an event poster) into content sharing and two-way communication. Social media activity is based on content, and increasingly, visual content. Not only is it easier for students to scan visual content than text-based content, they are also more likely to share a museum’s post on social media if it has a visual component (Feldman et al., “2013” 20). “Social sharing” is a primary benefit of using social media to market to students. If they connect with an event, news item, call to action, or other piece of content posted by their university’s art museum, they are likely to share it with friends. Additionally, social shares provide museums with concrete information on what this audience finds interesting, and with what content they want to engage.

On a deeper level, social media allows museums to have two-way communication with university students in a way that cannot happen through email or analog marketing materials. Though the authors of “Campus Art Museums in the 21st Century: A Conversation” were discussing in-house experiences, their following quote is also applicable to social media interactions between museums and students:

“[Students] seek opportunities for more engaged fluid participation, ‘insider’ access to the process as well as the ‘products’ of culture, an authentic voice for themselves in the experience, and modes of interaction that are not mediated by the traditional, hierarchical structures of authority.” (Shapiro et al. 9)

Social media allows students to have fluid interactions with university art museums in a way that is easy and familiar. It also allows students to add their voice to mix and converse with museum

staff. As Amelia Bartak noted in the book *Museum Marketing: Competing in the Global Marketplace*, this type of dialogue via technology allows for expansive relationship building (23). If university art museums approach their social media channels as outlets for promotion *and* places of relationship building, they may quickly develop a more engaged, more diverse student audience.

Word of Mouth

Survey respondents resoundingly championed word of mouth promotion. This circles back to the idea of trusted resources, as discussed in the section on email best practices. If information is communicated to a student from a source they trust, they are more likely to act on that information (e.g. attending an event or going to an exhibition). Hence, museum staff tasked with reaching students should work with other resources to spread the word. These resources can include campus news outlets (e.g. newspapers, radio stations), faculty, student organizations, and individual students. This promotion can occur either face-to-face, or online.

Most academic art museums are familiar with asking faculty members to make announcements in class, or requesting student advisory board members to promote the museum and its programming to their friends. What may be more unfamiliar is working with students to do online promotion. The student-to-student connection is as strong online as it is on campus. Accordingly, museums should consider how to involve students who are already active at the museum in online promotion. One respondent shared an example of this; “Social media outreach is via our Student Committee’s own social media platforms” (Appendix B, Question 14). Another respondent shared a more intensive involvement of students:

“Of all the digital platforms you list, Instagram has been a clear winner for us with respect to marketing the museum and its holdings to students. Our three student coordinators all have access to the account, and they each invite their friends to follow the museum account. This creates a solid base of currently enrolled followers who get to see when we post informal images of recent acquisitions or works on view.” (Appendix B, Question 15)

These examples highlight excellent use of student networks to increase marketing effectiveness. Students connect to their friends, who then connect the museum’s page to other friends, and so on. In this way, the museum’s network and reach broadens within the student body.

For those museums that want to increase the dynamism of their social media pages, they may want to consider letting individual students do social media “takeovers.” Most popular on Twitter and Instagram, a “takeover” is when an individual outside an organization posts as that organization for a limited amount of time (“Instagram Takeover”). The Council for Advancement and Support of Education interviewed two university administrators on the topic of student takeovers on Instagram (“Is an Instagram Takeover Right for Your Institution?”). The administrators noted that takeovers require more work, as students need to be vetted, trained (to an extent), and monitored. Yet, they both highlight how student takeovers provide content that they, as administrators, could not capture themselves. Additionally, the staff member from Ithaca College noted that, “Trust is also a huge benefit of our takeovers. Our audience trusts the account because each takeover has a different style and voice, so they know that the content they’re seeing comes from their peers.” The second administrator, from St. Lawrence University, reflected, “Students who have run the account have told their friends about the experience. The word is out: it’s real, it’s theirs. They like that we trust them” (“Is an Instagram Takeover Right for Your Institution?”). A social media takeover might be right for those museums looking to take advantage of the power of word of mouth promotion between students in the online environment.

Programming

Programming would usually be described as a product to be marketed, not a form of marketing. However, survey respondents mentioned programming so frequently in their comments that the topic requires discussion. Just as direct student involvement in promotion can be a boon to museums, so too can direct student involvement in event planning. One respondent highlighted this practice:

When developing programs or special projects, I find that including students as early in the process as possible, and recognizably incorporating their input in some important and visible way has been essential in cultivating investment in current and future projects. Asking a student to market projects wholly conceived within the institution without a substantive nod (a tangible idea or change that was recognizably catalyzed by them would be considered substantial) to a student voice is often met with little to no enthusiasm, and subsequently, little to no attendance or engagement. Another effective method of engagement is discovering latent connections between a student's own interests and the museum's interests. Asking a student to talk about their passions can often result in a hidden gem of an idea for a program. Student Outreach is an active process, and works best when institutions are open to working with students, rather than encouraging students to work for us. The more the former is sensed, the more the latter will occur as a result. (Appendix B, Question 15)

This is a laudable example of student involvement, one that meets many of the challenges at hand. Students are involved in all stages of planning, which leads to their greater investment in the program. This, in turn, breeds excitement and energy in the participating students. They then share their excitement with friends, who then become interested and invested as well. Accordingly, both the programming and promotion connect with a broader range of students, and bring them into the museum.

Though not all respondents appeared to be working so closely with students in program development, many museums are creating student-focused, or student-only, programming. These events include study sessions in the galleries, afterhours mingling alongside music and food, and

yoga in the galleries (Appendix B, Question 14). By creating programming that strongly reflect students' interests (as one respondent put it, "make it fun and serve food"), the chances of capturing students' time and attention increases dramatically (Appendix B, Question 15). For those university art museums with flexibility in their programming, they may want to consider creating student-focused events with the help of students already active at the museum. Providing activities that are of interest to the broader student body will certainly increase the chances of marketing efforts being effective.

Conclusion

University art museums have shifted their focus back to their campus constituents, and to fulfilling their role as teaching museums. These changes have meant putting a premium on attracting and engaging university students. Museums have been successful in doing so through classes, yet this reaches only a small demographic of a university's student body. Additionally, classes only engage students in part of a museum's offerings; students who do not attend museum programming miss out on unique learning, social, and networking opportunities.

A survey of 29 college and university art museums across the United States revealed that these museums market to students through a variety of analog materials and digital media. Posters, hardcopy mailings, email, Facebook, and Twitter are the most commonly used forms and platforms for marketing. Ads in college newspapers, Instagram, and blogging were used by fewer respondents, with only a few using chalk advertisements around campus, or sites like YouTube. Though many museums use the same tools, their perceptions of effectiveness vary.

Perceptions of effectiveness ran from very effective to slightly ineffective for both types of media, with the largest number of respondents choosing “slightly effective” in each category. The effectiveness of analog marketing materials is notably difficult to measure, and many museums relied on attendance numbers for assessment. It is suggested that museums instead survey or interview students for measurable data regarding how students learned about an event. The effectiveness of digital media is much easier to analyze, and many responding museums take advantage of built-in measurement tools in email programs, Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. No matter how museums track and analyze the effectiveness of their marketing materials, it is key that they do so. This will allow staff tasked with marketing to students to focus their energies on the material or media that produces the greatest levels of engagement.

In tandem with analyzing materials and media used, museums should also research best practices on communicating with student-aged individuals, and marketing best practices from civic museums. Reports such as the Millennial Impact Report and studies from the Pew Research Center provide excellent advice and information on communicating with young audiences. Individual practitioners like Sree Sreenivasan from the Metropolitan Museum in New York City also provide extremely useful information on current practices, and digital platforms, used by civic museums. Research should be done on a three to five year basis, as the rate of technological innovation will drive continual shifts in these areas.

Though the best practices gathered here will become somewhat outdated within that same time period, the following ideas will be of lasting use for museums in marketing to students. The first is to partner with trusted resources on campus to promote the museum and its programming. These resources are known by students and will therefore garner more attention than would an email from an organization. In a similar vein, develop strong word of mouth on campus and

online. This occurs most successfully between students; encourage students already active at the museum to spread the word about the organization and its programming to their friends. Or, enlist students be an active part of online promotion. Additionally, look at social media as a tool for relationship building as well as promotion. Talk to students, let them see behind the scenes at the museum, and invite them to be part of the museum's community. Lastly, offer programming that will be of interest to students. The best marketing materials and media will not translate into better student attendance if the programming is not of interest to this audience. This does not mean that museums should only create social activities for students. Instead, campus art museums should work with students to identify their interests as they relate to the museum and its collections, and use this information to develop programming. By doing the aforementioned, museums can develop strategies that will allow them to improve their effectiveness in marketing to university students. In turn, students will become more active constituents, taking fuller advantage of the dynamic, evocative collections and programming that are the unique offerings of campus art museums.

Appendix A

Screen Captures of the Survey Sent to University Art Museum Staff

Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students

Introduction

Thank you for taking part in this survey on the challenges of, and successes in, marketing university art museums, galleries, and their events to university students. Results from this survey will be used as part of the research for my capstone paper for my master's degree in Museum Studies from Harvard Extension School.

All responses will remain anonymous, and quotes and anecdotes will remain dissassociated from your institution.

This survey is 15 questions in length, and will take 15-20 minutes to complete. Your time and the information you share here are greatly appreciated. Please let me know if you have further comments on this subject, or if you have any questions on my research. Please also email me if you would like a summary of the survey results or a copy of my final paper - bethany.hankes@gmail.com.

Next

Questions on the museum-student relationship

1. What type of university is your museum or gallery affiliated with?

- ☐ Private
- ☐ Public
- ☐ Art School

Other (please specify)

2. Approximately, what is the size of the student body at the university which your museum or gallery is affiliated with?

- ☐ 2,000 students or less
- ☐ 2,000 - 5,000 students
- ☐ 5,000 - 10,000 students
- ☐ 10,000 - 20,000 students
- ☐ 20,000 - 30,000 students
- ☐ over 30,000 students

3. On a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important), please give an estimate of how important students are as a constituent group at your museum or gallery:

Not at all important	Somewhat unimportant	Neutral	Somewhat important	Very important
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. What activities do students participate in, or go to, at your art museum or gallery? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ volunteer positions
- ☐ internships
- ☐ paid positions
- ☐ student guide program
- ☐ advisory board
- ☐ extracurricular, learning-based activities (e.g. lectures, workshops . . .)
- ☐ extracurricular, social activities (e.g. openings, galas . . .)

Other

5. On a scale from 1 (not at all satisfied) to 5 (very satisfied), how satisfied is your museum or gallery with student attendance at your extracurricular events?

Not at all satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. On a scale from 1 (not at all satisfied) to 5 (very satisfied), how satisfied is your museum or gallery with student attendance during regular business hours, outside of class and events?

Not at all satisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Questions on marketing efforts to engage and gain students' attention

7. Which department is in charge of promoting the museum, or gallery, and its events to students?

- ☐ Marketing department
- ☐ Education department
- ☐ Both
- ☐ None of the above

8. Which analog methods of marketing does your museum or gallery use when promoting the museum, or gallery, and its events to students? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Ads in the college newspaper
- ☐ Postcards, flyers, or other mailings
- ☐ Posters
- ☐ Chalkboard advertisements (*handwritten advertising blurbs written on chalboards in classrooms*)
- ☐ Other (please specify)

9. On a scale of 1 (not at all effective) to 5 (very effective), how would you rate the effectiveness of the analog marketing methods your museum or gallery uses to reach and engage university students?

Not at all effective	Slightly ineffective	Neutral	Slightly effective	Very effective
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. How do you measure the effectiveness of the analog marketing methods that you use?

11. Which digital methods of marketing does your museum or gallery use when promoting the museum, or gallery, and its events to students? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Email
- ☐ Facebook
- ☐ Twitter
- ☐ Instagram
- ☐ Blog

Other (please specify)

12. On a scale of 1 (not at all effective) to 5 (very effective), how would you rate the effectiveness of the digital marketing methods your museum or gallery uses to reach and engage university students?

Not at all effective	Slightly ineffective	Neutral	Slightly effective	Very effective
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. How do you measure the effectiveness of the digital marketing methods that you use?

14. Are there any other strategies or programs used by your museum or gallery to engage university students?

15. Please leave any other comments or related anecdotes about your experience in marketing your museum, or gallery, and its events to students.

Thank you!

Thank you for completing this survey. Your time and participation is greatly appreciated.

If you would like a summary of the survey results or a copy of my final paper, please email me at bethany.hankes@gmail.com.

Prev

Done

Appendix B

Raw Data from “Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students”

Question 1: What type of university is your museum or gallery affiliated with?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Private	50.0%	14
Public	32.1%	9
Art School	17.9%	5
Other (please specify)		3
<i>answered question</i>		28
<i>skipped question</i>		1

Comments from “Other (please specify)”:

- Liberal arts under grad college
- All of the above
- [redacted for anonymity]

Question 2: Approximately, what is the size of the student body at the university which your museum or gallery is affiliated with?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
2,000 students or less	10.3%	3
2,000 - 5,000 students	27.6%	8
5,000 - 10,000 students	13.8%	4
10,000 - 20,000 students	10.3%	3
20,000 - 30,000 students	13.8%	4
over 30,000 students	24.1%	7
<i>answered question</i>		29
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Question 3: On a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important), please give an estimate of how important students are as a constituent group at your museum or gallery:		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very important	75.9%	22
Somewhat important	20.7%	6
Neutral	0.0%	0
Somewhat unimportant	3.5%	1
Not at all important	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		29
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Question 4: What activities do students participate in, or go to, at your art museum or gallery? (Check all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
volunteer positions	65.5%	19
internships	86.2%	25
paid positions	96.6%	28
student guide program	58.6%	17
advisory board	65.5%	19
extracurricular, learning-based activities (e.g. lectures, workshops . . .)	96.6%	28
extracurricular, social activities (e.g. openings, galas)	89.7%	26
Other		2
<i>answered question</i>		29
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Comments:

- student membership president, student membership advocacy council, classes, curatorial projects, teaching in k-12 education
- [...] Student Government currently funds free membership for students. Limited to 2,000 per semester currently but we're hoping to increase. [...] SG also funds once-a-month evening hours called Museum Nights (2nd Thursday of each month, 6 - 9 pm) with activities that students help program and student groups also perform.

Question 5: On a scale from 1 (not at all satisfied) to 5 (very satisfied), how satisfied is your museum or gallery with student attendance at your extracurricular events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very satisfied	6.9%	2
Somewhat satisfied	44.8%	13
Neutral	17.2%	5
Somewhat dissatisfied	27.6%	8
Not at all satisfied	3.5%	1
<i>answered question</i>		29
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Question 6: On a scale from 1 (not at all satisfied) to 5 (very satisfied), how satisfied is your museum or gallery with student attendance during regular business hours, outside of class and events?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very satisfied	3.5%	1
Somewhat satisfied	27.6%	8
Neutral	20.7%	6
Somewhat dissatisfied	31.0%	9
Not at all satisfied	17.2%	5
<i>answered question</i>		29
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Question 7: Which department is in charge of promoting the museum, or gallery, and its events to students?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Marketing department	17.9%	5
Education department	3.6%	1
Both	71.4%	20
None of the above	7.1%	2
<i>answered question</i>		28
<i>skipped question</i>		1

Question 8: Which analog methods of marketing does your museum or gallery use when promoting the museum, or gallery, and its events to students? (Check all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Ads in the college newspaper	57.1%	16
Postcards, flyers, or other mailings	71.4%	20
Posters	85.7%	24
Chalkboard advertisements (handwritten advertising blurbs written on chalkboards in classrooms)	14.3%	4
Other (please specify)	25.0%	7
<i>answered question</i>		28
<i>skipped question</i>		1

Comments:

- Word of mouth: if one's friend or group of friends will be in attendance, the likelihood of one's own engagement increases.
- Recently started the ads and posters. The effectiveness is not yet known.
- Digital signage on campus, table tents, stickers, social media, lawn signs
- Printed campus event calendar, articles in newspaper or on student radio station
- Chalking on sidewalks
- Social media is a big one. Our education department usually partners with student groups for programming our Museum Nights program and that gives mark/pr and automatic audience to help spread the work. They share our posts on social media. We use radio advertising, cheaper, more repetition. There are free opportunities to promote our programs on TV's within student housing. Table toppers in our student [...] union's food court.
- Social media

Question 9: On a scale of 1 (not at all effective) to 5 (very effective), how would you rate the effectiveness of the analog marketing methods your museum or gallery uses to reach and engage university students?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very effective	14.2%	4
Slightly effective	42.9%	12
Neutral	28.6%	8
Slightly ineffective	14.2%	4
Not at all effective	0.0%	0
<i>answered question</i>		28
<i>skipped question</i>		1

Question 10: How do you measure the effectiveness of the analog marketing methods that you use?	
Answer Options	Response Count
Comment field	24
<i>answered question</i>	24
<i>skipped question</i>	5

Comments:

- The attendance of our museum with students and the community; town hall meetings
- Informal surveying of attendees
- we really don't
- informal interviews/chats with students who come to the museum for various events (e.g. How did you hear about this event? What made you want to approach us to develop this program?)
- Honestly, we don't have a metric for looking at this.
- Student attendance
- Attendance figures
- It's challenging to measure the effectiveness of analog marketing methods, but we do often get students saying that they saw our posters.
- We don't have any metrics to analyze the effectiveness. The response is based on anecdotal evidence.
- We ask students directly about advertising and how they heard about events. Our college is very small (under 2000 total students) so analog marketing works extremely well for our institution.
- By attendance at events
- We really have no great way to measure the degree to which posters are/are not effective.
- Mainly word of mouth, visual presence of students at events, student response on social media/ on campus.
- Surveys, observation
- Attendance at events.
- Surveys, word-of-mouth
- Surveys at events
- estimated attendance, student feedback
- Attendance at Museum Nights which ranges from 300 to 800 per evening. Our 2,000 free student membership program has a waiting list.
- Regular visitor survey
- Attendance
- Student surveys and responsiveness from student advisory board
- How many people show up!
- Attendance!

Question 11: Which digital methods of marketing does your museum or gallery use when promoting the museum, or gallery, and its events to students? (Check all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Email	96.3%	26
Facebook	100.0%	27
Twitter	88.9%	24
Instagram	55.6%	15
Blog	44.4%	12
Other (please specify)		6
<i>answered question</i>		27
<i>skipped question</i>		2

Comments:

- Blog (Tumblr) is new this year; Instagram we have not used because of worries with copyright on works in the collection
- Occasionally YouTube
- targeted on-campus listserve communications
- Museum's website. Campus events page
- None at present.
- Website.

Question 12: On a scale of 1 (not at all effective) to 5 (very effective), how would you rate the effectiveness of the digital marketing methods your museum or gallery uses to reach and engage university students?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Very effective	32.1%	9
Slightly effective	42.9%	12
Neutral	17.9%	5
Slightly ineffective	3.6%	1
Not at all effective	3.6%	1
<i>answered question</i>		28
<i>skipped question</i>		1

Question 13: How do you measure the effectiveness of the digital marketing methods that you use?	
Answer Options	Response Count
Comment field	26
<i>answered question</i>	26
<i>skipped question</i>	3

Comments:

- Paid Facebook posts increased attendance (or seemed to) for this fall's open house; but the programming was likely the most effective for the target audience (students/staff)
- Informal surveying of attendees; digital engagement analytics
- monitoring likes, followers, and responses
- Facebook events let us know who plans to come, and the students search for people they recognize. Impressions on social media and constant contact stats help us figure out who is seeing the information, and we weigh those stats against attendance, where appropriate. We hear students who engage with us in other ways mention that they've seen our institutional facebook page, student facebook page, or blog.
- Again, we don't have a metric for looking at this. Our Communications office may look at Google analytics, but I'm not certain.
- Student attendance - participation in social media
- Attendance figures
- We use Facebook data (number of students "attending" an FB event, number of "likes" or other measures of interaction) to gauge the popularity of various posts or events.
- We use site visits and likes stats.
- Unfortunately, our email program currently does not allow us to see how many people open our emails, so there are no concrete metrics for us to use. Again, it's mostly anecdotal.
- Comparing likes/shares/reach to other posts, asking students directly.
- By likes, shares, retweets, etc.
- We look at email analytics & Facebook/Instagram likes etc. - but mostly we are guessing.
- Student engagement on social media, referrals from student sites to our webpage (calculated via Google Analytics).
- Google analytics, FB insights
- hard to measure - just started more serious twitter outreach;
- Attendance at events
- Analytics programs.
- surveys at events
- estimated attendance, student feedback
- We measure the likes and shares. But don't specifically monitor each use and can't connect it with exact attendance. We are a department of two.
- FB event responses, Likes/RTs/mentions and other engagements
- NA
- Measuring and Tracking Analytics
- We do not have a specific measurement tool.
- Attendance! Retweeting, Instagram hashtags.

Question 14: Are there any other strategies or programs used by your museum or gallery to engage university students?	
Answer Options	Response Count
Comment field	21
<i>answered question</i>	21
<i>skipped question</i>	8

Comments:

- Developing programs with professors and their students; lunch time lectures
- We employ three student coordinators who manage our outreach efforts to our student group. All students of the college are offered free membership in our Student Friends of the Art Museum, they simply have to supply us with their name and college email address. The student coordinators maintain a listserv of current student members -- which at present totals roughly 1,100 -- and they send email blasts to the listserv the day before or day of a student event. Student-only events, which typically involve some sort of refreshment (ranging from sushi and light apps up to high end beer and wine tastings), tend to attract on average 100 - 150 students.
- We make a practice of directly reaching out to individual students and student groups with expressed interest in topics related to our current projects and exhibitions. Our Student Advisory Board is a great sounding board for ideas that we hope to market to students. The group is also especially helpful in actively engaging and partnering with other students and institutions on campus on its own. The students are very dedicated to the mission of the Museum, and sometimes individually seize opportunities on behalf of the group when they see a great one arise. The students will also keep us abreast of changes in digital and social media trends, at least on campus.
- Most of these initiatives come from the departments themselves (Art, Design).
- A faculty advisory committee is used to try to engage students through their faculty
- Museum Education Club
- We are in the process of developing a YouTube series intended to spread awareness of our museum both to students at our college and the world at large.
- The core group of students we employ and work with are the most effective at spreading the word about our events and programs. There's nothing like word of mouth.
- Student to student engagement - using our advisory board and student docents to reach out to other students directly. Having students involved in planning stages of every event for the campus community.
- Getting faculty to require or encourage students to attend gallery exhibitions & events (or best of all to tie coursework to exhibitions & events) is most effective.
- Partnering with other student groups, offsite events like Trivia Nights at a student coffee shop, strong relationships with faculty who also promote our events to students
- important to engage faculty across campus
- Social media outreach is via our Student Committee's own social media platforms.
- special events just for students [...]
- Word of mouth

- We have a full time education staff member who's job is to directly encourage faculty to use our resources in their classes. There is a "What is the Good Life" course that requires every [...] freshman student to take a cell phone tour of objects at the museum.
- Work with professors to integrate museum visits into the curriculum; organize programs that are suited to student schedules (late-night study halls around finals, quick-drop-in de-stress events during the quarter)
- We've just scheduled a series of programs: Study Sundays with Art Therapy in the Museum, Late Night at the museum with music and food, an App for the museum galleries.
- The mission of our museum is grounded in our responsibility as an innovative and transformative teaching and learning resource to our university and local community. Due to this, we are constantly thinking about how we can better engage students, both at our university and at other learning institutions in our community and across the globe. Our art study center, university galleries, and even the design and layout of our building and exhibitions are centered around creating new and exciting learning opportunities.
- We ask that teachers make announcements.
- We have an academic programs department that brings classes on tours of exhibitions and also storage areas. We involve students in co-curating exhibitions; professors teach classes around our exhibitions.

Question 15: Please leave any other comments or related anecdotes about your experience in marketing your museum, or gallery, and its events to students.	
Answer Options	Response Count
Comment field	12
<i>answered question</i>	12
<i>skipped question</i>	17

Comments:

- Note- We have no full time marketing position at our museum. Each staff member takes on a part of the marketing responsibilities. We have little budget for funding, hence little to no ad buys.
- Of all the digital platforms you list, Instagram has been a clear winner for us with respect to marketing the museum and its holdings to students. Our three student coordinators all have access to the account, and they each invite their friends to follow the museum account. This creates a solid base of currently enrolled followers who get to see when we post informal images of recent acquisitions or works on view. Twitter has also proven to be a solid platform through which to engage other more official student groups on campus (e.g. student news sharing orgs, the student run newspaper, photography and other creative student groups, etc.).
- It is extremely challenging. they only come to the exhibits if their teacher makes them or for parties.
- When developing programs or special projects, I find that including students as early in the process as possible, and recognizably incorporating their input in some important and

visible way has been essential in cultivating investment in current and future projects. Asking a student to market projects wholly conceived within the institution without a substantive nod (a tangible idea or change that was recognizably catalyzed by them would be considered substantial) to a student voice is often met with little to no enthusiasm, and subsequently, little to no attendance or engagement. Another effective method of engagement is discovering latent connections between a student's own interests and the museum's interests. Asking a student to talk about their passions can often result in a hidden gem of an idea for a program. Student Outreach is an active process, and works best when institutions are open to working with students, rather than encouraging students to work for us. The more the former is sensed, the more the latter will occur as a result.

- We often personally reach out to professors when the content of the museum relates to their coursework to set up a tour or activity at the museum.
- It's not easy to capture the free time of college students when you are in a city with so many other offerings.
- Our students interact with the Museum often during the day, so it is unclear how willing they are to spend more time in the evening. Qualitative data suggest students could be much more engaged in the Museum outside of class, but we have had difficulty building that community connection.
- Whenever possible, we try to use students to market to students. Peer to peer marketing is the most successful tactic we've found for this audience.
- make it fun & serve food. Provide access to living artists. Create integrated interdisciplinary programming.
- It is always in flux facebook ebbs and flows based on its effectiveness
- We are just getting started with developing a marketing strategy.
- We believe that our museums are a laboratory for the arts and it is at the heart of how we envision how we are to engage students. Every department within our organization is challenged to develop innovative ways to create experiences that will transform how students engage with and learn about art. It is with this united vision and passion for students that helps us strive to make an impact on the world and leads us to be a world-class cultural institution.

Works Cited

- Bradley, Laurel. "Curricular Connections: The College/University Art Museum as Site for Teaching and Learning." *caareviews.org*. College Art Association Reviews, 12 Aug. 2009. Web. 8 August 2014.
- Duggan, Maeve and Joanna Brenner. "The Demographics of Social Media Users – 2012." *Pew Research Center*, n.d. Web. 12 Oct. 2014.
- Duggan, Maeve and Aaron Smith. "Social Media Update 2013." *Pew Research Center*, n.d. Web. 12 Oct. 2014.
- "FAQs about Retweets (RT)." *Twitter*. Twitter, Inc., n.d. Web. 24 Nov. 2014.
- Feldman, Derrick et al. "The 2013 Millennial Impact Report." *Achieve Guidance*, n.d. Web. 26 Sept. 2014.
- . "The 2012 Millennial Impact Report." *Achieve Guidance*, n.d. Web. 26 Sept. 2014.
- Glesne, Corrine. "The Campus Art Museum: A Qualitative Study: Section III Museum Art in Everyday Life." *The Samuel H. Kress Foundation*, 2012. Web. 10 Oct. 2014.
- Goethals, Marion M. and Suzannah Fabing. "College and University Art Museum Program." *The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Museums and Conservation Program*, n.d. Web. 26 Sept. 2014.
- Hammond, Anna et al. "The Role of the University Art Museum and Gallery." *Art Journal* 65:3 (2006) 20-39. Web. 10 July 2014.
- "Instagram Takeover." *Twitter*. Twitter, Inc., n.d. Web. 24 Nov. 2014.
- "Is an Instagram Takeover Right for Your Institution?" *Council for Advancement and Support of Education Blog*. Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 16 July 2014. Web. 10 Aug. 2014.
- Jandl, Stefanie S. "Five Strategies for Strengthening the Teaching Role of an Academic Art Museum." *A Handbook for Academic Museums: Exhibitions and Education*. Eds. Jandl, Stefanie S. and Mark S. Gold. Boston: MuseumsEtc Ltd, 2012. 120-141. Print.
- Kass, Emily and Carolyn Allmendinger. "Mining the Hidden Jewel: Engagement and Transformation." *A Handbook for Academic Museums: Exhibitions and Education*. Eds. Jandl, Stefanie S. and Mark S. Gold. Boston: MuseumsEtc Ltd, 2012. 54-87. Print.

- King, Lyndel. "University Museums in the 21st Century." *Managing University Museums*. Ed. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2001. 19-28. Print.
- Mercer-Golden, Zoe. "Students in the Museum: From Inside the Ivy Covered Walls." *Center for the Future of Museums Blog*. Center for the Future of Museums, 14 Mar. 2013. Web. 09 Oct. 2014.
- Lenhart, Amanda et al. "Social Media and Mobile Internet Use Among Teens and Young Adults." *Pew Internet and American Life Project*, 2010. Web. 13 Aug. 2014.
- McGough, Beth L. and Danielle Salomon. "Engaging Students Through Social Media." *2013 Charleston Library Conference*. Eds. Beth R. Bernhardt and Leah Hinds. Charleston, SC: Purdue University, 2013. Web. 13 Oct. 2014.
- Northington, Erin. Personal Interview. 23 Apr. 2014.
- "On-Campus Event Promotion Guide." *Rutgers University*. N.p., n.d. Web. 3 Oct. 2014.
- Shapiro, Tom, Peter Linett, Betty Farrell, and Will Anderson. "Campus Art Museums in the 21st Century: A Conversation." *Cultural Policy Center at the University of Chicago*, 2012. Web. 09 Oct. 2014.
- Sreenivasan, Sree. "A Year in Museums: Lessons from @MetMuseum and Beyond." Museum Ideas 2014 International Conference. Museum of London, London, England. 02 Oct. 2014. Conference Presentation Slides. Web. 05 Oct. 2014.
- "Student Life." *Harvard University*. The President and Fellows of Harvard College, n.d. Web. 10 Dec. 2014.
- "Survey to University Art Museums and Galleries on Marketing to University Students." Survey. *SurveyMonkey*. Beth Hanks, 21 Sept. 2014. Web. 10 Nov. 2014.
- "Track Your Results." *ConstantContact*. N.p., n.d. Web. 16 Nov. 2014.
- "Using Hashtags on Twitter." *Twitter*. Twitter, Inc., n.d. Web. 24 Nov. 2014.
- Tobelem, Jean-Michel. "The Marketing Approach in Museums." *Museum Management and Marketing*. Eds. Sandell, Richard and Robert R. Janes. New York: Routledge, 2007. 294-312. Print.