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experience into a conflicting set of feelings many Latinos experience in museums: a
desire to be different, and a desire to be the same (Acevedo and Madara 2015). The end
of this chapter features interviews with two curators of Latino art and history at the
Smithsonian American Art Museum and the National Portrait Gallery on the
representation of Latinos on a national scale.

Part I: Demographic Change in Washington D.C.

Positioned geographically between the northern and southern states,
Washington, D.C. was designed to be a bold and modern city that would serve the
interests of the new nation. The Constitution of the United States established the
nation’s capital at Washington D.C. in 1790. From its beginning, the district has served
as the site for national discussions about identity, racial politics, and economic
opportunity. The character of the city is complex; it exists simultaneously as a home for
its residents, an international center of politics, and a heavily visited tourist destination.

The residential population of Washington D.C. has been shaped by specific
political circumstances in the district, which have provided refuge in two notable
circumstances for minority groups seeking reprieve from political persecution prevalent in
other regions of the country. The district maintained a relatively small residential
population until the onset of the Civil War in 1861 (Destination DC 2016). Slaves owned
in Washington were emancipated nine months before President Lincoln signed the
Emancipation Proclamation. As a result, the city became a hub for freed slaves and the
district’s population grew (Destination DC 2016). After the Civil War, the city maintained
a vibrant African American population whose historic significance and cultural legacy is
apparent in the district to this day. Recently the capital city has served as a political
refuge to members of the LGBT community. In 1977, Washington passed the D.C.
Human Rights Act, one of the country's first laws protecting gays and lesbians from
discrimination (Washingtonian 2015). As a result, gays and lesbians became a major
demographic in the district and helped to revitalize the struggling inner-city corridors
(Washingtonian 2015).

The Supreme Court, both houses of Congress, and the President are all based
out of the relatively small 68 square mile city. As a comparison, Houston is 627 square
miles. Despite this confluence of governmental powers in the District, the residents of
Washington lack full self-governance. The district is represented in Congress by a single
non-voting delegate in the House of Representatives, and a shadow senator.
Washingtonians have only been allowed to vote in Presidential elections since 1964.

The suburban areas surrounding Washington D.C. initially expanded with the
installation of streetcars in the mid-19th century (Destination DC 2016). While the city's
growth continued throughout the 20th century, the inner city riots and civil unrest of the
1960s and 70s triggered an exodus to the suburbs. This exodus to the suburbs was a
common trend in many of the major American cities throughout the 1970s. This shift in
metropolitan living patterns began to reverse itself in the 1990s, following the
demographic patterns outlined by Aaron Renn (New Donut Model) and Alan Ehrenhalt
demographic inversion). From 2000 to 2010 the white population grew - both in number
and as a share of the total population - within the central tracts of Washington-
Alexandria-Arlington metro area (in which the District of Columbia is situated) (U.S.
Census Bureau 2012, 54).
Between 2000 and 2010, the demographic breakdown indicates that while the white population is growing in D.C, the African American population declined by 11 percent between 2000 and 2010 (Izadi 2011). Many of the black residents in the District have relocated to the suburbs, a trend that mirrors the move of minority groups across the nation to areas outside of city centers. But while the number of African Americans throughout D.C. is declining, the number of Latinos has actually increased by about 21 percent (Izadi 2011).

Census data from 2010 confirms that the number of Latino residents living in the District increased from estimates of 44,953 to 54,749 (9.1 percent of the D.C. population), consistent with the steady growth of Latinos in the district since 1980 (Chatlosh 2011). In 1980, only 2.8 percent of residents self-identified as “Hispanic or Latino.” In 2010 that share had increased to 9.1 percent, and in the last five years the percent has jumped to 15.3 (Chatlosh 2011; Pew Research Center 2016). Latino residents in the District are very diverse, representing more than twenty individual countries. The largest share of the Latino population living in Washington is El Salvadorian (30 percent) (Chatlosh 2011). The next largest share, at 16 percent, is from Mexico (Chatlosh 2011).

This growth is the result of both immigration and babies, according to Joy Phillips of the D.C. Office of Planning (Izadi 2011). According to Phillips, between 1997 and 2007 Latino births increased by 130 percent (Izadi 2011). But the biggest jump in the city’s Latino population was among adults between 55 and 64 years of age, indicating migration into the District (Izadi 2011). The Pew Research Center released numbers in
2016 supporting this indication of heavy migration: 53 percent of the share of the “Hispanic” population in Washington is foreign born (Pew Research Center 2016).

The National Significance of the Latino Population Growth

The Washington-Arlington-Alexandria metro area (in which the District of Columbia exists) is ranked twelfth in the nation for its number of “Hispanic” residents (906,000) (Pew Research Center 2016). Its growth follows the same national patterns of growth for the Hispanic population (U.S. Census Bureau 2012, 44).

One indicator of the changing race and distribution of Hispanic-origin residents across the nation is the growth of the Latino population when most other groups are shrinking. Every metro area in the country had a smaller white share of the total population in 2010 than in 2000 (U.S. Census Bureau 2012, 50-51). The opposite pattern held true for Hispanics, which saw increases in their shares of the population in every metro area in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau 2012, 50-51). The most recent U.S. Census data from 2010 indicated that approximately one-sixth of the U.S. population (16.3 percent or 50.5 million) was of Hispanic origin (U.S. Census Bureau 2012, 33). In most regions of the country (metropolitan and otherwise) the Hispanic

---

18 “The National Significance of the Latino Population” section of this chapter uses the term “Hispanic” in place of Latino because of this section’s reliance on data from the U.S. Census Bureau. The Census uses “Hispanic” on its forms and questionnaires. The OMB describes Hispanic origin as the heritage, nationality group, lineage, or country of birth of the person or the person’s parents or ancestors before their arrival in the United States. People who identify their origin as Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish may be of any race. (U.S. Census Bureau 2012, 45).

19 Here the distinction between metro area and city is important. Metro areas include both the dense downtown nucleus and the suburban outlying tracts of greater urban areas.
population increased more than any other group between 2000 and 2010 (U.S. Census Bureau 2012; 44).20

Part II: The Latino Experience in Museums

Many of the studies on Latino participation in museums distinguish between first and second generation respondents, native and non-native English speakers, and the varied ages of participants in the studies. Factors such as age, education, socioeconomic level, language, and number of years living in the United States add to the complexity of this population group, which is often only distinguished by country of origin. Collectively these factors are used to determine an individual's "level of acculturation" (Acevedo and Madara 2015, 1). The Contemporanea research divided participants into groups based on their levels of acculturation, because the experiences and identities within the Latino population varies so dramatically along these bases. General features of the Latino museum experience, however, can be understood from the research.

Cultural participation among Latinos is slowly growing, according to a Survey of Public Participation in the Arts by the National Endowment for the Arts (2015). In the 2010 publication *Demographic Transformation and the Future of Museums*, printed by the AAM Center for the Future of Museums, Betty Farrell and Maria Medvedeva

---

20 The OMB and U.S. Census use the term "Hispanic" to refer to the Latino population group. The OMB defines Hispanic or Latino as "a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race. People who identify with the terms "Hispanic" or "Latino" are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the decennial census questionnaire and various Census Bureau survey questionnaires" (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013).
summarize several studies that suggest Latinos are inclined to use museum exhibits as ways to teach about heritage and culture (Stein, Garibay and Wilson 2008). These studies are consistent with research completed in 2015 by the audience consulting group Contemporanea. Salvador Acevedo and Monique Madara, authors of the study “The Latino Experience in Museums,” describe their research goals to understand “the underlying factors that permeate the experience of Latinos in museums,” in an attempt to help design museum experiences that are engaging and relevant for the growing Latino population (Acevedo and Madara 2015, 1). Self-identified Latinos in California took part in the research: six focus groups were conducted with a total of 50 participants, and an online survey was completed by 224 respondents (Acevedo and Madara 2015).

Participants in the research were divided into two segments, low acculturation and high acculturation, which serve as preliminary and basic indications of the variety of Latino identities and experiences in the United States (Acevedo and Madara 2015).

Acevedo and Madara’s research revealed several key factors that impact Latino experiences, including signals of inclusion and the fulfilment of needs. First, respondent feedback indicated an awareness of the delivery (or lack thereof) of overt signals of inclusion throughout the museum that speak directly to the Latino population (Acevedo and Madara 2015, 2). Signals of inclusion include a diverse staff that “looks like us” in language, appearance, cultural identity, and values, and the use of Spanish language communications (Acevedo and Madara 2015, 2). Acevedo and Madara write this implies that “museums integrating Latino staff throughout more levels and functions of the organization can make large strides in delivering programming and experiences that are valued by Latino visitors” (Acevedo and Madara 2015, 2).
Second, the museum experience must fulfill multiple needs for the Latino visitor. The role of museums as educational institutions is well established in Latino communities (Acevedo and Madara 2015, 2). Latinos in this study specify that, "in addition to being educational, the experience must be enjoyable for the entire party and not solely for the children because visitor groups are often multi-generational and include extended family and friends" (Acevedo and Madara 2015, 2-3). Education at a museum is an expectation, but the experience will not be repeated if the multi-generational Latino family does not have a bonding experience.

The Contemporanea study introduces the acts of "bonding" and "bridging" in their discussion of museum experiences (2015, 3-5). Bonding and bridging are terms used to describe social networks, defined by Robert Putnam in his book *Bowling Alone* (2000). "Bonding" refers to the value assigned to social networks between homogeneous groups of people, like the Latino family (Putnam 2000; Acevedo and Madara 2015, 3). Acevedo and Madara write that "one of the most powerful experiences at museums for our respondents is related to the connection they feel to their native cultures through culturally specific programs and exhibits" (2015, 3). Culturally-specific programs, exhibits, publications and research are overt indicators of inclusion, and represent an opportunity for bonding experiences among Latinos. Bridging, on the other hand, refers to that of social networks between socially diverse groups, like a general mix of museum visitors (Putnam 2000; Acevedo and Madara 2015, 3):

Study results suggest that the preference for bonding versus bridging experiences may be linked to the acculturation level of the Latino visitor, in that less-acculturated Latinos tend to prefer culturally specific programs and exhibits that are targeted directly to them. However, acculturation is not the only variable at play. Respondent comments suggest that the desire for bonding or bridging experiences may be dynamic in nature and further influenced by life stage,
socioeconomic and education level, personality traits, and personal values (Acevedo and Madara 2015, 4).

Identity is fluid; life experiences have the potential to change levels of acculturation and understandings of self-identity. As a result of the diversity of the Latino population and the capacity of individuals in the group to change, desires for bonding or bridging experiences are not static. "Many respondents in the (Contemporanea) study expressed interest in programs and exhibits that extend beyond Latino subjects," Acevedo and Madara summarize; "They felt resentment when museums limited outreach efforts to Latino-specific programs or exhibits" (2015, 4). Many Latinos identify simultaneously as American. "Latino" and "American" are two facets of a comprehensive individual character, but communicating to that individual can prove difficult if representations of "Latino" distinguish that identity as exclusive.

Edmund Barry Gaither is the former Director and Curator of the National Center for Afro-American Artists, and currently works as a consultant for the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston. Gaither studies the American experience and asserts that identity is not either/or:

We must reject models of American experience that express - directly or indirectly - a concept of either/or ... Instead we must honor the comprehensive character of American experience. We must assert its inclusiveness and embrace the reality that folk can be simultaneously African American and American. We belong inseparably both to ourselves and to the whole. We are our own community while also being part of the larger community (Gaither 1992, 56).

Representing and relating to the Latino population in museums necessitates the acknowledgment of two experiences: the need to be unique from other museum visitors, and the need to be similar. These conflicting mandates, which the Contemporanea study
terms "The Latino Paradox," are not necessarily mutually exclusive, as Gaither illustrates above. Acevedo and Madara write that many Latinos embrace multiple identities: "I am Latino and different from other Americans. I am American and the same as everybody else" (2015, 8-9). The research indicates that these paradoxical needs are often expressed by bicultural Latinos, "who want to be acknowledged as such by museums, but do not want to be singled out as different from any other visitor" (Acevedo and Madara 2015, 5-6).

Through the study, Acevedo and Madara found that some museum visitors expressed a strong desire to be acknowledged as a Latino visitor, to have their culture recognized (2015, 9). These visitors appreciate signs of inclusion, like Spanish-language text in exhibitions (Acevedo and Madara 2015, 9). Other museum visitors prefer not to be singled out or treated differently than other visitors (Acevedo and Madara 2015, 9). Both expressions convey the complexity of the Latino identity.

Acevedo and Madara report that there is opportunity for museums of all types to establish a connection with the Latino population in the United States (2015, 9). This connection fundamentally involves demonstrating personal value to Latino individuals, while building tangible, reciprocal relationships within the larger Latino community (2015, 9). The study concludes that "to be sustainable, this relationship cannot be static, but must evolve over time and become a reflection of what is important for both sides" (Acevedo and Madara 2015, 9). A static relationship would not take into account the multi-layered and fluid identities of the Latino population in the United States.
Part III: The Smithsonian Institution

The Smithsonian Institution is the world's largest museum, education and research complex. Comprised of 19 museums, 9 research centers, a zoo and over 150 worldwide affiliates, the Smithsonian maintains a collection of over 150 million objects (Smithsonian Institution 2016a). The majority of the museums and research facilities are located in Washington D.C, less than a mile from the Capitol building on the National Mall.

The Smithsonian Institution was established with funds from British scientist James Smithson, who left his estate to the United States in 1829 to found "at Washington, under the name of the Smithsonian Institution, an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge" (Smithsonian Institution 2016c). The mission of the Smithsonian has remained the same since its founding (Smithsonian Institution 2016a).

An eclectic mix of people, including congressmen, educators, researchers, social reformers, and the general public, debated the meaning of Smithson's mission to "the increase and diffusion of knowledge" (Smithsonian Institution Archives 2016). Ideas for a university, an observatory, a scientific research institute, a national library, a publishing house, and a museum were all discussed (Smithsonian Institution Archives 2016). The Smithsonian's enabling Act of Organization passed in 1846, nearly 20 years after Smithson's death, was a compromise among many of these ideas (Smithsonian Institution Archives 2016).

Thirteen Secretaries have served as the chief operating officer of the Smithsonian Institution, today an independent federal establishment outside of the three branches of government (Smithsonian Institution Archives 2016). Undoubtedly a global
resource, the Smithsonian is maintained by the United States federal government as an asset to the American people with a vision of "shaping the future by preserving our heritage, discovering new knowledge, and sharing our resources with the world" (Smithsonian Institution 2016a).

The collections of the Smithsonian range from oil paintings, furniture and precious stones, to moon rocks, WWII aircraft and Dorothy’s red ruby slippers from the 1939 Wizard of Oz (Smithsonian Institution 2016e). The collection of over 156 million objects includes 145 million specimens and artifacts held by the National Museum of Natural History (Smithsonian Institution 2016e). These numbers do not include the 2 million library volumes held by the Smithsonian Libraries, or the 156,830 cubic feet of archival material held by the Smithsonian Archives (Smithsonian Institution 2016e).

Smithsonian Institution Governance and Funding

In 1846, President Polk created a trust to be administered by a Board of Regents and a Secretary of the Smithsonian (Smithsonian Institution 2016c). After twelve years, Congress provided an annual appropriation of funds and resources to the Smithsonian for the care of the national collection (Smithsonian Institution Archives 2016). Congress assigned responsibility for the administration of the Smithsonian to a Board of Regents, which consists of individuals from all three branches of government: the Chief Justice of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, three members of the United States Senate, three members of the United States House of Representatives, and nine citizens (Smithsonian Institution 2016b).
The Institution's Board of Regents elected David J. Skorton, the current Secretary of the Smithsonian, in 2015 (Smithsonian Institution 2014). Skorton is the first physician to lead the Smithsonian, and was most recently the president of Cornell University (Smithsonian Institution 2014). As Secretary, Skorton oversees for an annual budget of $1.3 billion, 6,5000 employees and 6,300 volunteers (Smithsonian Institution 2016a).

The Smithsonian is about 60 percent funded by the federal government, with a combination of the congressional appropriation, federal grants and government contracts (Smithsonian Institution 2016d). For fiscal year 2016 the Smithsonian's congressional appropriation was $840 million (Smithsonian Institution 2016d). Trust funds, revenues from Smithsonian consumer goods, and contributions from private sources (including private endowments, memberships, and donations) supplement the federal subsidy (Smithsonian Institution 2016d). No funds are generated through admission ticket sales; all Smithsonian museums in Washington are free.

Latino History and Culture at the Smithsonian Institution

The history of the Latino perspective in the Smithsonian Institution does not extend as far back as its founding mission. In 1994 a 15-person Smithsonian Institution Task Force on Latino Issues published the report "Willful Neglect" (Yzaguirre and Aponte 1994). The report garnered critical attention when it stated the Institution "displays a pattern of willful neglect toward the estimated 25 million Latinos in the United States...":

This lack of inclusion is glaringly obvious in the lack of a single museum facility focusing on Latino or Latin American art, culture, or history; the near-absence of permanent Latino exhibitions or programming, the small number of Latino staff,
and the minimal number in curatorial or managerial positions; and the almost total lack of Latino representations in the governance structure (Yzaguirre and Aponte 1994).


A few key individuals have served to build and maintain the Smithsonian’s collections of Latino art, artifacts and objects. The first Smithsonian curator of Latino history was appointed in 1991, three years before the task force formally found fault with the Institution’s neglect of Latino culture (Smithsonian National Museum of American History 2013). Marvette Pérez was trained as an anthropologist before becoming the Curator of Latino History and Culture at the Smithsonian American History Museum (Smithsonian National Museum of American History 2013). She played a critical role at the Smithsonian, challenging academia and the culture of the museum, until her death in 2013 (Kiviat 2013). Pérez notably coordinated an early and significant acquisition of Latino objects for the Smithsonian’s collections: 3200 Puerto Rican objects from the Vidal Collection for the Smithsonian’s National Museum of American History (Avila 2003; Ramos 2016).

Like Pérez, Andrew Connors, who worked at the Smithsonian American Art Museum (SAAM) as Associate Curator between 1992 and 1999, developed a broad interest in Latino art and focused his efforts on the acquisition of Latino objects and the preparations for an exhibition of Latino art, which would later become the seminal SAAM
exhibition Arte Latino (Avila 2003; Ramos 2016). Sixty-six paintings, sculptures and photographs were featured as representative of “the vitality of Latino art traditions and innovations” from the 18th through the 20th centuries (Avila 2003; Smithsonian American Art Museum 2016b). The majority of the displayed works, however, were by artists who lived and worked primarily in the Southwest and Puerto Rico (Avila 2003). The limited scope of regional and artist diversity was criticized by some academics as exclusionary and lacking context (Avila 2003). Maria Teresa Avila, an art historian at the University of New Mexico, argued that Arte Latino did not address Latinos’ place in American history, and did nothing to “guarantee a sustainable presence for Latinos within museums” (Avila 2003):

The objects included in Arte Latino are relevant to the history and experience of Latinos in the U.S., but the public must be educated about their significance in terms of their place in U.S. history, in terms of the specific maker and their unique cultural heritage and experiences, and in terms of their being a part of a larger collective, which in this case is the exhibition and SAAM’s collection. Here was an opportunity where information could have educated the museum visitor, and addressed Latinos’ places in American history, but it was deemed unnecessary to provide (Avila 2003).  

In other words, Avila argued that by separating the Latino art objects from other objects produced by North Americans in the same time period, the exhibition reinforced the miseducation that Latinos are not considered part of the history or social fabric of the United States (Avila 2003). Avila’s assessment of the Latino experience throughout the Smithsonian Institution in 2003 led her to conclude that “Latinos are not a priority on the

---

21 Maria Theresa Avila’s 2003 paper “Conceptions and Representations of Latinos and Mainstream Museums in the United States” does not include page numbers. This paper is available for download as a pdf on the Smithsonian Center for Latino Initiatives, classified as Research and Museum Conference Documentation.
agenda of the Smithsonian” (2003). She argues that absence of a significant collection of Latino objects in the Smithsonian collections and in permanent exhibitions is causing a misrepresentation of the American character.

Inclusion in U.S. mainstream museums collection and permanent exhibitions validates the objects' historical significance. It creates a space in time for those objects and all that they represent. This is where and how the object, and the culture it represents, gains power (Avila 2003).

In other words, Latino objects and the interpretive potential they embody are empowered through the context of being part of an assemblage of objects all representing the art and history of the United States. Cultures are validated as unique and American through the objects in the Smithsonian collection and permanent exhibition galleries. Avila’s assessment that “Latinos are not a priority on the agenda of the Smithsonian” highlighted a dire need for the targeted development of collections, exhibitions, research and educational materials pertaining to the Latino population in the United States.

Smithsonian Latino Center History

Six years before Avila published her paper on the “Conceptions and Representations of Latinos and Mainstream Museums in the United States,” the Smithsonian Institution had created the Smithsonian Latino Center to promote Latino presence within the Smithsonian (Smithsonian Latino Center 2016a). Avila’s paper is available for download on the Center’s Resources page, a reminder of the need to challenge the curatorial practices that maintained a largely Eurocentric collection at the Smithsonian for over a century (Smithsonian Latino Center 2016a). In addition to scholarly research, the Center supports exhibitions, collections and archives, public and
educational programs, web-based content and virtual platforms (Smithsonian Latino Center 2016). The Latino Center also manages leadership and professional development programs for Latino youth, emerging scholars and museum professionals (Smithsonian Latino Center 2016a). Latino Center staff work collaboratively with the Smithsonian’s museums and research centers "to ensure that the contributions of the Latino community in the arts, history, national culture and scientific achievement are explored, presented, celebrated and preserved" (Smithsonian Latino Center 2016a).

The Smithsonian Latino Center has spearheaded a number of programs that have had a big impact on the presence of Latino identities throughout the institution. In 2010, for example, they instituted the Latino Curatorial Initiative. Since the initiative’s creation, the program has provided funding to hire curators with expertise in Latino history, art and culture within Smithsonian museums - including the American Art Museum and the National Portrait Gallery (Smithsonian Latino Center 2016b). These designated curators “conduct research, organize exhibitions and public programs, inform educational programs and web content, and build collections and archives that reflect the contributions of Latinos to the U.S.” (Smithsonian Latino Center 2016b). Funding provided by the Center is provided in a five-year phased approach, which allows each museum to raise enough funds to permanently sustain the positions (Smithsonian Latino Center 2016b). Smithsonian Latino Center Director Eduardo Díaz reported this Initiative has dramatically increased the number of curators imbedded at the Smithsonian; to date at least six positions dedicated to Latino art and history have been established (2013; Caragol 2016). "In the museum context," Díaz said, "curators drive research, direct collecting efforts, lead exhibition development, and collaborate on correlative educational
and public programs and web presence. They are key linchpins in ensuring sustained Latino presence" (2013). Diaz, a lawyer by training, has held multiple arts management positions before becoming the Center’s director. He makes time to work with Smithsonian curators in broadening their scope of Latino art (Caragol 2016).

In 2012, the Center completed a comprehensive assessment of Latino collections, research, exhibits, public programs, and outreach efforts across the Institution (Diaz 2013). This assessment has since guided the Center’s strategies in building and maximize the Smithsonian's holdings, and how best to improve and enhance its existing resources (Diaz 2013).

Interview with Dr. E. Carmen Ramos, Curator of Latino Art at the Smithsonian American Art Museum

The Smithsonian American Art Museum (SAAM) is one of the largest and most inclusive collections of American art in the world (SAAM 2016a). Spanning three centuries, the SAAM collection “captures the aspirations, character, and imagination of the American people…. a record of the American experience” (SAAM 2016a). The museum is located two blocks from the National Mall and shares a National Historic Landmark building with another Smithsonian museum, the National Portrait Gallery. The two museums maintain distinct curatorial staff and collections, but share a facility and other resources such as the Smithsonian American Art and Portrait Gallery library.

22 This direct quote from Smithsonian Latino Center Director Eduardo Diaz comes from Diaz’s published paper “The Power of Presence” available for download on the Smithsonian Latino Center web page, and does not include page numbers.
The mission of SAAM states that the museum "is dedicated to collecting, understanding, and enjoying American art. The Museum celebrates the extraordinary creativity of artists whose works reflect the American experience and global connections" (SAAM 2016a). The legacy of SAAM includes being a leader in identifying and collecting significant aspects of American visual culture (SAAM 2016a). The collection includes photography, modern folk and self-taught art, African American art, Latino art, and video games (SAAM 2016a). Curatorial departments are organized by medium (painting, sculpture, film and media arts, folk and self-taught art) with the exception of Latino art.

Dr. E. Carmen Ramos, the first Curator of Latino Art, joined the American Art Museum staff in 2010. The first appointment of the Latino Center Curatorial Initiative, hers became the model for future Latino-focused curatorial positions throughout the Smithsonian (Ramos 2016). Ramos described previous museum experiences focused on Latino culture as short-term projects of intense focus that would disappear after a few years (Ramos 2016). She said the current Smithsonian model of embedding curators at museums as part of the fabric of the institution allows for the full-time and permanent work of developing the collection and conducting substantive research (Ramos 2016).

The SAAM collects and exhibits art of the United States; its curatorial priority is to present and interpret American art from a socio-historical perspective (Ramos 2016). The Smithsonian's institutional interest in the broad cultural environment of its collection is a distinct perspective in art history. By embracing social and historical elements, such as daily life, social networks, and economic contexts, curators are more attentive to the effects and interpretation of inequality throughout history. Ramos explained that she inherited a collection that was skewed to a particular historical moment, and has been
working to broaden the scope of the collection (Ramos 2016). She has been collecting the works of other major artists of various Latino identities, to add to the SAAM Latino art collection that primarily featured Mexican American artists working in the 1970s and 80s before her appointment (Ramos 2016). The priorities of each Smithsonian curator varies based on the state and scale of their collection (Ramos 2016). Each curator has different priorities based on the state of their collection.

The SAAM collection has been shaped by its institutional history, but also contextually as a museum within the Smithsonian Institution. For example, until 2006 SAAM did not consider contemporary art a collecting priority because the Smithsonian's Hirshhorn collection of contemporary art and culture existed; however, a contemporary art curatorial position was established at SAAM in 2006, and ignited a period of curatorial growth at SAAM (Ramos 2016).

Ramos interprets her collection through the museum's socio-historical curatorial perspective, and acquires works in order to represent a broad range of Latino art from different historic periods, aesthetic movements, and communities (Ramos 2016). Under Ramos' direction, SAAM has acquired the museum's first works by Dominican American artists, which were not represented in the collection before 2010 (Ramos 2016).

Ramos curated the 2013 exhibition "Our America: The Latino Presence in American Art," and proved her capacity to meet the curatorial mandate to strengthen SAAM's holdings of Latino art and present the collection in a new way (Clough 2013). The exhibition, which opened at SAAM and then traveled throughout the United States, included 92 works, more than two-thirds (63) of which had been acquired since 2011 (Clough 2013).
Ramos said that “Our America” tells “the largely untold story of how Latino artists contributed to all of the major movements in modern American art, while putting their own cultural stamp on those styles” (Ramos in Clough 2013). Ramos’ work indicates that the Smithsonian not only accepts the Latino perspective as part of the American experience, but no longer accepts a single Latino perspective as representative of the group. The exhibition’s socio-historical curatorial perspective provides an opportunity for audiences to explore the unique contexts, influences, events and cultures that shaped the relationship between Latino artists and major art movements in the United States. Upholding the mandate set forth by the Contemporanea “Latino Paradox,” Ramos is thoughtfully curating materials that provide for the myriad of Latino experiences in the United States.

The role of the Curator of Latino Art in acquiring Latino objects for the national museum is vital to representing an inclusive history. Many perceive the Smithsonian as a repository of national culture (Ramos 2016). Ramos said that the opportunity to include, shape and reflect Latino art in a national context is culturally and symbolically powerful (Ramos 2016). Including a diversity of Latino artworks within an American Art collection impacts the history and narrative of American art (Ramos 2016). In directly challenging the way that Latino artists have been marginalized in the history of U.S. art through exhibitions and acquisitions for the SAAM permanent collection, Ramos has asserted that Latino artists are participants and protagonists in the history of American art.
Interview with Dr. Taina B. Caragol, Curator of Latino Art and History at the Smithsonian National Portrait Gallery

The Smithsonian National Portrait Gallery (NPG) was authorized and founded by Congress in 1962 (National Portrait Gallery 2016). The Gallery, situated alongside the AAM in the revitalized Penn Quarter neighborhood of downtown D.C, has a mission "to tell the story of America by portraying the people who shape the nation’s history, development and culture" (National Portrait Gallery 2016). Today, the Portrait Gallery narrates the story of America through the individuals who have shaped its history, identity and culture (National Portrait Gallery 2016). The collection includes 22,000 items in all media, including visual and performing art, and new media (National Portrait Gallery 2016). Portrait Gallery content experts include a mix of historians and curators. The curatorial department is organized by media (prints and drawings, photographs, painting and sculpture), again (as with AAM) with the exception of Latino Art and History (Caragol 2016).

Before the appointment of a Latino Art and History curator in 2013, the sixty-year-old NPG had presented two exhibitions focusing on Latino portraiture in collaboration with outside organizations (National Portrait Gallery 2013). The exhibition Retratos: 2000 Years of Latin American Portraits was organized by the National Portrait Gallery, the San Antonio Museum of Art and El Museo del Barrio in New York City in 2005 (National Portrait Gallery 2013). Two years later, Legacy: Spain and the United States in the Age of Independence, 1763-1848, was presented by the Portrait Gallery and the Smithsonian Latino Center, together with the Sociedad Estatal para la Acción

Dr. Taina B. Caragol was appointed Curator of Latino Art and History at the National Portrait Gallery in 2013. Her position was the fifth curatorial position embedded within Smithsonian museums with funding from the Smithsonian Latino Center (Caragol 2016). The Center provided the first three years of funding for Caragol's curatorial position; after three years, the National Portrait Gallery will fund her position (Caragol 2016). Caragol is supervised by the NPG Chief Curator Brandon Brame Fortune and works across departments, acquiring art of all mediums (Caragol 2016).

All curators are charged with furthering the mission of the National Portrait Gallery - to tell the story of America by portraying the people who shape the nation's history, development and culture (Caragol 2016). This is done through exhibitions, acquisitions, and research (Caragol 2016). Caragol's personal curatorial priority is to make Latinos more visible at the NPG by telling their stories, and making the group more visible in American history (Caragol 2016). This includes changing the perception of Latinos in American history, by not telling their story as a story of the Other in American history (Caragol 2016).

In her first year at the NPG, Caragol has orchestrated permanent acquisitions for the collection and contributed to the visibility of Latino artists in the galleries (Caragol 2016). In 2015 Caragol curated her first solo exhibition at the Portrait Gallery, One Life: Dolores Huerta. The exhibition was the 11th installment in the NPG's One Life series showcasing significant individuals in American history. Dolores Huerta was the first Latina to be featured in the ongoing series. The exhibition opening coincided with the
50th anniversary of the 1965 grape strike launched by the farm workers movement in California, a movement in which Huerta served as lobbyist and negotiator for the United Farm Workers union in the 1960s and 70s (National Portrait Gallery 2015). Caragol described the Huerta exhibition as crucial to exposing the American and international public to an incredible woman who changed history through advocacy (Caragol 2016).

Funding for the One Life: Dolores Huerta exhibition, which included more than 40 objects ranging from documentary photographs to a hand-knit propaganda sweater owned by Huerta, was made possible in part through the Smithsonian Latino Center Latino Initiatives Pool (National Portrait Gallery 2015). Caragol explained that the Latino Initiatives Pool is money from Congress designated for the Smithsonian (2016). The money is allocated by an internal call for applications from Smithsonian curators (Caragol 2016). Caragol has applied for and received funding for the One Life: Dolores Huerta exhibition, Staging the Self exhibition, funds to travel Staging the Self (now in Albuquerque), as well as funding to grow the collection for two consecutive years (2016). Caragol noted these collection-building funds have been large matching gifts from the Center that requires the NPG to match the amount of funding given by the Center (2016).

Caragol said the relationship between the Latino Center and the NPG entails reciprocal support and resources in order to meet shared goals (Caragol 2016). The collaboration between the two entities is both structural and intellectual: on an administrative level the Latino Center partnered with the NPG to create Caragol’s curatorial position. The collaboration extends, however, beyond bureaucracy. Caragol said she considers the Center’s Director Diaz a close collaborator, especially in
connecting with regional Latino communities; Diaz has helped Caragol to connect with artists in specific geographic locales like his native Southwest over the course of her research, in an effort to broaden her scope of what it means to be ‘Latino’ (Caragol 2016).

The task of adding Latino works to the permanent collection at the National Portrait Gallery was a curatorial priority with the appointment of the first Curator of Latino Art and History (Caragol 2016). Artwork reflecting the Latino experience was not evident in exhibitions, and museum leadership concluded that a curator with such experience and a curatorial perspective in this area was needed to address the situation (Caragol 2016). Since being hired, Caragol has collected nearly 90 works for the NPG permanent collection (Caragol 2016). These works are integrated into the rotations of portraits on the gallery walls (Caragol 2016). Caragol said this change provides audiences with a different view of American history, and a different profile of the American people (Caragol 2016). Most of Caragol’s recent acquisitions for the collection are of Latinos active since the 1960s; she said it is very difficult to find Latino portraits before the turn of the 20th century (Caragol 2016). In the last three years the NPG has been giving curatorial tours discussing ‘absence,’ asking audiences ‘why is something or someone not here?’ (Caragol 2016). Caragol explained that these tours are one way to overcome absence in the NPG permanent collection when it is not possible to acquire a portrait - or if a portrait simply does not exist (2016).

The historical narrative of the United States was not really questioned until the 1970s and 1980s (Caragol 2016). History that is told from a single perspective has the potential to alienate people (Caragol 2016). Today the NPG takes very seriously that
visitors enter the museum and question the histories and artwork labels (Caragol 2016). The museum has recently started to address the absences in the master narrative of history, notably in places of conflict, by researching more unexplored places in history (Caragol 2016). As a result the NPG is providing more focused shows about historic events that have not been presented at the museum to date (Caragol 2016).

Caragol noted that Latinos are not the only underrepresented group at the NPG (2016). Portraiture is generally a very conservative genre that historically focused on members of the elite (Caragol 2016). The advent of photography as well as the efforts of more recent contemporary artists has challenged and diversified the genre; however, minority groups remain underrepresented in the collection of the NPG (Caragol 2016). African Americans make up the largest represented non-white group with 5-6% of the museum collection (Caragol 2016). Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders and Latino Americans each make up 1-2% of the permanent collection (Caragol 2016). The Director of the National Portrait Gallery, Kim Sajet, is working to increase the permanent representation and sustained participation of minority audiences at the museum (Caragol 2016).

Demographic studies and audience tracking happens at the NPG, but not within the realm of the curators (Caragol 2016). Caragol receives her sense of the demographic diversity within the institution from Director Sajet, who continually cites both national and regional demographics as a reason to make the museum more diverse (Caragol 2016). Caragol noted that they are still figuring out how to reach Latinos in the D.C. metro area (2016). A specialist on Latino audiences in museums worked with the NPG to evaluate and better understand the local reception to the One Life: Dolores
Huerta show (Caragol 2016). A number of programs, including family days, artist talks and a Day of the Dead program (held in November 2015 for the first time at the NPG), have recently been initiated to bring local Latino audiences to the NPG (Caragol 2016). Director Sajet, who was hired in 2013, is leading her staff to a more diverse and inclusive future. Caragol remarked that since Sajet became the director, NPG staff has been encouraged to ask themselves ‘Who is not at the NPG? How can we address that?’ (Caragol 2016). The NPG audience is the entire American public, and accessibility necessitates making important content available to more than the English-speaking population. Sajet created a bilingual initiative to make the NPG fully bilingual in English and Spanish by 2018, the 50th anniversary of the NPG (Caragol 2016). Since 2014, nine exhibitions at the Gallery have been bilingual (Caragol 2016). This has included periods of experimentation and evaluation to various approaches to bilingual exhibition text, including offering a separate Spanish language booklets, English/Spanish brochures, and bilingual online exhibition labels (Caragol 2016). Caragol added that the NPG is starting with Spanish because of the growing Latino population in the country, but that the museum will move towards becoming multilingual in the future (2016).

Sajet has also created two additional Latino-focused positions at the NPG (in Public Relations and Education) since hiring Caragol (Caragol 2016). These positions, which are devoted to Latino outreach, are not funded by the Latino Center. Caragol has noticed that the PR work in generating targeted media attention (for example, creating a NPG presence on the Spanish-language channel Telemundo) has made a big difference in the ways in which people respond to the museum (2016).
The Smithsonian's decision to establish Latino-focused positions throughout the Institution is forward thinking. Conversations about the display of Latino art are being transformed; discussions previously limited to regional or cultural-specific institutions are now national conversations about America as a whole (Caragol 2016). The Latino-focused curatorial positions throughout the Smithsonian is an encompassing means of affecting change: Caragol's position heightens the visibility of Latinos in art history, American history, and in the curatorial profession (Caragol 2016). Caragol perceives her museum audience and community to be the American public (Caragol 2016). Her professional responsibility and opportunity, to showcase artists who are not well known, to explore the nuances of Latino identities, will take years of research and play out on a national stage.

Analysis

The 2010 Census results confirmed a real shift in the population makeup of the U.S., including the rapidly growing share of Latinos around the country. The Smithsonian Institution considers their community to be the American people. The Institution's collections are perceived as representative of the culture and identity of the nation. What is excluded from the collection is as significant as what is included. Gaps in the collection are reflections of systemic neglect and exclusion.

As a network of federally-funded organizations, the Smithsonian has a responsibility to represent the diverse and multicultural population of the United States. The National Portrait Gallery and American Art Museum have institutionalized that responsibility by appointing and sustaining curators of Latino art and history. Both Dr. E.
Carmen Ramos at the American Art Gallery, and Dr. Taina Caragol at the National Portrait Gallery, are working to rewrite the American narrative by including Latino artists and artworks. The Latino influence in the history and contemporary landscape of this country is undeniable, and yet both the NPG and AAM saw gaps in their permanent collections resulting from systemic institutional inequalities. Curators of Latino art and history acquire new works to redress systemic neglect and exclusion in the institution's history of collecting. Ramos and Caragol are filling holes in the national narrative created by filling holes in the collection of the Smithsonian. Acquiring Latino artworks for the permanent collection of the Smithsonian is an act of inclusion - an acknowledgment and celebration of the diversity of the American population - on a national scale.

As Ramos and Caragol acquire works for the permanent collection, and as Latino art is assimilated into the galleries, the American story expands to include more voices, cultures, perspectives and identities. The Latino population in the United States is not distinct from the American population. By including rather than segregating Latino art in national museums, the Smithsonian proves its understanding of the multiple identities embraced within the Latino population. The "Latino Paradox," described by the Contemporanea report on the Latino experience in museums, is accounted for at the AAM and NPG: the desire to be unique from other museum visitors on the basis of Latino heritage is fulfilled by representation in the galleries, and the experience of being similar to all other museum visitors is acknowledged by the scope of the national narrative representative of America.

Inclusion at the Smithsonian is understood as comprehensive understanding of the Latino experience as represented by the collection. Adding works of art by
underrepresented artists to the permanent collection incorporates diverse voices into the identity of the nation. Distinguishing Puerto Ricans from Dominicans, and El Salvadorans from Mexicans, prioritizes the diversity of the Latino identity and the complexity of the Latino experience in the United States. The social and political history of inequality in this country has unfortunately excluded some stories from ever being told by the AAM or NPG collections. As Caragol noted, sometimes a portrait just simply does not exist that would be representative of a part of American history (Caragol 2016).

When the AAM and NPG offer "absence tours" the institutions are calling public attention to what is missing in their collections. This facilitates conversation, and creates a space for questioning as well as dialogue, two significant features of inclusive museums. Elijah Anderson's "cosmopolitan canopy" is a useful framework for envisioning the potential of the Smithsonian museums (2004). Despite racial dynamics and other social cleavages that exist in the United States, the Smithsonian museums can serve as neutral public spaces that provide contact, facilitate dialogue and foster tolerance between disparate people on a national scale (Anderson 2004).

Curators and other museum staff can be empowered to act as agents of social change when museum leadership cultivates a supportive and innovative professional environment. Directors at both the AAM and NPG have prioritized sustaining the Latino-focused positions as a permanent curatorial staff positions. This directive from museum leadership is a strong indicator of the commitment to inclusivity at the both institutions. Ramos and Caragol were both "embedded" at their institutions as full-time curators, with funding to support their position for two years provided by the Smithsonian Latino Center. The context for a new Latino-focused curatorial position at the NPG was
enriched by NPG Director Kim Sajet’s goal to more accurately represent minority groups in the permanent collection. This shared vision between the museum director and the director of the Latino Center was the genesis of inclusive hiring practices and a restructured curatorial department that led to the appointment of Dr. Caragol as the Curator of Latino Art and History at the NPG.

In conclusion, through the work of Caragol, Ramos, and their colleagues, the Smithsonian is addressing decades old critique of institutional neglect towards the Latino population in the United States. The Smithsonian is now attuned to the diverse, multifaceted character of the Latin American population, and is working to publicize the group’s complex and varied history in the United States.
CHAPTER 9: DISCUSSION

Changes in art museums during last ten years indicate that a curatorial response to demographic changes in the museum’s city is underway. In particularly, the museums featured in the case studies demonstrated an awareness of the changing residential population in their cities and enacted a substantial institutional response to new audience identities. Indeed, curators in these and other museums are employing a new professional skill set aimed toward fostering inclusivity that go beyond the best practices outlined for the profession.

This chapter will discuss four major themes that emerged from the case study interviews and literature review research. First, this analysis will describe the unique position of museums to act as agents of social change within an urban landscape. Large, dense cities are complex environments; many factors influence the lifestyles of their residents, including the city’s demographic make up. Museums form an integral part of city fabric. As educational institutions in possession of the public trust, they are uniquely situated to fulfill the civic and social needs of an urban public.

Second, this chapter will analyze a recent shift by institutions to track demographic change in their museum community. Using population data to frame and support the work of museum staff facilitates institutions’ ability to maintain a clear definition of their community or audience. As described throughout this research, diversity (ethnic, racial, generational, religious, cultural, etc.) is a defining characteristic of the 21st-century American city. The most diverse population, however, is increasingly concentrated outside of urban centers in the suburban tracts of metropolitan areas. In order to represent the diversity that is integral to the civic identity of so many cities,
museums are increasingly responsible to new suburban audiences. Museum leadership is crucial in successfully aligning their institutions' practices with the sensitivity of changing demographics.

A third theme discussed in this chapter is the evolution of the curatorial role within museums. Increasingly art museum collections are employed to reflect a community. In both the acquisition and display of objects, curators today work to convey a holistic and diverse representation of their subject. Particularly within new curatorial departments, curators are tasked with acquiring objects for the permanent collection that reflect a fluid, variable, and often evolving community identity. Subsequently, there has been an increased emphasis on interpretation; additionally, curators are incorporating educational theories and models into the display of objects. These changes signal to the general public a shift in the relationship between curators and museum audiences. In exhibitions, new models of community curation are pushing the boundaries of curatorial responsibility, shifting their professional role from expert to interpreter.

Finally, the fourth theme explored in this chapter is the function of curatorial collaborations in aiding institutional responsiveness to their audience, for the purpose of promoting inclusivity. Museums that promote inclusivity serve the greater civic community as places of cultural contact, dialogue, and exchange. Reciprocal exchanges between museums and community members, organizations, and outside institutions increase the resources available to serve the public, stimulate innovative responses to community problems, and enhance the museum's role in the city.

Curators are responding to demographic changes in the cities in which their museums are located. The nature of the curatorial tradition and role within large art
museums may impede direct and immediate responses to rapid population changes. New curatorial departments and collections established in the last ten years, however, prove that even large institutions can commit to reflecting the people that make-up their urban community.

Museums as Agents of Social Change in the Urban Landscape

Museums occupy a particular position within the infrastructure of cities. Since the nineteenth century museums have existed to preserve cultural knowledge and history for the greater good of its citizens and, more importantly, disseminate that knowledge in their capacity as trusted public educators. In the 21st century, however, the nature of cities has changed. With the decline of industrial production, many cities now serve as centers for a "creative economy," powered by culture, commercialism, and artistic and technological innovation (Vivant 2011). In this new context, contemporary museums exert significant influence, which researchers such as Gail Lord and Ngaire Blankenburg define as soft power, the ability to influence behavior through intangible resources, like knowledge, value, culture and ideas (Lord and Blankenburg 2015). As a result, cultural institutions such as museums must adapt to a new urban landscape, and play a more active role in ensuring societal well-being.

In order to successfully secure a position as agents within an urban context, museums must embrace a holistic approach to civic partnerships and infrastructure redevelopment. The Guggenheim Museum, Bilbao, for example, formed part of a successful city-wide project that served to rejuvenate a regional economy. In the Bilbao project, the museum was one component of a comprehensive reimagining of an entire
urban infrastructure. Writing decades before the Guggenheim Museum, Bilbao was conceived, Jane Jacobs described a successful city, in which residential diversity, public space, and mixed-used buildings promote civic health and vitality (1961). The intersection of the two models - one a successful, fixed-term project, and the other a successful, maintained city - is at the crux of this research. When they are integrated into the urban infrastructure, museums can play an active role in creating healthy, sustainable futures for cities.

Museums must demonstrate an understanding of their city's populations in order to maintain their value to the public; therefore, community relevance is critical in the museum's new civic capacity. As previously defined in Chapter 4, communities are groups of people that share a sense of belonging to other people in that group (Watson 2007). The museum community includes its stated audience (ideally identified with the institutional mission statement), but also includes those people that share a geographic location with the institution. The institution establishes a sense of belonging to its city by virtue of its physical location. Like all of the other residents of the city, the museum forms part of the local community. As co-community members, city residents are stakeholders in the museum. And museums will only be successful if their community stakeholders view the relationship as reciprocal and symbiotic. In other words, the phenomenon of demographic transformation forces public institutions to evolve alongside the people they serve. Those institutions that do not evolve become irrelevant, and are not valued by the community they exist within.

This thesis has focused on museums that are located in cities in part because of the web of factors and relationships with which urban institutions must contend. For
example, institutions must negotiate municipal governments, local politics, non-profit organizations, local and international businesses, and public education system. Similarly, museum must liaise with a variety of people: residents, tourists, commuters, families, retirees, school-aged children, etc. As educational institutions and cultural storehouses, museums are afforded the benefit of the public trust, a privileged position in society. Museums possess an enormous amount of influence or soft power and have a responsibility to uphold the civic and social needs of fellow community members.

Tracking Demographic Change

The major governing body for American museums, the American Alliance of Museums (AAM), has commissioned numerous reports that track demographic change in the country, signaling the importance of such research for the museum field as a whole. In 2008 the AAM’s Center for the Future of Museums outlined the significance of population change to museum audiences in their publication *Museums and Society 2034* (AAM 2008b). While the AAM and other bodies are tracking demographics on a national level, institutions are responsible for monitoring community transformations on a local level.

Case study research has indicated that curators in large art institutions do not have a direct role in evaluating their audience. Curatorial departments may receive information about their audience on a small scale, for example as first-hand impressions at public programs, or alternatively as a general statement about the demographics of their institution from their director. The task of visitor evaluation and demographic study, however, is often assigned to Education and/or Interpretation departments or otherwise
outsourced to an independent consultant or contractor who specializes in this type of visitor research. Nevertheless, the creation of curatorial positions that address new communities which have emerged as city populations change, demonstrates a long-term commitment to ensuring the diversity and the relevancy of the museum community. The curators in those positions (ie. Oen at the Asian Art Museum, Froom at MFAH, Caragol at NPG and Ramos at AAM) work in departments that exist, at least in part, as a result of the transformed demographic landscape of the city where the museum is located. And clearly, while curatorial divisions in urban museums may not directly track demographic change in their environments, those curators that wish to engage with their communities more deeply may need to consider adding analytical skills relating to audience development to their tool kits.

Two factors are critical to the success of demographic tracking: defining the population of interest, and support from institutional leadership. In the context of this research, city residents, and those residents that live in the larger metropolitan area, are the population of interest.

Defining the City

City museums that respond to local demographic change are increasingly defining their geographic community in terms of metropolitan areas rather than city limits. Chapter 2 of this thesis described the national trend that emerged within the last decade in urban areas: the more ethnically and economically diverse residents have left city centers for the suburbs. Related to that shift, young adults increasingly prefer to live in downtown areas, which has increased property values and the overall cost of living in
city centers. Subsequently, many city centers now have a majority of affluent, often white, residents downtown.

Despite this shift in urban living patterns, research demonstrates that diversity remains a defining characteristic of 21st-century cities. Museums, as explained earlier, function as symbols of civic identity must reflect the diversity that is concentrated in surrounding areas, but not centered in, their city; therefore, city museums have a responsibility to suburban audiences as well as to other museum stakeholders (residents in the museum neighborhood, funders, origin groups, etc.).

All three case studies have exhibited a willingness to include suburban groups in their local audience, despite their downtown addresses. The Asian Art Museum broadened the definition of 'Asian,' to include the Asian and Asian Americans populations concentrated in cities outside of San Francisco, like Oakland and San Jose, who identify with more than one ethnicity, race, or culture. The Arts of the Islamic Worlds program at the MFAH expands the encyclopedic collection of the Museum and simultaneously integrates in the museum's narrative the cultural heritage of growing Muslim and Middle Eastern communities of the greater Houston area.

Smithsonian museums form part of a larger national institution, and consequently operate on a different scale than either the Asian Art Museum or the MFAH. The case study interviews with curators Taina Caragol and E. Carmen Ramos indicate that Smithsonian museums are attuned to a national audience, and feel a responsibility to represent a diverse American audience through their collections, exhibitions and programming. The local Washington D.C. population is not, however, insignificant; the growing share of Latinos in the museums' immediate geographic population is indicative
of a national trend. By appointing Latino art curators throughout Smithsonian museums, such as the American Art Museum and the National Portrait Gallery, the institution is responding on both a micro and a macro scale to an increasingly diverse demographic.

Because diversity is a characteristic of the twenty-first century urban environment, museums must value diversity as more than a lofty principle. In order to maintain and reflect the unique diversity that is a feature of civic identity, city museums are redefining their local audience to include the suburbs.

Support from the Top

Results from this research underscore the instrumental role of museum leadership in creating and championing workplace environments that allow curators to produce inclusive, responsible, and relevant work. In San Francisco, Director Jay Xu spearheaded the reevaluation of the Asian Art Museum brand that culminated in the creation of the Contemporary Art department in order to better produce relatable content for a growing and diverse museum community of Millennials in the city. At the MFAH, previous Director Peter Marzio and current Director Gary Tinterow have both proven their commitment to broadening the Museum's holdings of non-European art, reflecting a local audience in Houston that is the most diverse metropolitan population in the country. As a natural expansion of their collection, the Arts of the Islamic Worlds department adds not only to the MFAH's encyclopedic collection, but reflects a growing share of the region's cultural heritage. At a national level, leaders at the Smithsonian, including NPG Director Sajet, have worked to redefine nothing less than the American identity through the establishment of new curatorial positions and collection designations.
Museum leaders foster curatorial work that is relevant and responsible to evolving communities in a number of ways. For Tony Butler, former Director of East Anglian Life in the U.K. and creator of the Happy Museum Project, the entire infrastructure of the museum institution was transformed in order to create a sustainable and healthy environment for staff and visitors. In a similar reimagination, Santa Cruz MAH Director Nina Simon oriented her institution around their local audience, re-writing job descriptions and planning exhibitions to be visitor-centric. In these instances, curators are just one part of a holistic institutional change.

Museum leadership has proven the effectiveness of working on a smaller scale to promote relevant work within the context of more traditional museums where drastic infrastructural change is not feasible. The creation of new curatorial departments or positions that relate directly to their audience, as seen at all three case study museums, broadcasts the institution's attention to community transformations and identities. Ultimately, curators are inhibited by the scope of their collection and the resources at their disposal. It is the responsibility of innovative museum leaders to initiate and encourage institutional flexibility through structural change and curatorial redefinition.

It is important for museums to intentionally track demographic change in order to create systems and functions that are proactive, rather than reactive. This necessitates museum leaders who value demographic data as indicators of institutional relevance and define audiences that include suburban resident. By being proactive, museums add value to their position in society, and ensure a more sustainable future in the community.
Evolution of the Curatorial Role: Reflecting Community through Objects

The review of published literature and the data collected in the case interviews indicate that the curatorial role within museums is being transformed. Inviting communities into the museum (literally and figuratively) has required the development of a new set of curatorial skills. In both the acquisition and display of objects, as outlined below, curators exhibit inclusivity, responsiveness, flexibility and collaboration to portray holistic representations of their subject area.

Acquisition

New objects acquired for museum collections are increasingly expected to reflect a diverse narrative, and contribute to the formation of a more holistic community identity. Recent permanent collection acquisitions by the Asian Art Museum, the MFAH, and the Smithsonian Institution, demonstrate inclusive curatorial practices in response to new demographic communities. Each case study approaches acquisitions differently: to both redress historical neglect or gaps in the museum collection, and/or to enhance the diversity of the collection.

As the collecting efforts of the Asian Art Museum demonstrate, acquisitions can also build and enhance the permanent collection by expanding its scope. The Asian, for example, is recognizing the diversity of its audience by now acquiring and exhibiting contemporary art. The museum's audience is comprised of many Asian and non-Asian populations that call San Francisco home: first, second, and third generations of Asian and Asian Americans; San Francisco residents who identify with the culture of the city that has been shaped by a legacy of Asian influenced; young adults interested in new media and technology in contemporary art. Acquiring contemporary art, therefore, can
be considered an act of inclusion. The Asian Art Museum is building a sustainable future for itself in San Francisco by restructuring the collection to be relevant to its local audience. The curatorial and administrative decision to include new types of objects in a museum collection is a way to include more voices in the museum community.

Like the Contemporary Art department at the Asian Art Museum, the Arts of the Islamic Worlds department at the MFAH was established as a completely new curatorial designation within a larger institution. While contemporary art could be found at the Asian in other culturally-designated curatorial departments prior to the creation of the Contemporary Art department in 2015, the MFAH’s Arts of the Islamic Worlds collection had to be built from scratch (Oen and Mayer 2016). The Arts of the Islamic Worlds collection at the MFAH has been supported in large part by the biennial gala, which is held for the express purpose of raising funds to acquire objects for the department. Both the new collection and the fundraising gala were created in 2007. The MFAH ensured a degree of financial stability and sustainability for the fledgling collection by establishing a regular source of funding through the gala. The gala provides Froom, the curator, a unique opportunity to present groups of desirable objects at one time to the gala-going public (Froom 2016). In 2015 all five of the curatorial suggestions presented at the gala were purchased for the permanent collection (Froom 2016). While the collection is growing, Froom works to emphasize quality and rarity of objects in the collection (Froom 2016). In the long-term, the department will add to the encyclopedic tradition of the MFAH; the goal of the Museum is to “establish a collection reflecting the regional, chronological, and material diversity of the Islamic artistic tradition” (MFAH 2014).
In contrast to the MFAH, the Smithsonian curators Caragol and Ramos have used acquisitions to broaden the scope of their collection and redress the neglected Latino history of the United States. Including a range of Latino artworks within national, "American," collections impacts the history and narrative of American art (Ramos 2016). Such additions to the permanent collection of the American Art Museum and the National Portrait Gallery demonstrates a willingness to incorporate alternative perspectives and new protagonists to the historic record and directly challenges any notion of history or identity as static. The Smithsonian is afforded a privileged role in American society, simultaneously safeguarding and determining our shared cultural heritage, and by integrating Latino and other minority art to their collections, the institution is embracing the diversity of American identity and providing opportunities for curators to explore the Latino experience in American history.

Display

Objects are increasingly employed in exhibitions to tell the story of a community, rather than to represent a single truth or history. It is now accepted in the field, after decades of scholarship on the subject of meaning-making, that methods of display influence the ways in which visitors produce meaning (Errington 1998; Hooper-Greenhill 2000; Clarke and Bickford 2010; Karp and Kratz 2014; Nielson 2015). During the 1960s and 70s scholars examined the construction of meaning and questioned the institutional authority imbued upon museums by the public (Clarke and Bickford 2010). In 1992, Fred Wilson's exhibition "Mining the Museum" at the Maryland Historical Society challenged the accepted narrative of American history as presented in museums. His display of works previously hidden from view and singular juxtapositions transformed objects into
sources of community empowerment (Karp and Wilson 1996). Following in the tradition of postmodern critics, Wilson called attention to the technology of representation - how and why objects are displayed in museums - and the ethical dilemmas and challenges that arise when exhibiting history and/or identity.

Wilson’s influence as well as more recent scholarship on museum display and meaning-making has informed the recent interest in the interpretive and educational priorities of contemporary curators. Curatorial focus and responsibility has broadened from object-centric scholarship and research to include community engagement. As a result, curators are developing the skills to serve as responsible interpreters, or “midwives of meaning” (Karp and Kratz 2014). While skills related to conservation, research and scholarship remain professional priorities for curators, additional social skills are helping contemporary curators build successful, sustainable careers as community liaisons.

The responsibility to curate exhibitions that respond to contemporary life and speak to a broad and diverse public, is acutely felt by curators at the three case study institutions. At the Asian Art Museum, Oen and Mayer are collaborating with living artists to produce contemporary art displays unlike any their Museum has organized. By hanging Latino art in the permanent galleries of the American Art Museum and National Portrait Gallery, curators Caragol and Ramos are expanding American history and identity. At the MFAH, Froom is calling public attention to shared artistic heritage and cultural contact by displaying Islamic art alongside European works. Curators that prioritize inclusivity, responsiveness, flexibility and collaboration in their work are better
able to successfully navigate the transformation of the curatorial role that has defined the profession in the last decade.

In exhibitions, new models of community curation continue to push the boundaries of curatorial responsibility, shifting their professional role from expert to interpreter. Curators within institutions of various types and sizes have proved that community-curated displays produce dialogue, engagement with the arts, and a sense of community-ownership in the museum. The Santa Cruz MAH and the Danish Trapholt Museum of Art and Design both invited the public to create displays in the museum space, but through very different means. "Everybody's Ocean" in Santa Cruz provided a narrative framework for the public, who then responded to curatorial prompts and defined the scope of the narrative story. The community response became the exhibition: a short video interview with each contributing artist greeted visitors entering the gallery. Curators filtered and arranged the display of ocean-themed art created by the public and served as mediators (along with museum leadership) in the community-wide dialogue sparked by the exhibition. In this instance, curatorial expertise on the exhibition subject was irrelevant; instead, curatorial interpretation was vital to the selection and display of public art.

"The Kaleidoscope of Culture" at the Trapholt required long-term and extensive participation from the public. The community itself ultimately determined the framework for their display: subject and content were sourced from the community participants. In this case, curators served as facilitators and resource managers who interpreted museum methodology for the participants, who then created a narrative.
Curatorial Collaborations Fostering Inclusivity

Collaboration that involves reciprocal relationships, both inside and outside the museum, serves to root the institution in the community. Successful collaboration also produces positive social change that museum resources alone could never have realized. The partnership between the National Portrait Gallery (or the American Art Museum) and the Smithsonian Latino Center is a perfect example. The organizations complement one another’s resources: the NPG has scholarly expertise, a curatorial department, and a collection; the Latino Center has designated funding for a Latino-focused curator. Both share a vision for the same outcome: to represent the Latino experience as part of the American identity at the Smithsonian. Collaboration has resulted in the appointment of a Curator of Latino Art and History at the NPG for the first time in the institution’s history. Significantly the Latino Center did not initiate a partnership with the NPG as act of outreach. After the curatorial appointment and funding is negotiated, the Latino Center maintains relationships with the embedded curator and museum leadership, and helps to establish networks of Latino artists and historians for the benefit of the NPG.

The Asian Art Museum is involved in collaborative efforts both inside and outside the institution: internally the curatorial and education departments collaborate over the new contemporary art program, and both departments are increasingly involved in collaborations with artist communities outside the institution. Dr. Oen’s transition to the museum as the only designated curator for contemporary art was aided by her professional relationship with the museum’s Senior Educator of Contemporary Art Marc Mayer. Mayer’s five-year history at the institution and his networks of relationships with
artists in San Francisco constituted an essential resource as Oen began her job in 2015 (Oen and Mayer 2016). The exhibition "Extracted" represents the degree of collaboration between the curatorial and education departments. The exhibition's "Big Idea" was generated through a public program with an artist in San Francisco, and grew to become a three-part traveling exhibition that opened at the Asian in 2015. The blend of professional responsibilities between the education and curatorial realms has been heightened since Oen's appointment and the creation of her department. The collaboration between Oen and Mayer allowed for a major institutional restructuring during a season of intense publicity concerning the new contemporary art program (Oen arrived in April, two months before the opening of "28 Chinese," the first of two contemporary art exhibitions during the museum's "Summer of Contemporary Art") (ArtRadar 2015). Both Mayer and Oen collaborate with artists as part of the museum's exhibitions and public programs, and are in the process of building relationships with the artists throughout the greater Bay Area (Oen and Mayer 2016). In acknowledging and working with artists as a community, the Asian Art Museum is building their audience and fulfilling responsibilities to their growing museum community (Zolberg 1992, 106).

In Houston, the Museum of Fine Arts is using collaboration to support their growing Arts of the Islamic Worlds department. The unique partnership between the Dar al-Athar al-Islamiyyah (DAI) in Kuwait and the MFAH has proved a creative solution to a curatorial obstacle: a limited permanent collection at hand to reflect complex, diverse and cultural heritage. The long-term loan of objects from the private DAI collection authorizes the MFAH to house, exhibit, study, and share the collection in the United States (MFAH 2014). Collaboration between the two institutions extends beyond the
long-term loan: staff and expertise are shared through conservation, research and programming initiatives (MFAH 2014). This exchange encourages innovation, cultural contact, and also reinforces the role museums can play in fostering healthy international relations. Both curatorial and administrative staff are involved in this high-level institutional collaboration. Since her appointment in 2014, Froom has continued and expanded upon the work of Director Tinterow’s initial agreement with the DAI. The expanded loan of more than 200 additional objects from the DAI collection in 2015, two years after the first loan of 67 objects, is an indication of the success of the collaboration (MFAH 2014).

No single museum department exists in a vacuum: curators need support, resources and expertise from their entire institution in order to be successful in their work. Collaboration between curators and educators, public programmers, fundraisers, and marketing teams strengthens the relationship between the museum and its community.

Conclusion

The results from the three case studies support the idea that museums are uniquely situated to play a role in building sustainable, equitable urban environments. They have the potential to remove social barriers, build communities’ economic and political capacities, and expand opportunities for disenfranchised groups. An equitable environment ensures the full inclusion of all residents in the economic, social, and political life of the region, regardless of race, ethnicity, age, gender, neighborhood of residence, or other characteristic (PolicyLink and PERE 2015).
Museums that function as "cosmopolitan canopies" can create equitable environments by helping to foster dialogue among disparate groups in cities (Anderson 2004). The healthy city that Jane Jacobs envisioned - where residential contact builds trust and reduces prejudice and fear between diverse communities - requires a designated cosmopolitan canopy in the 21st-century American city (Jacobs 1961; Anderson 2004). Competition for space in cities is stimulating private development projects and whitewashing urban populations as a result. Moreover, diversity in public spaces may not be a defining feature of the future American city. In order to maintain the health and vitality of cities, museums can serve as public centers of dialogue, cultural contact, identity creation and community empowerment. Significantly, for museums to function as cosmopolitan canopies, they must consider reimagining themselves as agents of social change, a theme to be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 10: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Curators hold positions of power within museums. As their role transforms in order to fulfill new expectations from their public, curators continue to serve as the primary collectors and interpreters of the institution. In this chapter, four conclusions about museums and the role of curators related to demographic transformation will be outlined, followed by recommendations concerning curatorial agency and community relationships during periods of change.

Conclusions

First, the American city is changing. Young adults are exhibiting a different set of preferred living arrangements from those sought by previous generations. Access to diverse cultures and experiences, alternative modes of transportation and reduced commute times, and sociability are all extremely valued characteristics of urban lifestyles for the next generation of adults. This group is larger and more diverse than any previous generation. As members of this population obtain positions of power and influence in society, the shape of the city will transform to reflect that diversity.

Cities are proving to be environments, however, that exacerbate inequality. The living patterns of urban residents indicate segregation based on economic class and systemic disenfranchisement. The most ethnically and economically diverse populations, largely immigrant and minority groups, are relocating to suburban areas, farther away from city centers. In order to continue serving and reflecting diverse audiences,
museums are redefining their local audience to include residents from all regions within a metropolitan area.

Second, relevancy is a measure of success for institutional sustainability. Museums are facing a value crisis in contemporary society: as funding sources disappear or change, as academic and scientific knowledge is criticized as elitist, and as the public demands accountability and transparency, museum professionals have to prove their value in order to build a stable, sustainable future for their institutions. Relevancy is the key to proving the value of museums. Relevancy involves connecting existing museum collections, exhibitions and programs to the everyday life of audiences; it requires generating dialogue about identity, culture, and the modern experience; it should mean working to solve contemporary problems with the aid of historic collections, artistic reflections and community collaborators.

Museums that are willing to be flexible and evolve alongside their stakeholder communities (city residents, funders, audiences, origin groups, etc.) are engaging, reflecting and responding to contemporary life. Being relevant includes inviting new emerging communities into the museum and fostering a cultural dialogue. It can also involve forging new relationships or systems of feedback with influential community voices. In the three case studies in this thesis, relevancy has included broadening the scope of the collection, to redress historic neglect and/or to acknowledge growing diversity. Institutions that can prove their relevancy to their communities are better prepared to weather the unknown future.

Third, understanding the demographic landscape of the immediate museum environment is crucial to remaining relevant. If relevancy is the key to the future success
of museums, then demography is an indicator of whether or not museums are relevant. All case study museums are cognizant of the audience demographics of their immediate environment. The Asian Art Museum and MFAH are beholden to regionally-defined demographics, in the San Francisco Bay Area and Greater Houston Area. The Smithsonian, however, is beholden to two demographic groups: the local D.C. population, and the national American population. Both groups are experiencing growth in their share of Latino residents, and Smithsonian curators of Latino art are able to reflect D.C. audiences by addressing the Latino experience for a national audience.

Finally, the role of museums in society has changed since the turn of the 21st century. No longer storehouses for objects with assumed intrinsic value, museums are expected to engage and reflect the community that they serve. Curators are responding to this new context, with increased attention to inclusive and holistic practices that respond to contemporary society. Curatorial responses to community transformation have proven to be as varied and diverse as the communities themselves. In general, curators are tasked with meeting real community needs through acquisitions and display. For the three case study museums, community needs have included identity representation, community empowerment and agency, and symbolic restitution in the form of inclusion in the museum’s master narrative for historical and cultural neglect.

**Recommendations**

Until recently, agency has long been considered unprofessional, or even unethical, in the curatorial field. Declaring subjectivity, revealing opinion, promoting an agenda, or engaging in anything involving politics has never been the conduct of the
curator. Parameters of the profession are historically rooted in scientific objectivity and intrinsic artistic quality. But as museums respond to public demands for operational transparency, curators have been revealed to be ... human.

The age of the objective, distant, authoritarian curator has passed. Curators and museums are parts of communities that are contending with issues of social inequity and sustainability in a very public arena. Social media and technology has flooded society with dialogue. Museums must participate in the dialogue, facilitate conversations and act decisively to channel public energy into healthy and productive problem solving. Museums that do not engage, and remain passive, will find themselves irrelevant and obsolete. The final portion of this chapter will propose recommendations related to curatorial agency in the face of community transformation, based on the literature review and case study examination.

First, curators and museum leaders at city museums will need to consider suburban audiences in museum planning. Diversity is highly valued by city residents and municipal governments; as icons of civic identity as well as public and cultural entities, museums are expected to reflect this valued urban characteristic. Shifting demographic patterns of metropolitan areas across the nation indicate that the most diverse populations are no longer located in city centers; therefore, institutions must strive to serve the suburban populations as well as their immediate neighbors, who are increasingly more affluent, younger, and white. If curators hope to continue reflecting diverse audiences through collecting and display practices, museums will need to work harder to engage with those audiences. Satellite museum campuses away from downtowns, pop-up exhibition spaces, public art installations, and programming that
takes place in suburban neighborhoods away from the museum provide alternative methods of communing with an audience outside of the museum walls. One advantage of accepting the museum's new role in society as agents of social change is no longer being dependent on a physical building to communicate.

Second, curators should look to involve communities in curatorial efforts in as many ways as possible. Not all museums can afford to hire staff dedicated to specific communities, or re-brand their entire institution. Curators can respond to community transformations on different scales. This may look like an assessment of the resources a museum currently offers its public. For example, maybe school field trips are not making a significant impact in a particular community, and perhaps museum resources would be better spent producing public weeknight forums. Curators can partner with community organizations that share the museum's values and desired outcomes, in order to organize and/or fund an exhibition that reaches a new audience.

Engaging with communities is fundamental to the role of museums in the 21st-century American city. Curators are in the position to fight societal polarization by representing as many legitimate voices as possible. Curators can influence and empower innovative and honorable future leaders, by fostering the ambition of younger generations. Too often the work of relationship-building and audience evaluation takes place outside of curatorial departments. Working with communities can no longer be treated as "outreach," or alternatively as an obligatory legal requirement related to source communities and/or repatriation. Curators need to accept the perspectives, resources, identities and alternative forms of storytelling within the work of their departments. This thesis has examined various ways that arts institutions have invited
communities to participate in their work: community-curated exhibits, reciprocal arts programming partnerships, institutional re-branding and structural re-organization are a few examples.

Finally, museums need to build internal mechanisms within their institution to regularly assess their urban community; curatorial departments need to be integrated into this process. This research has highlighted the significance of the local residential population to the function of museums in cities. City museums are both landmarks that broadcast civic identity, and members of an urban community with responsibilities to their public. Those responsibilities include serving the public good, a task that increasingly involves greater institutional agency in the community. How can museums serve a public, without an understanding of the character of the public? Demographic data is only one component of the character of a community, but it is a crucial and readily available component. Census data is a reliable and free resource on regional populations that museums can utilize, in addition to reports from the AAM and Center for the Future of Museums. In order to maintain a valued and privileged place in any urban society, museums need to ensure that their audience reflects the diversity, complexity, and dynamism of their city's population. This includes addressing any identities or communities that have been systematically neglected from the museum narrative. It is imperative that museums develop the ability to monitor their surrounding community, as relevancy is increasingly a vital measure for institutional success.
Concluding Statement

This thesis focused on curatorial responses within large art museums to rapid demographic change in large American cities. Future research may narrow the scope of the research, by limiting the study to cities of a particular population size (for example, between 500,000 and 1 million people), or to museums with a similar scope (for example, only museums with encyclopedic collections, or only contemporary art museums). Another area for future research includes museums of another genre: anthropology museums, history museums or historic sites, science and technology museums, and even zoos. All museums have the potential to start conversations about pressing issues in society, from social justice and equity, to conservation and sustainability.

Urban demographic transformations affect not only the shape and culture of a city, but also impacts plant and animal life, the use of energy and fuel, and the stability of potentially global economies. All three cities examined in this study - San Francisco, Houston and Washington, D.C. - are tied to international systems of influence. As a result, many of the concerns of Houston residents, for example, are concerns shared by a global population. Energy and fuel use, responsible and safe technology, immigration, international relations, and climate change are all scalable issues, shared by a city community as well as the global community. Museums that do not engage on these issues, and remain passive out of allegiance to an outmoded code of objective professionalism, will find themselves irrelevant and obsolete.

Museums of all sizes and types inherently already hold the tools to help communities problem solve: collections, public trust, and neutral space. Object-based
narratives can represent real people, places and ideas; museums are the most trusted institutions in the United States (Lord and Blankenberg 2015)\textsuperscript{23}; and museums often feature neutral public spaces wherein a public can congregate. Given these realities, museums are uniquely primed to help communities problem solve to build an inclusive, equitable, sustainable future. Richard Sandell adds that museums' position in the community, as socially responsible institutions, obligates this type of action:

> Within the museum context, social responsibility requires an acknowledgement not only of the potential to impact on social inequality, but also of the organization's' obligation to deploy their social agency and cultural authority in a way that is aligned and consistent with the values of contemporary society (Sandell 2002, 18).

In other words, Curators who work with an understanding of the values, identities and functions of the diverse audiences in their community have the capacity to not only address community needs, but work with the community in achieving a shared vision for the future. Acknowledging and investing in the community ultimately affords museums undeniable societal value, as agents of positive social chang

\textsuperscript{23} National public opinion survey conducted by Lake Snell Perry & Associates for the American Alliance of Museums, 2001. Museums were seen by the public as society's most trusted source of reliable information (Lord and Blankenberg 2015).
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APPENDICIES

Appendix 1: AAM About Us

About Us

The American Alliance of Museums' mission is to champion museums and nurture excellence in partnership with our members and allies.

What We Do

The American Alliance of Museums has been bringing museums together since 1906, helping to develop standards and best practices, gathering and sharing knowledge, and providing advocacy on issues of concern to the entire museum community. Representing more than 30,000 individual museum professionals and volunteers, institutions, and corporate partners serving the museum field, the Alliance stands for the broad scope of the museum community.

Who's in the Alliance

Organizations:
- art museums
- history museums
- science museums
- military and maritime museums
- youth museums
- aquariums
- zoos
- botanical gardens
- arboreums
- historic sites
- science and technology centers
- museum-service companies
- state museum associations
- regional museum associations

People:
- directors
- curators
- registrars
- educators
- exhibit designers
- public relations officers
- development officers
- security managers
- trustees
- volunteers
Appendix 2: Arab American Education Foundation (AAEF) MFAH Visit

On Thursday, June 4th, 2009, members of the Board were treated to a private tour of the permanent gallery dedicated to the arts of the Islamic world, at the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston. The gallery was established in 2007 as a commitment to exhibit "the diversity of styles, forms, and media characterizing the arts of the Islamic world." (Peter Marzio, Director, MFAH. Friends of the Arts of the Islamic World).

The collection, the only one in the state of Texas, includes works from the 7th century to the present, and covering an area stretching from Mogul India to Ottoman Turkey. Dr. Francesca Leoni, Assistant Curator of the Arts of the Islamic World at MFAH, led the tour, explaining the methods used in the production and decoration of ancient glass, lustreware, porcelain, and pottery. She also highlighted the art of calligraphy and illumination used in the Koran on display, and discussed the distinction between religious and secular art in the Islamic world.

We look forward to a continuing collaboration with the museum in its effort to expand the scope of the collection, and increase awareness of the art of this important region.
Appendix 3: AAEF Pledges to Success of the Arts of the Islamic World

In August 2009, the Arab American Educational foundation (AAEF) became a Founder Benefactor of the Friends of the Arts of the Islamic World, the principal support group of the Islamic art initiative at the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston. By pledging $15,000 the association is the first cultural group in town to sustain the ambitious goal of the MFAH to develop a permanent collection of Islamic art.
Dr. Pedro Moura Carvalho Appointed Deputy Director for Art and Programs at The Asian Art Museum

SAN FRANCISCO, January 7, 2014— The Asian Art Museum announced today the appointment of Dr. Pedro Moura Carvalho as the museum’s new Deputy Director for Art and Programs, a key leadership position overseeing the curatorial, museum services, education and public programs departments. Reporting to the museum Director, Moura Carvalho will be responsible for providing strategic oversight and management of collections, exhibitions, education and interpretive initiatives that enhance audience engagement. He begins his tenure at the museum in March 2014.

A scholar of Islamic art with deep interests in cross-cultural artistic traditions, Moura Carvalho has been serving as Chief Curator and Deputy Director for Curatorial, Collections, and Exhibitions at the Asian Civilisations Museum and the Peranakan Museum, Singapore, since 2011. While there, he curated the exhibitions Treasures of the Aga Khan Museum; Islamic Art in Southeast Asia, and was the lead curator of The Peranakan World presented at The National Museum of Korea, Seoul, in the spring of 2013.

“I am delighted to join Jay Xu and museum trustees and commissioners in supporting the museum’s vision to deliver captivating art experiences centered on stunning artworks,” says Moura Carvalho. “The museum is a great institution with an extraordinary collection. I feel privileged to partner with staff, volunteers, and patrons to shape remarkable and innovative visitor-centered endeavors in the rapidly growing and changing field of Asian art and cultures.”
Appendix 5: Asian Art Museum – Dr. Karin G. Oen Press Release

MEDIA CONTACT:
Tim Hallman
415.581.3711
pr@asianart.org

ASIAN ART MUSEUM NAMES DR. KARIN G. OEN ASSISTANT CURATOR OF CONTEMPORARY ART

SAN FRANCISCO, April 16, 2015 — The Asian Art Museum of San Francisco today announced the appointment of Dr. Karin G. Oen as the museum’s Assistant Curator of Contemporary Art, effective June 15, 2015. A scholar of modern and contemporary Asian art with museum experience focusing on contemporary and historical collections, Dr. Oen will help plan, develop, and implement the museum’s burgeoning contemporary art program. For the next two years the position is generously supported by funding from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

“Karin—a curator, scholar, and museum educator—brings a great mix of skills to this important role at the museum,” said Dr. Pedro Moura Carvalho, the museum’s deputy director, art and programs. “Her appointment reflects a growing commitment by the Asian Art Museum—long acclaimed for its collection of historical works—to present contemporary art to audiences in a savvy, engaging way that connects past and present. She arrives as the museum kicks off our ‘Summer of Contemporary,’ a series of programming, including the exhibitions 28 Chinese and First Look: Collecting Contemporary at the Asian.”

Dr. Oen joins the Asian Art Museum from the Crow Collection of Asian Art in Dallas, TX, where she served as curator, organizing exhibitions from the collection and private lenders. Dr. Oen participated in a large-scale renovation of the museum and the opening of its sculpture garden. She also served on the adjunct faculty at the University of Texas, Dallas, and the University of North Texas, offering specialized courses on modern and contemporary Asian art.
Appendix 6: Asian Art Museum – Governance

Governance

The City and County of San Francisco Asian Art Commission is responsible for the determination of policy for and the administration of the Asian Art Museum of San Francisco.

At the time the Asian Art Museum was formed, upon the significant donation of art from Avery Brundage, the Asian Art Museum Foundation was established as the private fundraising arm of the Museum. Originally, this arrangement was made to comply with Mr. Brundage’s request that funds be raised for acquisitions he had selected for addition to the collection. This obligation was duly met but the Foundation has continued its fundraising as a nonprofit organization in order to support various Museum activities. Over the years, the City’s share of funding for operational expense has declined sharply and the Foundation has borne an increasingly large share of such costs.

Commissioners and Foundation Trustees work together for the benefit of the Museum, frequently serving on each other’s committees. Some members have had a lifelong interest in Asian art and are serious collectors. Others do not have great depth of knowledge of Asian art but contribute expertise in other areas. All share a fellowship based on the conviction that the Asian Art Museum is unique and the best of its kind and is a tremendous asset to the City of San Francisco. By strengthening the Museum, they feel strongly that they are benefiting the City of San Francisco by enhancing its quality of life, reputation as a cultural center, and appeal to visitors who bring in millions of dollars annually. Through involvement with the Museum, Commissioners in turn develop a better understanding of Asia, of vital importance to San Francisco and the Bay Area in this era of emphasis on the Pacific Rim.

Contact Details
Asian Art Commission
Asian Art Museum
200 Larkin Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
phone: 415.581.3753
toll free: 800.376.3764
fax: 415.581.4700
e-mail: commission@asianart.org

Documents
Code of Ethics
Whistleblower Policy (Hotline: 415.581.3754)
Statement of Incompatible Activities
Audit Financial Statements for the Year Ended 9/30/16
Form 990 for the Year Ended 9/30/15 (2014)
(form years available upon request)
Annual Report 2011-12
Appendix 7: Asian Art Museum – Museum History

Museum History

In 1959, Chicago industrialist Avery Brundage agreed to donate the first part of his vast collection of Asian art to San Francisco on the condition that the city build a new museum to house it.

In 1969, to meet the Brundage challenge, a $2,725,000 bond issue was passed by the voters of San Francisco to acquire the collection and to build a facility for it. Completed in 1966, the new facility opened on June 11, 1966, in a space constructed as a wing of the M.H. de Young Memorial Museum in Golden Gate Park. At that time, the administrative responsibility of overseeing the collection and the building remained with the board of trustees of the de Young. At the dedication of the new wing, Avery Brundage said, "In presenting this collection to San Francisco my hope is that, together with the facilities of the region's great universities, it will help San Francisco and the Bay Area become one of the world's greatest centers of Oriental culture.

Avery Brundage continued to collect for the next decade, spending hundreds of thousands of dollars a year filling in the gaps in his collection. In 1969, he was in a position to make a second gift. This was the occasion of Brundage's second challenge to San Francisco—to provide an autonomous administration for the collection and operations and to raise $3 million for acquisitions and education. The agreement between Mr. Brundage and the city in July 1969 provided for an independent Committee of Asian Art and Culture, whose goal would be to make the museum the foremost center for Asian art in the Western world. At that point, the institution became an independent entity with its own 21-member governing body (known today as the Asian Art Commission); its own staff, including specialists in Chinese, Japanese, South Asian, and Himalayan arts (a department dedicated to Southeast Asian art was added in 1985, and another dedicated to Korean art—the first of its kind outside of Asia—in 1989); its own library; its own conservation and photographic departments, and its own budget. The city agreed to provide building maintenance, security, and adequate funds for standard operating expenses. In 1973 the institution—until then known officially as the Center for Asian Art and Culture—was renamed the Asian Art Museum of San Francisco.

Avery Brundage continued to collect until his death in 1975. He bequeathed his remaining Asian art to the museum, making the collection one of the greatest in America. In total, Avery Brundage donated more than 7,700 Asian art objects to the City of San Francisco—all housed at the Asian Art Museum. Today, the museum's collection stands at more than 18,000 objects, making it the largest museum in the United States devoted exclusively to the arts of Asia.
Golden Gate Park Years

During its 35 years of residency in Golden Gate Park, the museum was a leader in presenting groundbreaking special exhibitions. Some highlights include:

- In June 1975, the museum presented the first major international exhibition to travel outside of China since the end of World War II: The Exhibition of Archeological Finds of the People’s Republic of China. It drew an astounding 800,000 visitors in an eight-week period.

- In May 1979, the museum presented 5000 Years of Korean Art, a landmark exhibition of national treasures organized by the Asian Art Museum in conjunction with the National Museum of Korea.

- May 4, 1983, marked the opening of Treasures from the Shanghai Museum: 6,000 Years of Chinese Art. It was the first exhibition ever organized with a museum in China, and grew out of San Francisco’s Sister City relationship with Shanghai.

- On April 17, 1991, the Dalai Lama officially opened Wisdom and Compassion: The Sacred Art of Tibet, an exhibition organized by the Asian Art Museum in association with Tibet House, New York; the exhibition traveled to other worldwide venues for many years.

- In August, 1994, the museum played host to the famous terra-cotta warriors of China’s first emperor when it organized and presented Tomb Treasures from China: The Buried Art of Ancient Xi’an.

- In July, 1995, the museum organized and presented the largest and most comprehensive collection of Mongolian art ever viewed in the United States, Mongolia: The Legacy of Chinggis Khan.

Move to Civic Center

After the museum’s collection began to grow—compounded by the museum’s desire to display more special exhibitions and offer more public programs—it became clear that the institution had outgrown its Golden Gate Park facility.

The City of San Francisco, understanding the museum’s limitations in Golden Gate Park, offered the city’s former Main Public Library building to the museum after it was clear the library was relocating to a new space, and after usage studies suggested the building would be better suited for a museum. In 1987, the City approved a plan for revitalization of the Civic Center. In late 1994, San Francisco voters overwhelmingly supported a bond measure to renovate the former Main Library as the new home of the Asian Art Museum.

In October 1995, Asian Art Commissioner and respected Silicon Valley entrepreneur Chong-Moon Lee presented a $15 million leadership gift to the capital campaign for the new Asian Art Museum at Civic Center. Recognizing the magnitude of Mr. Lee’s gift, the Asian Art Commission established the “Chong-Moon Lee Center for Asian Art and Culture” at the Asian Art Museum. In 1994, Mr. Lee also gave $1 million to the museum’s Korean Department. In 1996, the museum chose renowned Italian architect Gae Aulenti—widely recognized as a designer who specializes in the adaptive conversion of historic structures into museum spaces—as the design architect of its new facility. Her award-winning projects include the Musée d’Orsay in Paris, which was created from an enormous railway station built in 1900; the Palazzo Grassi in Venice, adapted within the framework of an eighteenth-century Venetian palace; and the National Museum of Catalan Art in Barcelona, the former National Palace built in 1929 for an international exposition. The joint venture of Hellmuth, Obata + Kassabaum (HOK), LDA Architects and Robert Wong Architect acted as the project architect, working with Gae Aulenti to incorporate her design concepts into the complete design package. The museum stayed open to the public at its Golden Gate Park facility until October 7, 2001, when it closed in preparation for the move to its new, expanded facility. The Asian Art Museum reopened at its current Civic Center location on March 20, 2003.
Appendix 8: Asian Art Museum – About the Museum

Welcome and thank you for visiting. Through great art experiences, we strive to be a catalyst for discovery, dialogue and inspiration. Our vision and mission are centered on you, the visitor. We hope you’re able to experience our museum in person, in addition to visiting with us online. I look forward to seeing you here soon.

Jay Xu, Director
Asian Art Museum

Strategically located on the Pacific Rim and serving one of the most diverse communities in the United States, the Asian Art Museum of San Francisco – Chang-Moon Lee Center for Asian Art and Culture is uniquely positioned to lead a diverse, global audience in discovering the distinctive materials, aesthetics and intellectual achievements of Asian art and cultures, and to serve as a bridge of understanding between Asia and the United States and between the diverse cultures of Asia.

Our Vision
With Asia as our lens and art as our conversation, we spark connections across cultures and through time, igniting curiosity, conversation, and creativity.

Asia is not one place. The ideas and ideals that we call Asian are countless and diverse. Some of the works we display pre-date written history. Others were recently created. Many have connections to works from other continents and other millennia. We explore these links, provoking discovery, debate, and inspiration.

At the Asian Art Museum, artistic and educational programs empower visitors to discover the relevance of great artworks in profoundly personal ways. Immersed in our galleries, visitors ponder the universal values found in human expression. Through the pulse of daily programs, students of the world steep in cultures through art, music, dance, and tradition. In the classrooms of the museum, children build bridges to old and new worlds.

This is the vision of our Asian Art Museum.

Our Mission
Our mission is to lead a diverse global audience in discovering the unique material, aesthetic, and intellectual achievements of Asian art and culture.

About the Asian Art Museum

Welcome and thank you for visiting. Through great art experiences, we strive to be a catalyst for discovery, dialogue and inspiration. Our vision and mission are centered on you, the visitor. We hope you’re able to experience our museum in person, in addition to visiting with us online. I look forward to seeing you here soon.

Jay Xu, Director
Asian Art Museum

Strategically located on the Pacific Rim and serving one of the most diverse communities in the United States, the Asian Art Museum of San Francisco – Chang-Moon Lee Center for Asian Art and Culture is uniquely positioned to lead a diverse, global audience in discovering the distinctive materials, aesthetics and intellectual achievements of Asian art and cultures, and to serve as a bridge of understanding between Asia and the United States and between the diverse cultures of Asia.

Our Vision
With Asia as our lens and art as our conversation, we spark connections across cultures and through time, igniting curiosity, conversation, and creativity.

Asia is not one place. The ideas and ideals that we call Asian are countless and diverse. Some of the works we display pre-date written history. Others were recently created. Many have connections to works from other continents and other millennia. We explore these links, provoking discovery, debate, and inspiration.

At the Asian Art Museum, artistic and educational programs empower visitors to discover the relevance of great artworks in profoundly personal ways. Immersed in our galleries, visitors ponder the universal values found in human expression. Through the pulse of daily programs, students of the world steep in cultures through art, music, dance, and tradition. In the classrooms of the museum, children build bridges to old and new worlds.

This is the vision of our Asian Art Museum.

Our Mission
Our mission is to lead a diverse global audience in discovering the unique material, aesthetic, and intellectual achievements of Asian art and culture.
Appendix 9: Association of Art Museum Curators – Museum and Vision

The Association of Art Museum Curators

AAMC & AAMC Foundation Mission Statement
The mission of the Association of Art Museum Curators is to support and promote the work of museum curators by creating opportunities for networking, collaboration, professional development, and advancement. In support of these aims, the AAMC Foundation seeks to heighten public understanding of the curator’s role in museums through professional development programs, awards, and grants. By providing a dynamic forum in which to share ideas and encourage professional development, the Association of Art Museum Curators will continue to attract membership, increasing its vitality and importance to the larger arts community.

As of June 2015, the AAMC has a board of 21 trustees from 20 museums, comprising of some of the most distinguished figures in the field. It consists of more than 1000 members from over 400 institutions, including representation from all 50 states and 5 provinces. With offices in New York City, generously provided the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, AAMC employs a full-time Executive Director and Administrator.

Values & Goals
The AAMC values, supports and promotes:
- Professional development and advancement
- Recognition of excellence within the field
- Research and scholarship
- Ethical and professional standards
- Collaboration among members and across professional organizations
- Dissemination of information and resources pertinent to the advancement of curatorial practice and expertise

The goals of the AAMC are to:
- Provide an open forum for discussion about museum issues
- Articulate professional standards and best practices
- Promote research, scholarship, networking, and mentoring opportunities through travel grants
- Use the website to exchange scholarly and procedural information as well as traveling exhibition and employment opportunities
- Recognize distinguished achievement in the field through annual awards
- Promote best practices and professional relationships through Annual Meetings and educational programs on selected themes held at venues throughout North America
- Serve as an advocacy group for the curatorial profession
- Accomplish these goals in cooperation with museum directors, trustees, and other staff as well as other national cultural and arts advocacy organizations

AAMC History
The AAMC, a 501(c)(6) membership organization, grew out of the Forum of Curators and Conservators at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, a recognized, non-union body of more than 100 members. In response to news of staff reorganizations at several major US museums, members of the Forum created an ad hoc committee to explore the feasibility of a national organization of museum curators in 1959. Over the course of two and a half years, curators at the Metropolitan Museum, including Katharine Baetjer, Stefano Careoni, coconut ives, and Anne d'Harnoncourt, met with senior curators regarding the establishment of the AAMC, the final time that curators were invited to speak to this committee. In April 2001, they held a meeting in New York, attended by representatives from a dozen American art museums, during which they voted the formation of the AAMC in its name. Following the recommendation of the ad hoc committee, the AAMC was incorporated in New York in 2002. As of 2015, the AAMC has a board of 21 trustees from 20 museums who comprise some of the most distinguished figures in the field. It consists of 9 committees, more than 1000 members from over 400 institutions, including representation from all 50 states and 5 provinces. With offices in New York City, generously provided the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, AAMC employs a full-time Executive Director and Administrator.

The AAMC values, supports and promotes:
- Professional development and advancement
- Recognition of excellence within the field
- Research and scholarship
- Ethical and professional standards
- Collaboration among members and across professional organizations
- Dissemination of information and resources pertinent to the advancement of curatorial practice and expertise

The AAMC has held an annual meeting every year since 2002, and continues to build membership and programs. As of 2014, the AAMC has a board of 21 trustees from 20 museums who comprise some of the most distinguished figures in the field. It consists of 9 committees, more than 1000 members from over 400 institutions, including representation from all 50 states and 5 provinces. With offices in New York City, generously provided the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, AAMC employs a full-time Executive Director and Administrator.
State of the Region 2015: Economy, Population, Housing

This report examines present conditions in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area in the context of historic trends and expectations for the future. The report describes the recovery of the economy and identifies driving factors influencing industry expansion, employment opportunities, and income consequences throughout the region. A shifting population is the theme of an analysis of changing demographics generated by continuing foreign immigration, revitalized in-migration of workers seeking opportunities in the region's expanding economy, and a baby-boom population moving into retirement years. A close look at recent housing trends and housing policy shows a shift in the balance of growth from single to multifamily dwellings and from suburban and rural to urban job centers.

The report consists of an introduction, four main sections addressing the regional overview, the economy, the population base, and the housing market, and a concluding section.

1 While some of the discussion in this report takes a long-term historic context, most focuses on more recent trends. For data on longer-term historic trends, visit the MTC Vital Signs web site at http://www.vitalsigns.mtc.co.ca.gov.
Section 1: A Strong Recovery in the Region

The first section sets the framework of recent history and expectations. With a 9.8 percent increase in employment and 10.7 percent increase in gross regional product between 2010 and 2013, the Bay Area has outpaced both California and the US in job recovery and expanding output. Population growth has been more moderate, at 3.8 percent between April 2010 and January 2014, while the housing stock has expanded by only 1.4 percent. The sections that follow explain these short term trends in context to help shape longer term expectations.

Section 2: The Economy; Strengths and Consequences

By spring of 2013, the region had regained all of the jobs lost in the 2007 to 2009 recession, while estimates indicate that the jobs lost since the higher peak in 2000 were finally regained by the end of 2014. This rebound has spread unevenly throughout the region, with counties as diverse as San Francisco and Napa each having passed the two previous peaks in employment.

The other seven counties remain below previous peaks, although they are rapidly approaching full recovery. Long term industrial shifts continue, with steady growth occurring in health, social services and education, and leisure and hospitality, resumption of boom growth after a period of volatility in professional and business services and information, and a leveling off of declines in manufacturing employment and financial services. San Francisco has taken the largest share of new professional and technical jobs, Santa Clara the largest share of new information jobs, while the bulk of health and social service and accommodation and food job growth is distributed evenly between San Francisco, the South Bay, and the East Bay.

In all, much of the new growth has gone to sectors and locations that already are areas of competitive advantage for the region. The three fastest growing major occupation categories—computer and mathematical, food preparation, and sales and related occupations—reflect the combination of highly technical, distributive and local serving industry expansion.

Labor force participation—close to 67 percent—is higher than the average for the state or nation, and has ceased its decline from the 2009 peak. The region has a highly educated workforce, and shows signs this high education level will continue well into the future. The majority of the adult age groupings have seen growth in the share that are college educated, and most of the younger adult age groups are better educated than the next older population group. Total personal income growth (the change in the sum of all income across the entire population) has been strong in the region, although, adjusting for inflation, household incomes remain below their 2007 peak, and in six counties remain at or below 1990 levels. The number of jobs in higher wage occupations is growing more quickly than low wage or middle income jobs, while many occupational categories—whether high, middle or low wage—continue to have wages below their 2010 levels. With these trends, the Bay Area is moving in concert with other parts of the nation in seeing rising income inequality.

Section 3: A Diverse and Changing Population

The region's rate of population growth is rebounding from low levels in the previous decade, but remains far below the experience of the 1990s. The character of population growth has changed in several ways, including the location of growth, age composition of the population, and ethnic makeup. The location of growth has shifted from concentrating in the suburban and rural counties in the 1990s and 2000s to focusing on the more urban counties since 2010. Santa Clara, Alameda, and San Francisco counties, the three largest counties in the region, had the fastest rate of population growth between 2010 and 2014, with over one third of the region's population increase occurring in the cities of San Jose, San Francisco, and Oakland. However, Contra Costa County exceeded San Francisco in the number of households added, suggesting a very different age and family composition between the two counties.
Aging is happening unevenly throughout the region. San Francisco is the only one of the nine counties with a decrease in the share of population over 65, while the share is rising steadily in the other eight counties. The median age has dropped since 2007 in San Francisco, Santa Clara, Alameda, and San Mateo counties, but is increasing in the North Bay counties. Marin County has the oldest and most rapidly aging population. The region’s population is also diversifying. The share of the population that is non-Hispanic white has dropped from being a majority in 2000 to 41 percent in 2013. The non-Hispanic Asian population has overtaken the Hispanic population as the second-largest expanding population group. The larger counties with the more urban job centers have significantly higher shares of foreign born residents than the smaller and more suburban counties. The region’s growth patterns are further changing with the stronger economy, as fewer people leave the region and more move into the region.

Section 4: Gauging Progress on Housing Goals

Although new housing production has lagged behind population and job growth, new construction and building permits are focusing more on existing job centers than in the recent past, and multifamily units are a growing proportion of new stock. The region’s housing stock grew by less than 40,000 between 2010 and 2014, a slower pace of growth than in the previous two decades. While the pace of construction has yet to reach that of the 2000s, the overall share of housing in the biggest cities has increased. During the 1980s, San Francisco and San Jose accounted for 22 percent of all units added; the following decade, the share was up to 28 percent; while for the period since 2010, the share had risen to 37 percent. Approximately 13,000 of the units added to the region since 2010 were single-family homes, while over 23,000 were multifamily homes. This is a continuation of a steady increase in the multifamily share of new units from 1990 to the present. While single-family units are still built predominately in the more suburban areas, multifamily construction is concentrated not only in the large urban job centers of San Jose, San Francisco, and Oakland, but also in areas that were historically suburban but have added major employment hubs, such as Dublin, Sunnyvale, Fremont, and San Ramon. These trends can be expected to continue in the near future, as reflected by the high share of building permits that are for multifamily projects.

A survey of planning departments shows a large share of new multifamily units are being permitted in priority development areas (PDAs), especially in the more urban parts of the region where the majority of new building permits have been issued. The counties where the majority (or all) of new multifamily units have been permitted outside of PDAs are also counties with very small shares of multifamily units permitted (Marin, Napa, and Solano). Using the Regional Housing Need Assessment Goals as a benchmark, only about one-fourth of the region’s needed production goals have been met for very low, low, and moderate income housing, compared to over 80 percent for above moderate income housing. The overall numbers are less than in the 1999 to 2006 period—not surprising when comparing two time periods divided into housing boom and bust. While the lag in housing construction and strong economic growth, housing affordability continues to be a major concern for the region. Renters have the highest levels of housing burden, higher rates of growth in housing burden, and greater levels of overcrowding, as measured with census data and using the HUD definition of more than 1.01 occupants per room. While affordability is predictably poor in San Francisco and Santa Clara counties, renter affordability is a challenge even in Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma counties, where more than 50 percent of households pay over 30 percent of their income on housing. Problems of homeowner affordability also show up in both urban and rural pockets throughout the region.

Conclusion: Prospects and Challenges

The San Francisco Bay Area has experienced a decade of economic recovery since the Great Recession (which officially went from fourth quarter 2007 through second quarter 2009) and is poised for expansion. Although employment growth since 2010 has far outpaced recent history on long-term trends, in fact by the end of 2014, the region had just returned to the employment peak of 2000 after the peak of the dot-com bubble. Population and labor force are growing more slowly, not needing to match the pace of employment change because many of the "new jobs" have been filled by existing residents. Nevertheless, household growth continues, increasing the demand for new housing units, while financing for new residential construction from either the private or public sectors is less readily available than in the previous decade.

The region’s challenges continue to be related to the interplay of employment change, population shifts, and housing supply.

Key uncertainties include:

- A history of job change driven by innovative but volatile industries.
- Housing and location choices of a changing population: to what degree will an increasingly urban lifestyle be the choice for aging retirees as well as for today’s young adults as they begin to form families?
- Meeting the housing needs for a wide spread of income groups: the concentration of occupation growth at both the low and high ends of the wage spectrum means the region will need housing affordable to households at multiple income levels.

- Whether new business centers and residential development will concentrate where transit services exist or can be provided.
- The effects of changing public resources and public policy on the ability of the region to meet the housing demands of growing population and labor force.
### Appendix 11: Bay Area Census, SF City and County

#### San Francisco City and County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POPULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In households</td>
<td>754,976</td>
<td>799,971</td>
<td>783,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In group quarters</td>
<td>19,737</td>
<td>24,294</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>365,720</td>
<td>390,287</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>86,515</td>
<td>68,810</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>3,406</td>
<td>4,034</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>239,565</td>
<td>247,615</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3,944</td>
<td>3,396</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>50,386</td>
<td>53,021</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>36,265</td>
<td>37,959</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or latino (of any race)</td>
<td>168,899</td>
<td>131,744</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>667,220</td>
<td>663,461</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>56,791</td>
<td>46,791</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>256,173</td>
<td>285,730</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3,602</td>
<td>3,126</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>23,195</td>
<td>20,762</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEX</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>364,828</td>
<td>408,462</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>391,058</td>
<td>386,773</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>31,632</td>
<td>35,220</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 17 years</td>
<td>51,189</td>
<td>72,321</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 64 years</td>
<td>557,280</td>
<td>557,950</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>195,111</td>
<td>109,842</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSEHOLDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>320,700</td>
<td>345,911</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family households</td>
<td>165,198</td>
<td>151,029</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with children under 18</td>
<td>54,707</td>
<td>55,212</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household size</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average family size</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING OCCUPANCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total housing units</td>
<td>346,527</td>
<td>378,902</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied housing units</td>
<td>339,730</td>
<td>345,811</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-occupied housing units</td>
<td>115,351</td>
<td>123,848</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-occupied housing units</td>
<td>214,320</td>
<td>222,165</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant housing units</td>
<td>16,457</td>
<td>13,872</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 unit, detached housing</td>
<td>30,400</td>
<td>30,400</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median value of owner occupied unit (dollars)</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median gross rent (dollars)</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLACE OF BIRTH BY CITIZENSHIP STATUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>491,192</td>
<td>505,110</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign born</td>
<td>283,541</td>
<td>281,062</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized citizen</td>
<td>163,426</td>
<td>173,039</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a citizen</td>
<td>123,115</td>
<td>107,623</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME AND POVERTY IN 1999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income (dollars)</td>
<td>35,221</td>
<td>71,304</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median family income (dollars)</td>
<td>39,545</td>
<td>55,178</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita income (dollars)</td>
<td>34,596</td>
<td>43,478</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of families in poverty</td>
<td>98,565</td>
<td>82,800</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 20 and over</td>
<td>506,805</td>
<td>605,565</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>32,918</td>
<td>33,947</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>60,186</td>
<td>51,546</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>25,958</td>
<td>18,464</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUTING TO WORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean travel time to work (minutes)</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 12: D.C. Office of Latino Affairs – “Latinos in the District” Excerpt

The Latino population in the District has noticeably increased from 2000 to 2010 in all Wards across the District, except Ward 1. The greatest positive numeric changes in the Latino population from 2000-2010 were seen in: Ward 4 (increase of 4,923), Ward 5 (increase of 2,870), and Ward 6 (increase of 1,657). The only Ward in the District where there was a negative numeric change in the Latino population from 2000-2010 was Ward 1 (decrease of 2,382). Please note that although data have exhibited a decrease in the number of Latinos living in Ward 1, this decrease does not reflect the large population of Latinos still residing and working in this area. Please see Figures 3, 4, and 5 below for geographic distribution by Ward in 2000 and 2010, as well as the Latino population numeric change by Ward from 2000 to 2010, respectively:

The number of Latino residents living in the District has steadily continued to increase over the past decade, 2000-2010. Note that the population data below for the years 2000 and 2010 is from the U.S. Census Bureau decennial reports, and the population estimates for years 2001 through 2009 are from the 2009 American Community Survey. Please see Table 1 below for the yearly Hispanic/Latino Population Trend from 2000-2010 in the District:

Table 1: Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009 American Community Survey. Data prepared by D.C. Office on Planning/Data Center. Table created by Office on Latino Affairs.

DC Hispanic/Latino Population Trend 2000-2010

Table 1: Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009 American Community Survey. Data prepared by D.C. Office on Planning/Data Center. Table created by Office on Latino Affairs.
## Fayez S. Sarofim

**Location:** Tex.

**Source of wealth:** Family wealth, Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Gift Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Museum of Fine Arts</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>G/R</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, has received a gift of $10 million from Fayez S. Sarofim, an investor, former director of the Houston-based energy company Kinder Morgan, and the heir to an Egyptian cotton fortune. The gift will support its capital campaign for a new campus, which will be named in Mr. Sarofim's honor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The giving figures listed for each individual are based on donations announced to date by the donors or their beneficiaries. In cases of bequests, most of the figures are estimates because the wills have not been settled. If you know about a recent gift of $1 million or more that should be added to this directory, please send a message to phil@philanthropy.com.
Appendix 14: Contemporanea Ethnographic Study Excerpt – Santa Cruz MAH

Objectives

The Santa Cruz Museum of Art and History (MAH) commissioned an ethnographic study focused on Latino families in three (3) specific neighborhoods in Santa Cruz: Beach Flats, Lower Ocean, and Live Oak. The Museum already engages with these neighborhoods through some of its public and educational programs, but the Museum seeks to deepen its understanding of these communities in order to increase its cultural competency and inclusive practices.

This study was conducted by Contemporanea, an audience research and strategy consulting agency, utilizing a qualitative methodology to deeply understand the values and motivations of Latino families related to cultural participation. The study was designed around the following objectives:

1. Explore and understand the local Latino families' values and motivations associated with cultural and educational experiences in order to increase the Museum's cultural competency and inclusive practices.

2. Identify leisure and recreational choices of Latinos/as in the city of Santa Cruz and the most effective communication channels among specific sub-segments of the Latino population (Spanish dominant, bilingual, youth, etc.)

3. Examine general perceptions of the MAH, and of downtown Santa Cruz among Latinos/as in Santa Cruz.

This study was conducted during November 2014.

Conclusions

Based on demographic data and study findings, the level of acculturation of these respondents is low, regardless of the number of years living in the U.S. Most respondents were Spanish dominant and foreign born, and all of them are strongly oriented towards Latino/Mexican-centric activities and experiences. For these respondents cultural participation is primarily a way to create and negotiate their ethnic and cultural identity.

Family unity is fundamental to assure that cultural identity is well-established. Parents fear that without the right amount of exposure to Mexican/Latino culture, children might get confused about who they are and their own heritage. For parents it is also important to maintain their identities as immigrants.

There are incipient efforts towards experiences bridging other cultures and lifestyles, but those are still intellectual efforts that need an associated emotional component. American traditions (Thanksgiving, Halloween, Easter, 4th of July, etc.) are the closest to achieving an emotional component, and celebrations are adapted to Latino families' own interests and preferences (Latinization of American traditions).

Outdoor experiences provide a sense of safety, expansiveness, and freedom that is deeply meaningful for Latino families in Santa Cruz. Most cultural activities for these families occur at outdoor festivals, which have the value of being free, participatory, self-curated, and unstructured.

Establishing trust is a hard and winding road. Information is acquired not only through trusted channels, but also shared among individuals. Traditional channels of communication are somewhat effective, but the role of influencers (friends, family, community leaders, school leaders) is fundamental. New experiences must be communicated via trusted influencers in order for them to be considered and tried.

Word of Mouth is king. In some cases word of mouth spills into social media channels, mostly Facebook, but penetration is still incomplete (many respondents do not use computers or smartphones at all). Texting is increasingly used by most respondents and is a good tool for interpersonal communication.

Being polite carries strong cultural currency. Respondents appreciate and acknowledge Spanish language services, but at the same time they won't openly share their concerns or discomforts; they would discreetly leave and probably never return to a place where they don't feel accepted.

MAH awareness and recognition is low. One of the most recurrent sources of awareness are school field trips, but those are not enough to provide recognition of the Museum's programs and exhibits or to ignite active participation on-site. There is confusion with other museums.

Santa Cruz Museum of Art and History - Latino Family Ethnography Study
Appendix 15: New Geography – Downtown Growth

The United States Census Bureau has released a report (Eyewitness of Metropolitan and Metropolitan Population Change: 2000 to 2010) on metropolitan area growth between 2000 and 2010. The Census Bureau’s analysis reveals highlighted population growth in downtown areas, which it defines as within two miles of the city hall of the largest municipal city in each metropolitan area. Predictably, media sources that interpret any improvement in core city fortunes as evidence of people returning to the cities (often while they remain rural), referred to people “flocking” back to downtown.

The United States Census Bureau has released a report (Eyewitness of Metropolitan and Metropolitan Population Change: 2000 to 2010) on metropolitan area growth between 2000 and 2010. The Census Bureau’s analysis reveals highlighted population growth in downtown areas, which it defines as within two miles of the city hall of the largest municipal city in each metropolitan area. Predictably, media sources that interpret any improvement in core city fortunes as evidence of people returning to the cities (often while they remain rural), referred to people “flocking” back to downtown.

Downtown Population Trends: Make no mistake about it, the central cores of the nation’s largest cities are doing better than at any time in recent history. Much of the credit has to go to successful efforts to make crime-infested urban areas suitable for habitation, which started with the strong law enforcement policies of former New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani. However, to characterize the trend since 2000 as reflective of any “flocking” to the cities is to exaggerate the trend of downtown improvement beyond recognition. Among the 51 major metropolitan areas (those with more than 1 million population), nearly 99 percent of all population growth between 2000 and 2010 was outside the downtown areas (Figure 1).

There was population growth in 33 downtown areas out of the 51 major metropolitan areas. As is typical for core urban measures, nearly 80 percent of this population growth was concentrated in the six most vibrant downtown areas, New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Washington, Boston and San Francisco.

If the next six fastest-growing downtown areas are added to the list (Dallas-Fort Worth, Houston, Los Angeles, Portland, San Diego and Seattle), downtown growth records the national total of 205,000 people, because the other 35 downtown areas had a net population loss. Overall, the average downtown area in the major metropolitan areas grew by 2000 people between 2000 and 2010. That may be a lot of people for a college lacrosse game, but not for a city. While in some cases these losses were substantial in percentage terms, the population base was generally small, which was the result of huge population losses in previous decades as well as the conversion of old disused office buildings, warehouses and factories into residential units.

Trends in the Larger Urban Core: The downtown population gains, however, were not sufficient to stem the continuing decline in urban core populations. Among the 51 major metropolitan areas, the aggregate data indicates a loss of population within six miles of city hall, the essence, the oasis of modest downtown growth was more than negated by losses surrounding the downtown areas. Virtually all the population growth in the major metropolitan areas lay outside the six mile radius core, as areas within the historical urban core, including downtown, lost 0.4 percent. Even when the radius is expanded to 12 miles, the overwhelming majority of growth remains outside. Approximately 94 percent of the aggregate population growth of the major metropolitan areas occurred more than 12 miles from downtown (Figure 2). Figure 3 shows that more than one-half of the growth occurred at 10 miles and farther from city hall. Further, the population growth beyond 10 miles (5-10 mile radius, 15-20 mile radius and 20 mile and greater radius) from the core exceeded the (2000) share of population, showing the continuing dispersed of American metropolitan areas (Figure 4).
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Chicago: The Champion? The Census Bureau press release highlights the fact that downtown Chicago experienced the largest gain in the nation. Downtown Chicago accounted for 13 percent of the metropolitan area's growth with an impressive 48,000 new residents. However, while downtown Chicago was prospering, people were flocking away from the rest of the city. Within a five-mile radius of the Loop, there was a net population loss of 12,000 and a net loss of more than 200,000 within 20 miles (Figure 5). Only within the third-mile radius from city hall is there a net population gain.
Cleveland: Comeback City and Always Will Be? In view of Cleveland's demographic decline (down from 915,000 in 1950 to 397,000 in 2010), any progress in downtown Cleveland is welcome. But despite the frequently recurring reports, downtown Cleveland's population growth was barely 3,000. Despite this gain, the loss within a 6 mile radius was 70,000 and 125,000 within a 12 mile radius. Beyond the 12-mile radius, there was a population increase of nearly 55,000, which insufficient to avoid a metropolitan area population loss.

Other Metropolitan Areas: A total of 30 major metropolitan areas suffered core population losses, despite the fact that many had downtown population increases.

- Five major metropolitan areas suffered overall population losses (Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Pittsburgh and Katrina ravaged New Orleans).
- St. Louis, with a core city that holds the modern international record for population loss (from 857,000 in 1950 to 319,000 in 2010), experienced a population decline within a 27 mile radius of city hall. Approximately 150 percent of the growth in the St. Louis metropolitan area was outside the 27 mile radius. Even so, there was an increase of nearly 6,000 in the population of downtown St. Louis.
- There were population losses all the way out to a considerable distance from city halls in Memphis (16 mile radius), Cincinnati (15 mile radius) and Birmingham (14 mile radius). The three corresponding downtown areas also lost population.
- Despite having one of the strongest downtown population increases (12,000), population declined within a 10 mile radius of the Dallas city hall. This contrasts with nearby Houston, which also experienced a strong downtown increase (10,000) but no losses at any radius of the urban core.
- Milwaukee experienced a small downtown population increase (2,000), but had a population loss within an 11 mile radius.

The other 21 major metropolitan areas experienced population gains throughout. Even so, most of the growth (77 percent) was outside the 10 mile radius. San Jose had the most concentrated growth, with only 24 percent outside a 10 miles radius from city hall. All of the other metropolitan areas had 60 percent or more of their growth outside a 10 mile radius from city hall.

As we have observed before, 2000 to 2010 was, unlike the 1970s and other decades, more friendly to the nation's core cities, although less so than the previous decade. Due to the repurposing of old offices and other structures, sometimes aided by subsidies, small downtown slivers may have done better than at any time since before World War II. But the data is clear: Suburban growth was stronger in the 2000s than in the 1990s. The one percent flocked to downtown and the 99 percent flocked to outside downtown.
MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS, HOUSTON

The Museum of Fine Arts, in the Montrose area of Houston, is the oldest art museum in Texas. It has its roots in the Public School Art League, formed in 1900 by a group of five women led by Emma Richardson Cherry, who proposed "the encouragement of art and culture in the public school system" through the installation of fine-art reproductions in classrooms. League members also offered art classes, lectures on art appreciation, and exhibitions in the Scanlan Building downtown. In 1913 the organization's name was changed to Houston Art League to reflect its broader focus. During this period the league began acquiring art objects and determined to establish a public museum. A plot of land at South Main and Montrose was donated by the trustees of the Hermann estate with financial assistance from Joseph S. Cullinan, and the site was dedicated on April 12, 1917. World War I quelled fund-raising efforts until the Armistice, at which time league president Florence Fall revived the effort to establish a museum. The museum building, designed by the late architect John Staub, opened to the public on April 12, 1924. The Houston Art League subsequently amended its state charter and formally changed its name to Museum of Fine Arts of Houston in 1929. The museum's name was shortened to Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, by its trustees in the early 1960s.

The museum's founding director, James Chillman Jr., developed a modest exhibition program that consisted primarily of locally organized shows, notably the Houston Artists Annual Exhibition, and annual circuit exhibitions organized by the Southern States Art League. The donation in 1919 of twenty-five paintings and a few works in other media by George M. Dickson and his sister Belle formed the core of the museum's permanent collection, which was augmented in the 1930s by Annette Fmnigan’s donations of a collection of fine lace and antiquities from Egypt, Greece, Rome, Turkey, and Spain. During this period Ima Hogg bequeathed important collections of works on paper, Indian artifacts, and paintings and sculpture by Frederic Remington to the museum. The 1944 donation of the Edith A. and Percy S. Straus collection formed the nucleus of the museum’s collection of Renaissance art; a series of gifts from the Blaffer family and a 1961 gift from the Samuel H. Kress Foundation further fleshed out the museum’s European holdings. The lack of endowment funds, a problem that persisted until the late 1960s, prohibited a methodical development of the museum’s permanent collection.

Two wings were added to the original museum facility in 1926. Funds were not available to complete the interior of the east wing, which proved to be an ideal site for the museum school begun in 1927. Classes in painting, sculpture, and other media were taught by a series of outstanding teachers, many of whom were practicing artists. Ruth Pershing Uhler, hired in 1937 as an instructor and later curator of education for many years, was an influential force in the museum’s development until her death in 1967. In 1954 Chillman was succeeded by Lee Malone, the Museum of Fine Arts’s first full-time director. Under Malone’s leadership the museum entered a more professional era, organizing exhibitions drawn from public and private collections throughout the United States and abroad and bringing in noteworthy traveling exhibitions. The museum received one of the largest and most important gifts in its history in 1957, when Ima Hogg donated her twenty-eight-room home, Bayou Bend, and her collection of American paintings and decorative arts, which ranged in date from the early seventeenth to the mid-nineteenth century. Bayou Bend, located on Buffalo Bayou five miles from the museum, was designed by the Houston architect John F. Staub in 1927 and opened to the public in 1966. The Robert Lee Blaffer Memorial Wing and the Frank Price Sterling Galleries were completed in 1953. In 1968 another gallery was added, older parts of the building were remodeled and air-conditioned, and Cullinan Hall, a gift from Nina I. Cullinan in memory of her parents, opened. Designed by internationally acclaimed modernist architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Cullinan Hall features a 10,000-square-foot, fan-shaped exhibition gallery with a dramatic glass curtain-wall.
Malone left the Museum of Fine Arts in 1959, and James Chillman served as interim director until 1961, when the museum announced the appointment of James Johnson Sweeney as its new director. Sweeney, a well-known critic and former director of the Guggenheim Museum in New York City, ushered in a new era of aesthetic sophistication during his six-year term. Undaunted by Cullinan Hall's vast exhibition space, Sweeney excelled at dramatic installations. For the exhibition Three Spaniards: Picasso, Miró, Chillida (1961), for example, he built a pool outdoors to serve as a backdrop for Picasso's six bronze Bathers and inside Cullinan Hall installed just five large works, focusing the viewers' attention on their interrelationships. Among the exhibitions organized by Sweeney that garnered national attention were Derain: Before 1915 (1961), The Olmec Tradition (1963), and The Heroic Years: Paris 1908–1914 (1965).

In the belief that Houston artists would profit from a wider pool of competition, Sweeney discontinued the annual competitive exhibition of local artists, instituting in its place a juried regional competition. He further supported local artists by purchasing their work for the museum and by organizing a series of solo exhibitions for museum-school faculty members. Under Sweeney the museum's holdings of modern and non-European art were significantly expanded through purchase and especially through the gifts of Alice Nicholson Hanszen, who donated approximately 200 pre-Columbian objects, and Dominique and John de Menil, who donated many fine examples of contemporary African and Oceanic art. Sweeney's taste was perceived as too narrow by certain sectors of the community; this, together with mounting financial pressures, prompted the board to terminate his contract as full-time director in 1967. He was succeeded by interim director Mary Hancock Buxton.

Guy Philippe de Montebello, director of the museum from 1969 to 1974, provided much-needed structure for museum operations. He reorganized the museum staff, hiring curators to head separate departments and expanding the museum's educational staff. Montebello improved the museum's financial status by encouraging endowments and by launching a $15 million fund drive to expand the museum facility, fund endowments, and contribute to operating costs. Under his leadership the board of directors determined that the museum should collect and exhibit art from all areas and time periods. The staff began work on a handbook that would highlight the strengths of the collection and gaps that needed to be filled. Money provided by a bequest from the estate of Laurence H. Favrot and an endowment fund established in honor of Agnes Cullen Arnold enabled Montebello to acquire major examples of Roman, Medieval, and Renaissance works. During this period the museum's early modern holdings were strengthened by the donation of John A. and Audrey Jones Beck's important collection of Impressionist and Post-Impressionist paintings.

A 1970 gift from the Brown Foundation enabled the museum to complete Mies van der Rohe's master plan for the museum facility, and on January 14, 1974, the Brown Pavilion opened to the public. The pavilion more than doubled the museum's gallery space, to a total of 75,331 square feet, and, like Cullinan Hall, was dominated by an upper gallery encased on three sides with glass panels. Shortly after the opening of the new addition Montebello left to take a position as assistant director at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City. He was succeeded by William Agee, whose interest in the then relatively unknown American abstract painters of the 1920s and 1930s led him to organize two nationally acclaimed exhibitions, Modern American Painting, 1910–1940: Toward a New Perspective (1977) and Patrick Henry Bruce: American Modernist (1979). The museum organized several successful traveling exhibitions during Agee's eight-year tenure, including Gustave Caillebotte: a Retrospective Exhibition (1976) and Winslow Homer Graphics (1976).

In 1976 Target Stores made a substantial donation with annual supplements that enabled the Museum of Fine Arts to develop a collection focused on twentieth-century American and European photography. The following year the Brown Foundation announced a ten-year challenge grant for museum operations and acquisitions, enabling Agee to acquire important art objects from a variety of periods, with emphasis placed on twentieth-century American paintings. The museum's physical plant grew as well. In 1977 the museum acquired the property north of its building and constructed a 41,000-square-foot glass and concrete building for the museum school. Alfred C. Glassell, Jr., provided funds for the new facility, and the school was renamed in his honor. A gift from the Cullen Foundation funded the Lillie and Hugh Roy Cullen Sculpture Garden, located between the museum and Glassell School. Designed by California sculptor and designer Isamu Noguchi, the garden was completed in 1986, and features sculptures by such nineteenth and twentieth-century masters as Henri Matisse, Auguste Rodin, Emile-Antoine Bourdelle, and Alexander Calder. Shortly before he left the museum in 1982 Agee oversaw the publication of The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston: A Guide to the Collection (1981).
Peter Marzio became director in 1982. During the 1980s the museum exhibited support for local and regional artists, neglected by the museum since Sweeney left, by purchasing their works and organizing such exhibitions as Fresh Paint: the Houston School (1985), The Texas Landscape, 1900–1986 (1986), and Tradition and Innovation: A Museum Celebration of Texas Art (1990). Marzio supplemented these regional exhibitions by organizing shows featuring artwork in a variety of media from many cultures and time periods. The museum also mounted blockbuster exhibitions organized by major institutions in the United States and abroad, such as Rediscovering Pompeii (1990), which attracted more than 350,000 visitors. In order to emphasize the strengths of the museum's permanent collection, Marzio installed 450 works tracing the development of western art in the upper gallery of the Brown Pavilion, an area previously reserved for traveling exhibitions.

By the end of the 1980s the Museum of Fine Arts had built a permanent collection of more than 20,000 works of art, with exceptional depth exhibited in the areas of early American decorative arts and twentieth-century European and American art. Under Marzio the museum developed new strengths in the areas of photography, costumes, and English decorative arts. In 1991 the museum employed 382 people and was governed by an eighty-seven-member board of trustees. The museum operated on a $14.5 million budget, with financial support provided primarily by grants from the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Texas Commission on the Arts, the Cultural Arts Council of Houston, and other governmental agencies; private foundations and corporations; membership fees; and annual fund drives and benefits. In addition to mounting exhibitions, the museum organizes public tours, lectures, gallery talks, and film series. The Museum Guild, organized in 1939, and the Junior League Docent program, organized in 1943, provide volunteer support for the museum's education program. Also of service to scholars in the region is the 74,000-volume library endowed by Winifred and Maurice Hirsch and an archive of the museum's history. The museum archive also maintains more than 700 reels of microfilm on art in Texas and the surrounding states assembled by the Smithsonian Institution's Archives of American Art.

In 1989 the museum hired urban planner Denise Scott Brown to prepare a long-range expansion plan for options such as linking the museum facility, the Glassell School of Art, and the Cullen Sculpture Garden. In 1992 Spanish architect Rafael Moneo, who had designed national museums in Spain, was picked to design a $50 million complex to be built east of the institution's main building. Museum officials hoped to break ground by 1995 and open in 1999. The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, is affiliated with the American Association of Museums, the Texas Association of Museums, the American Federation of Art, the American Art Alliance, and the American Association of Museum Directors.

In March 2000, in conjunction with its 100th anniversary, the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, opened the Audrey Jones Beck Building. Named for the gracious collector of Impressionist and Post-Impressionist art, the Beck Building houses the encyclopedic permanent collection of American and European art which includes the 2004 acquisition Portrait of a Young Woman by the Dutch master Rembrandt.

A number of groundbreaking special exhibitions have originated at the MFAH since 2000. In 2002 the museum launched the Quilts of Gee's Bend, a show that brought the little-known African-American community of Gee's Bend, Alabama, to the public's attention. Four generations of quilters' bold, dynamic pieces went on view in Houston before traveling the United States. The newly formed Latin American art department introduced twentieth-century avant-garde art with the remarkable Inverted Utopia: Avant-Garde Art in Latin America. The 2004 exhibition showcased the broad vision of artists from Mexico, Central and South America, and the Caribbean. Contemporary African artists received national regard in 2005 when highlights from the Jean Pigozzi Collection went on view in the Caroline Wiess Law Building. Thirty-three artists were included in this spectacular array of contemporary art from fifteen different African nations.
Many important gifts to the museum have entered the collection in recent years. Careful collecting and
mindful purchases have allowed the photography and antiquities departments to flourish with the
acquisition of 3,740 images from the Manfred Heiting Collection of Photography and the Hellenistic Greek
Head of Poseidon. The 2003 death of benefactress and life trustee Caroline Wiess Law brought a substantial
grouping of modern and contemporary works of art to the collection, including two important Picasso
drawings and works by Franz Kline, Hans Hoffman, and Andy Warhol. Latin American art holdings have steadily
increased thanks to the International Center for Art in the Americas purchase of works of art from
important twentieth-century artists such as Xul Solar, Joaquín Torres García, Francisco Matto, Antonio
Bergi, and Gego.
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THE HISTORY OF WASHINGTON, DC

Founded in 1790, the nation's capital has been a dynamic city with plenty of highs and lows to match its place in American history.

Founded on July 16, 1790, Washington, DC is unique among American cities because it was established by the Constitution of the United States to serve as the nation's capital. You can read the actual line at the National Archives. From its beginning, it has been embroiled in political maneuvering, sectional conflicts and issues of race, national identity, compromise and, of course, power.

Like many decisions in American history, the location of the new city was to be a compromise: Alexander Hamilton and northern states wanted the new federal government to assume Revolutionary War debts, and Thomas Jefferson and southern states who wanted the capital placed in a location friendly to slave-holding agricultural interests.
President George Washington chose the exact site along the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers, and the city was officially founded in 1790 after both Maryland and Virginia ceded land to this new "district," to be distinct and distinguished from the rest of the states. To design the city, he appointed Pierre Charles L'Enfant, who presented a vision for a bold, modern city featuring grand boulevards (now the streets named for states) and ceremonial spaces reminiscent of another great world capital, L'Enfant's native Paris. He planned a grid system, at which the center would be the Capitol building.

Even before coming of age, DC was nearly completely destroyed. During the War of 1812 against Great Britain, enemy forces invaded the city and burned much of it to the ground, including the newly completed White House, the Capitol and the Library of Congress (including all of its books). Thomas Jefferson later replenished the library's collection by selling off his entire library for $23,950 in 1815.

After the devastation, the city remained small, especially in terms of permanent residents. Soon it would become smaller in physical size as well. In 1847, the portion of the city that had originally belonged to Virginia was retroceded, after the voters of Alexandria elected to leave DC, feeling that they had been left out of development on the other side of the river. You can still see some surviving, original markers for the District today.

The city only increased in size as a result of the Civil War. Slaves owned in Washington were emancipated on April 16, 1862, nine months before the Emancipation Proclamation, and it therefore became a hub for freed slaves. After, it remained a home to a significant and vibrant African American population, which included abolitionist Frederick Douglass. A substantial army was set up just to protect the capital during the war, and the federal government grew around this administration.

Post-war Washington experienced substantial expansion, eventually absorbing nearby Georgetown and surrounding rural areas beyond L'Enfant's original plans. The initial boundary of Washington City was Florida Avenue, originally called Boundary Street. The first neighborhoods were those that grew up around the Capitol (Capitol Hill), the Center Market (Downtown), and the White House (Lafayette Square). The expansion of streetcar lines in the mid-19th century spurred creation of new suburbs.

In 1901, the city proposed the McMillan Plan, which set out to fully complete L'Enfant's original designs. This included a redesign and expansion of the National Mall, now the crown jewel of DC. The city continued to expand and develop during the rest of the 20th century, though it suffered riots and civil unrest in the '60s and '70s, and many residents left inner city areas for the suburbs. Today, these downtown areas are undergoing an urban renaissance, and many people are moving back into Washington itself.

Though a capital city, it is ironic that residents of Washington lack full self-governance. Representation in Congress is limited to a non-voting delegate to the House of Representatives and a shadow senator. In 1964, Washingtonians were first allowed to vote in Presidential elections; the city was allowed to elect its own mayor only in 1973.

It remains a vibrant and culturally diverse city today. The city is rich with international cultures, African American heritage and culture and it's also one of America's most gay-friendly cities. In fact, DC recognized same-sex marriage in 2010, before the Supreme Court, nearby, ruled that it was a right in 2015.

After more than 200 years as the nation's capital, Washington has developed as a complex and layered city, with a distinctive character: both a town for locals, an international center of power and an amazing place to visit.

Today, you can have the best of both worlds by delving into the nation's past with a visit on the National Mall and museums or adventuring into very modern, exciting neighborhoods.
After the presidential election, much has been made of the impact of the Latino vote, shifting some of the national focus to issues that matter to this large and growing population sector. How this plays out on the public policy front remains to be seen; however, interest in tackling nagging and divisive immigration reform appears to be on the front burner.

Receiving less notice was pending legislation establishing the National Museum of the American Latino. A special commission, appointed by the President (George W. Bush, then Barack Obama) and Congress submitted its report in May 2011 calling for the creation of the museum. With the advent of a new Congress, authorizing legislation designating the museum as part of the Smithsonian Institution will likely be reintroduced this year. Most observers hope that this process will be handled with the same bipartisan spirit that greeted the 2011 report.

Given the Smithsonian Latino Center’s commitment to preserving and promoting the historical, cultural and scientific contributions of Latinos in the U.S., I thought it would be useful to briefly describe what we are doing to further this work.

First, a comprehensive assessment of Latino collections, research, exhibits, public programs, and outreach efforts across the Institution was completed in 2012. This provided guidance on how we can build upon and maximize our strengths and holdings, where affirmative effort is needed to improve and enhance our resources, and what strategies are necessary to ensure access.

Secondly, a Latino curatorial initiative is in full swing that will dramatically increase the number of curators imbedded in our museums and research and program centers. Within a museum context, curators drive research, direct collecting efforts, lead exhibition development, and collaborate on correlative educational and public programs and web presence. They are key lynchpins in ensuring sustained Latino presence.

Thirdly, we are working to establish a Latino gallery on the National Mall. Any national Latino museum or cultural center is 12-15 years away from opening so in the meantime, we
believe it is critical to establish a physical Latino presence at the Smithsonian. This will allow us to utilize Smithsonian collections and expertise to best share the U.S. Latino story with millions of visitors each year.

The Latino Center is completing a strategic plan that will focus our energies on the three areas noted above, in addition to managing core leadership and professional development programs, completing ongoing exhibition projects and public programs, expanding the creative use of technology and new media, broadening outreach and marketing strategies, intensifying resource development efforts, and strengthening the capacity of our national board of directors—the operational infrastructure necessary to build upon for museum development purposes.

Maintaining current levels of service and establishing a new gallery on the National Mall is a full plate. Unwinding from time to time helps, especially with humor. The other day I thought I’d watch Bowl of Beings, a 1991 series of vignettes by the Latino comedy troupe, Culture Clash. In one of the sketches, Chuy (Mexican nickname for Jesús), our erstwhile Chicano activist and rabid San Francisco 49’ers fan, laments to a giant poster of Che Guevara that “the decade of the Hispanic turned out to be a weekend sponsored by Coors!”¹ There is great poignancy in Chuy’s hilarious lamentation. It left me wondering if the Latino community’s time on the national cultural scene had reached the proverbial tipping point. Will a weekend, or even a decade, do? What role will potential physical presence on the National Mall play? Many questions and challenges lay ahead.

When Chuy’s 49’ers step out onto the football field, they play for keeps. In moving the national Latino cultural development agenda forward, so must we.

¹ In the 1960s, leaders in the Chicano movement launched a boycott to protest hiring practices they considered discriminatory. It finally ended in 1977 after Coors settled a lawsuit brought by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission alleging the company had violated the 1964 Civil Rights Act. (Denver Post, 2007)
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Houston’s population grew substantially between 1990 and 2010. Between 2000 and 2010, the Houston metropolitan area added more people (over 1.2 million) than any other metropolitan area in the United States.

That growth has brought important changes to the region. This report focuses on two such changes—the changes in racial/ethnic diversity and in residential segregation between the four major racial/ethnic groups.

Analyzing the 1990, 2000, and 2010 censuses, the Houston region has grown dramatically more racially/ethnically diverse over the past 20 years, such that every racial/ethnic group is now a demographic minority. As of 2010, Houston metropolitan area is the most racially/ethnically diverse large metropolitan area in the nation, narrowly surpassing the New York metropolitan area.

The growth of racial/ethnic diversity has occurred throughout the region. The City of Houston is more diverse in 2010 than it was in 1990. So too is every other city analyzed in this report (all of those in the region with 2010 populations greater than 50,000), and every county analyzed in this report. Yet, for the first time, as of 2010, the City of Houston is no longer the most diverse city in the region. Missouri City and Pearland are now the region’s most racially/ethnically diverse cities.

As the region has grown in racial/ethnic diversity, what has occurred to levels of segregation between the racial/ethnic groups? The overall trend is a slight decline in segregation between groups over the 20-year period. There are exceptions, and these are explored in the report.

The analysis also finds that (1) the City of Houston is substantially more segregated than other areas of the region, (2) African American-Latino segregation in the region has declined most rapidly, (3) African Americans are most segregated where they represent the largest absolute and relative numbers, (4) the smaller the percentage Anglo in an area, the greater their segregation from other groups, and (5) Asians live closest to Anglos, and continue to be significantly segregated from African Americans and Latinos.

Harnessing the region’s burgeoning racial/ethnic diversity is a central challenge for the Houston region. Future research that investigates the underlying factors contributing to the increased diversity and continual segregation has the opportunity to illuminate how Houston can lead the nation in the transition to a fully inclusive, unified multiracial/multiethnic region.
The Racial/Ethnic Diversity of The Houston Region

The Houston metropolitan region is becoming more diverse. Over the past two decades—from 1990 to 2010—the balance between the four major racial/ethnic groups has increased across the multiple county metropolitan region (Figure 1). The Anglo population\(^1\) represents a declining share of the Houston metropolitan area. In 1990, Anglos were more than half the population (57.9 percent), but by 2000 they decreased to slightly less than half the total population (48.2 percent), and by 2010 they were only 39.7 percent of the metropolitan population.

Meanwhile, the percentage of Latinos has increased from one fifth of metropolitan residents (20.8 percent) in 1990 to more than one third (35.3 percent) in 2010, only slightly smaller than the Anglo population. At current rates of population change, Latinos are poised to become the Houston region’s largest racial/ethnic group sometime within the next few years.

Other racial/ethnic groups in the metropolitan region have either increased, though to a smaller degree than Latinos, or remained the same. The percentage of Asians in the Houston metropolitan region has increased from 3.4 percent in 1990, to 4.8 percent in 2000, and to 6.5 percent in 2010. African Americans have remained relatively stable across this time period, representing 17.5 percent in 1990 and 16.8 percent in 2010. Beginning with the 2000 U.S. Census, individuals were able to define themselves as multiracial. For the past two decennial censuses, about the same proportion of the population chose this option (1.2 percent in 2000 and 1.3 percent in 2010).

---

1. In order to compare the Houston metropolitan area across different time periods and with other metropolitan areas, in this first section of this report we use the Houston-Metroplex Statistical Area (MSA) as defined by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for each decennial Census. We do not normalize the boundaries of the MSA but use the definition for each decennial Census year.

2. The U.S. Census collects data on race and Latino-ethnicity. We use categories that combine race/ethnic backgrounds in ways consistent with tables presented by the U.S. Census. Latinos, an ethnic group that may be of any race, are placed in one category and all other persons not of Latino origin are assigned to their respective racial categories. The resulting categories are: Latinos (non-Latino) Whites referred to as “Anglos”, (non-Latino) Blacks referred to as “African Americans”, (non-Latino) Asians referred to only as “Asian”, and those non-Latino persons selecting two or more races, referred to as “Two or More Races.” For ease of presentation, we show race/ethnic information for only the four most demographically prominent race/ethnic groups. We exclude non-Latino persons whose race is “Some other Race”, “American Indian/Alaskan Native”, or “Pacific Islander.”
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Museums and happiness:
The value of participating in museums and the arts

Daniel Fujiwara

April 2013
Key findings

We find that visiting museums has a positive impact on happiness and self-reported health after controlling for a large range of other determinants that may confound the relationship. We also find that participation in the arts and being audience to the arts have positive effects on happiness. The effect of participation in the arts is of the same magnitude as the effect of participation in sports if we control for health. Our valuation headline figures are as follows:

- People value visiting museums at about £3,200 per year.
- The value of participating in the arts is about £1,500 per year per person.
- The value of being audience to the arts is about £2,000 per year per person.
- The value of participating in sports is about £1,500 per year per person.

We must apply some caution to these results though. As involvement in the arts and sport was not randomised across our sample, we are reliant on the data we observe and statistical methods for controlling for as many of the differences between people that are involved and those who are not involved in order to make inferences about causality. But there are always likely to be some important factors that we cannot observe and control for and hence these factors may be driving any observed relationships between the arts, happiness and health. For example, extraverted people may be more likely to participate in the arts and also are more likely to report higher happiness and wellbeing, which means that any observed relationship between the arts and happiness may in part be driven by this personality trait rather than the act of participation itself. Further, there may be the problem of reverse causality (wellbeing prompting attendance, rather than attendance creating wellbeing). However, we have taken steps to employ the most robust statistical methods possible given the data and this level of statistical rigour passes thresholds used by many OECD governments in impact assessments.
Appendix 21: Visit Houston Texas – Museum District

Museum District

Just southwest of downtown, in the pedestrian-friendly Museum District, more than 8.7 million visitors explore the 19 cultural institutions that make up the tree-lined, culture-filled neighborhood each year. The district is the proud home of the nation’s sixth largest art museum, offering guests 300,000-square-feet of space dedicated to paintings, sculptures, costumes, photography and textiles dating back to the antiquities. Other area highlights include—a vault containing the largest emerald crystal ever recovered in North America, a kid-run city complete with skyline, government and job roles, plus Houston’s first and only 4D theater.
Appendix 22: NPR Houston Diversity Article

In Houston, America’s Diverse Future Has Already Arrived

All this week, NPR is taking a look at the demographic changes that could reshape the political landscape in Texas and the rest of the country.

To see the speed at which that is happening, you need to move beyond the top 10 most populous cities, to the hundreds of smaller towns and cities across America.

"There is a sense of renewal," says Linda Wu, a Chinese-Texas community organizer who once called Houston her home.

"I’m half Chinese, I’m half Irish," she says. "I also do business. I work with entrepreneurs. I also ride bikes. That’s what Texas is.

At about 40 percent of the population, Latinos make up the second-largest group in Houston after non-Hispanic whites or Anglos, according to Census numbers. But Asian-Americans are the fastest-growing group, doubling between 2000 and 2010 to almost 7 percent.

"There is no majority group here, nor ever since," says Michael Eriksen, a Rice University sociologist who studies Houston's demographic changes. He and his research partners put together the data analysis that gives Houston the title of most diverse metropolitan area in the country. If you look at the four major ethnic groups — Anglo, Black, Asian, and Latino — all have substantial numbers in Houston, with no group dominating. It means close to having an equal balance of each group that you would see in New York or Los Angeles.

The city's transformation to an international metropolis happened quickly, and only within the past few decades. As the center saw a shot to nearly 6 million people, 59 percent of all that growth was non-white.

"Houston now about 20, 30 years ahead of Texas, 50 years ahead of the U.S. in terms of ethnic diversity and immigration flows," Eriksen says. "So it is fundamentally reshaped in a way that all of America shall eventually.

Jobs fuel that transformation. The energy industry remains a big player, but there’s also the Texas Medical Center, burgeoning tech and a blossoming shipping port.

Despite struggling humidity, long commutes and a reputation for pollution, Houston's cheap land, affordable homes and low barriers to doing business have lured immigrants from all over.

"You are here to make your fortune, you are here to move ahead in the world. You are about making things happen. There's no way you could be a hockey here in this monstrously and not recognize that," says Houston Mayor Annise Parker, who is a minority among politicians. She is the only female mayor among the top 10 most populous cities, and she's one of only 15 openly gay politicians, period. And she's learned a few lessons about preventing a place where different cultures collide.

"You often what happens is a show of force or in Washington is that it is about partisan and partnership, but about the practical immediacy of making something. Citizens here is, too," Parker says.

For her, ensuring the plane means enforcing the multicultural situation. Houston is incredibly practical that way. Just ask seventh-generation Chinese-Houstonian Donna Jue.

"It is honorable. The change in terms of leadership, the change in terms of how we look — It's immaterial," Jue says.
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ICOM Code of Ethics for Museums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>1. Museums preserve, interpret and promote the natural and cultural inheritance of humanity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutional standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Physical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Museums that maintain collections hold them in trust for the benefit of society and its development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Acquiring collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Removing collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Care of collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Museums hold primary evidence for establishing and furthering knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Primary evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Museum collecting &amp; research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Museums provide opportunities for the appreciation, understanding and management of the natural and cultural heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Display and exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Museums hold resources that provide opportunities for other public services and benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identification services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Museums work in close collaboration with the communities from which their collections originate as well as those they serve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Origin of collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Respect for communities served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Museums operate in a legal manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Legal framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Museums operate in a professional manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conflicts of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Museums hold resources that provide opportunities for other public services and benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Museums work in close collaboration with the communities from which their collections originate as well as those they serve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Museums operate in a legal manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Museums operate in a professional manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Museums hold primary evidence for establishing and furthering knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Museums provide opportunities for the appreciation, understanding and management of the natural and cultural heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Museums hold resources that provide opportunities for other public services and benefits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 15: Glossary
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ICOM Missions

The International Council of Museums works for society and its development. It is committed to ensuring the conservation, and protection of cultural goods.

Establishing Standards of Excellence
ICOM sets standards for museums in design, management and collections organisation. The ICOM Code of Ethics for Museums is a reference in the global museum community. It establishes minimum standards for professional practices and achievements for museums and their employees. By joining ICOM, each member is committed to respecting this code.

Leading a Diplomatic Forum
ICOM is officially associated with multilateral international conventions on heritage. As a diplomatic forum made up of 136 countries and territories, it gathers international professionals, renowned for their contribution to culture.

Developing the professional network
With more than 35,000 members, ICOM is a unique professional network of institutions and museum professionals. ICOM brings together museum experts to discuss various museum-related themes.

Leading a Global Think Tank
ICOM’s 30 International Committees conduct advanced research in their respective fields for the benefit of the museum community. They discuss and reflect on museum and heritage-related issues.

International Missions
ICOM carries out its international missions thanks to international mandates in association with partners such as UNESCO, INTERPOL and the World Customs Organisation (WCO). ICOM’s missions include:
- Fighting the illicit traffic of cultural goods
- Risk management
- Culture and knowledge promotion
- Protection of tangible and intangible heritage
The Islamic Society of Greater Houston (ISGH) was established in 1969 in the heart of the City of Houston. Our start was humble, organic and purposeful. In the late 1960s a group of Muslim students from the University of Houston as well as other young professionals and their families used to meet and pray at each others' houses. It was a small community then and the first Eid was prayed in the house of one of the founders of the society.

However as the community grew in size, this newly formed society decided to get a center to accommodate the growth. It wasn't easy. Finding the appropriate location was a challenge due to the limited financial resources and other reasons. Despite these challenges, and with the help of many other Houstonians, ISGH now represents 23 communities from all over the Greater Houston area.

All Muslims living in the Greater Houston area are considered natural members of ISGH; however, to vote or hold an office a person has to be an eligible voting member and file a membership application. Persons who apply for ISGH membership do so strictly on a voluntary basis. Our members' benefits can be viewed here.

ISGH is a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization that is registered in the State of Texas. It is governed by a Board of Directors which consists of nine elected members, four of whom are elected at large by the eligible voting members of ISGH and are called the Executive Body. They are: The President, the Vice President, the General Secretary, and the Treasurer. The five remaining members are Zonal Directors who represent five zones of the Greater Houston area and are elected by eligible voting members residing in their respective zones. You view the current board, please click here.

In each zone that has more than one Islamic Center, each Islamic Center has an Associate Director elected by the eligible voting members of that Islamic Center. You can read more about our governance system in our organization's Constitution.

Our vision is to provide religious and social services to all Muslims and to provide channels of understanding and communication between Muslims and the Houston community in general. We aim to live our vision by providing a variety of services that range from educational, to charitable, social and religious services. You can read more about our services here.
Columbia Heights and Mount Pleasant, traditionally the center of the D.C.’s Latino community, are much different places now than they were 20 years ago. Big box stores sit upon formerly vacant lots. Pupuserias now have vegan cafes as neighbors. House values have exploded. Ward 1, where these neighborhoods are located, has lost more than 2,000 Latinos over the past decade.

Travel a few blocks south and you see a similar transformation. The U Street area, formerly “Black Broadway,” was 77 percent black; it’s now only 45 percent black. Many longtime residents who had bought homes at modest prices have sold them for large sums. Others were priced out by rising rents. Luxury high-rise condo buildings have sprouted up.

But while the number of African Americans throughout D.C. is declining — by 11 percent over the past decade — the number of Latinos actually increased, by about 21 percent. This growth happened despite the fact that rapidly increasing housing prices have particularly affected longtime Latino neighborhoods, according to the District’s 2009 State of Latinos report.

So why is D.C.’s Latino community growing while it’s black community shrinks?

Migration and babies, according to Joy Phillips of the D.C. Office of Planning.

Between 1997 and 2007, Latino births increased by 130 percent, while black births declined by 13.5 percent [PDF]. But the biggest jump in the city’s Latino population wasn’t among little children (0 to 4 year olds); it was among adults between 25 and 64 years of age, indicating migration into the District has a lot to do with the growing Latino population, according to Phillips.

“Gentrification may be having an impact on Latinos in some areas of the city,” Phillips writes in an email. “However, Hispanics have increased in every other ward of the city.”

Ward 4, which includes Petworth, Takoma and Brightwood, experienced the city’s biggest increase in Latino residents — 4,923 people — “where it may be argued housing is cheaper,” Phillips writes. Even small Latino communities in Southeast and Northeast, where few have ever lived, are growing; Ward 7’s Hispanic population grew by 150 percent to about 1,500 residents.

Meanwhile, more black residents are leaving D.C. than are moving into the District. Over the past decade, the number of black residents has dropped in every ward of the city except in Ward 8, where the black population only grew slightly.

So even as black residents are leaving D.C. — whether because of gentrification or looking to the suburbs for greener pastures — the city is still attracting new Latino residents. It’s just that now, they are choosing to settle in Petworth or Brightwood over pricier Columbia Heights.
Appendix 27: “Changing Shape of American Cities” Report Excerpt

About this Report
This report describes demographic changes that have taken place in U.S. metropolitan areas since 1990 by looking at the spatial distribution of residents by income, education, age, etc. relative to the center of the city.

The Demographics Research Group
The Demographics Research Group produces the official annual population estimates for Virginia and its localities; conducts practical and policy-oriented analysis of census and demographic survey data under contract; and communicates rigorous research and its policy implications to the general public, as well as to clients including state and local governments, employers, and non-profit organizations through meaningful, intuitive publications and presentations.

About the Author
Luke Juday is a Research and Policy Analyst for the Demographics Research Group. He received his Bachelor’s degree in political science from Grove City College and a Master of Urban and Environmental Planning from the University of Virginia. His expertise is in mapping and spatial analysis and he focuses on how demographic trends are related to local government decisions and metropolitan change. Prior to attending graduate school, he worked as a middle school teacher and debate coach, and was a Fulbright Scholar in Gaborone, Botswana.
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The old donut

Metropolitan areas in the United States have changed significantly since the 1990's, making the widely-held conceptual model of cities increasingly inaccurate. That model has been called "the donut" and looks something like this:

In the original donut model, a ring of thriving suburbs surrounds a decaying city center. The suburban ring is growing and residents are wealthy, educated, and safe; the city center is poor, minority-dominated, crime-ridden, and increasingly being abandoned.

Many more cities in the United States resemble the "old donut" model than cities elsewhere in the developed world, possibly due to a uniquely American combination of the post-WWII economic boom, mass automobile ownership, racial strife, and government policy. By the late 20th-century, remnants of upper-class city life still existed in the largest metropolitan areas — like New York and Boston — but in most cities "urban" had become synonymous with "poor."

The new donut

Today, observers suggest that American cities are evolving into what researcher Aaron Renn calls "the new donut." Across the country, anecdotal evidence supports a widespread resurgence of historic downtowns and urban neighborhoods, often driven by an influx of educated 20-somethings. Renewed interest and rising demand in these areas has the potential to drive up prices, bring new opportunities, and create conflict in neighborhoods abandoned by middle-class residents in the 1950s and 60s.

Meanwhile, many neighborhoods in the earliest ring of suburbs that were once the domain of middle-class professionals and their families now attract lower-income residents. This could be the result of aging housing stock, greater access to assistance for low-income families on the open housing market, or increasing pressure on renters in central urban neighborhoods. Poor families may be finding that an older single-family house with a yard in a suburban school division can be cheaper than an urban apartment in a rapidly gentrifying neighborhood.

Beyond the inner ring, new waves of development, accounting for most population growth, have continued to expand into the countryside, attracting the same middle-class residents who once populated the inner ring. These outer suburbs, however, demand longer commute times and are much less attractive to younger workers. Wealthy residents are also looking beyond the outermost suburban developments for rural seclusion with an urban paycheck.

While plenty of stories have been told about individual cities and neighborhoods, there has been little data to back them up. Are these stories just the result of individual revitalization programs taken up by city governments or non-profits? Or are they part of a larger shift? This report suggests the latter. Far from being unique to a few cities, these changes are
The study looks at areas of education, income, and employment conditions with particular phrasing and expressions that are directly related to the paragraphs discussing the relationship between population growth and economic opportunities. The researchers compared the economic growth of areas with higher income and employment rates with those with lower rates. They found that areas with higher income and employment growth rates had better economic conditions.

In conclusion, the study suggests that policies aimed at boosting economic growth and improving education outcomes are crucial for fostering sustainable economic development. The researchers recommend implementing targeted interventions to improve educational opportunities, particularly in areas with lower income and employment growth rates. This approach could help create a more equitable and prosperous future for all residents in the study areas.
Through my work with the Incluseum, I've become convinced that all aspects of the museum-as-we-know-it will have to be transformed in deep ways if the value of inclusion is to become a central and foundational commitment. This is why I get excited when I come across what I call "museum ways of being" that deviate from the norm. For example, I believe the Museum of Art and History (MAH) in Santa Cruz, CA is breaking ground in rethinking museum jobs, and thus what a museum can be.

The MAH is currently looking to hire four new staff members whose job descriptions are unlike what I am accustomed to reading; both the language used to describe the positions and the qualifications required present us with a more inclusive vision of what a museum can be. Here are highlights from the job descriptions that struck me:

- The Curator of Exhibitions is described as one with superb communication skills who'll be able to co-develop and "animate" exhibitions in a way that "prioritizes community/visitor engagement." This person is also expected to have experience working collaboratively with community organizations and community members (in addition to artists) and have connections to "art and art movements relevant to Californians of diverse ethnicity, race, age, and cultural affinity." The traditional collection development, publication, and research skills are not emphasized. (Application deadline: May 16, 2014)
Appendix 29: Smithsonian Magazine “Changing Demographics of America”

The Changing Demographics of America
The United States population will expand by 100 million over the next 40 years. Is this a reason to worry?

Population growth places the United States in a radically different position from that of Russia, Japan, and Europe. (Q. Sakumachi / Redux)

By Joel Kotkin
SMITHSONIAN MAGAZINE I SUBSCRIBE
AUGUST 2010

Estimates of the United States population at the middle of the 21st century vary, from the U.N.'s 404 million to the U.S. Census Bureau's 422 to 450 million. To develop a snapshot of the nation at 2050, particularly its astonishing diversity and youthfulness, I use the nice round number of 400 million people, or roughly 100 million more than we have today.

The United States is also expected to grow somewhat older. The portion of the population that is currently at least 65 years old—13 percent—is expected to reach about 20 percent by 2050. This "graying of America" has helped convince some commentators of the nation's declining eminence. For example, an essay by international relations expert Parag Khanna envisions a "shrunk America" lucky to eke out a meager existence between a "triumphant China" and a "retooled Europe." Morris Berman, a cultural historian, says America "is running on empty."

But even as the baby boomers age, the population of working and young people is also expected to keep rising, in contrast to most other advanced nations. America's relatively high fertility rate—the number of children a woman is expected to have in her lifetime—hit 2.1 in 2006, with 4.3 million total births, the highest levels in 45 years, thanks largely to recent immigrants, who tend to have more children than residents whose families have been in the United States for several generations. Moreover, the nation is on the verge of a baby boomlet, when the children of the original boomers have children of their own.
Between 2000 and 2050, census data suggest, the U.S. 15- to 64- age group is expected to grow 42 percent. In contrast, because of falling fertility rates, the number of young and working-age people is expected to decline elsewhere: by 10 percent in China, 25 percent in Europe, 30 percent in South Korea and more than 40 percent in Japan.

Within the next four decades most of the developed countries in Europe and East Asia will become veritable old-age homes: a third or more of their populations will be over 65. By then, the United States is likely to have more than 350 million people under 65.

The prospect of an additional 100 million Americans by 2050 worries some environmentalists. A few have joined traditionally conservative xenophobes and anti-immigration activists in calling for a national policy to slow population growth by severely limiting immigration. The U.S. fertility rate—50 percent higher than that of Russia, Germany and Japan and well above that of China, Italy, Singapore, South Korea and virtually all the rest of Europe—has also prompted criticism.

Colleen Heenan, a feminist author and environmental activist, says Americans who favor larger families are not taking responsibility for "their detrimental contribution" to population growth and "resource shortages." Similarly, Peter Kareiva, the chief scientist at the Nature Conservancy, compared different conservation measures and concluded that not having a child is the most effective way of reducing carbon emissions and becoming an "eco hero."

Such critiques don't seem to take into account that a falling population and a dearth of young people may pose a greater threat to the nation's well-being than population growth. A rapidly declining population could create a society that doesn't have the work force to support the elderly and, overall, is less concerned with the nation's long-term future.

The next surge in growth may be delayed if tough economic times continue, but over time the rise in births, producing a generation slightly larger than the boomers, will add to the work force, boost consumer spending and generate new entrepreneurial businesses. And even with 100 million more people, the United States will be only one-sixth as crowded as Germany is today.

Immigration will continue to be a major force in U.S. life. The United Nations estimates that two million people a year will move from poorer to developed nations over the next 40 years, and more than half of those will come to the United States, the world's preferred destination for educated, skilled migrants. In 2000, according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, an association of 30 democratic, free-market countries, the United States was home to 12.5 million skilled immigrants, equaling the combined total for Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada and Japan.

If recent trends continue, immigrants will play a leading role in our future economy. Between 1990 and 2005, immigrants started one out of four venture-backed public companies. Large American firms are also increasingly led by people with roots in foreign countries, including 15 of the Fortune 100 CEOs in 2007.

For all these reasons, the United States of 2050 will look different from that of today: whites will no longer be in the majority. The U.S. minority population, currently 30 percent, is expected to exceed 50 percent before 2050. No other advanced, populous country will see such diversity.

In fact, most of America's net population growth will be among its minorities, as well as in a growing mixed-race population. Latino and Asian populations are expected to nearly triple, and the children of immigrants will become more prominent. Today in the United States, 25 percent of children under age 5 are Hispanic; by 2050, that percentage will be almost 40 percent.

Growth places the United States in a radically different position from that of Russia, Japan and Europe. Russia's low birth and high mortality rates suggest its overall population will drop by 30 percent by 2050, to less than a third of the United States'. No wonder Prime Minister Vladimir Putin has spoken of "the serious threat of turning into a decaying nation." While China's population will continue to grow for a while, it may begin to experience decline as early as 2035, first in work force and then in actual population, mostly because of the government's one-child mandate, instituted in 1979 and still in effect. By 2050, 31 percent of China's population will be older than 60. More than 41 percent of Japanese will be that old.

Political prognosticators say China and India pose the greatest challenges to American predominance. But China, like Russia, lacks the basic environmental protections, reliable legal structures, favorable demographics and social resilience of the United States. India, for its part, still has an overwhelmingly impoverished population and suffers from ethnic, religious and regional divisions. The vast majority of the Indian population remains semiliterate and lives in poor rural villages. The United States still produces far more engineers per capita than India or China.

Suburbia will continue to be a mainstay of American life. Despite criticisms that suburbs are culturally barren and energy-inefficient, most U.S. metropolitan population growth has taken place in suburbia, confounding oft-repeated predictions of its decline.

Some aspects of suburban life—notably long-distance commuting and heavy reliance on fossil fuels—will have to change. The new suburbs will be far more environmentally friendly—what I call "greenurbia." The Internet, wireless phones, video conferencing and other communication technologies will allow more people to work from home: at least one in four or five will do so full time or part time, up from roughly one in six or seven today. Also, the greater use of trees for cooling, more sustainable architecture and less wasteful appliances will make the suburban home of the future far less of a danger to ecological health than in the past. Houses may be smaller—let sizes are already shrinking as a result of land prices—but they will remain, for the most part, single-family dwellings.

A new landscape may emerge, one that resembles the network of smaller towns characteristic of 19th-century America. The nation's landmass is large enough—about 3 percent is currently urbanized—to accommodate this growth, while still husbanding critical farmland and open space.
**In other advanced nations where housing has become both expensive and dense—Japan, Germany, South Korea and Singapore—birthrates have fallen, partly because of the high cost of living, particularly for homes large enough to comfortably raise children. Preserving suburbs may therefore be critical for U.S. demographic vitality.**

A 2009 study by the Brookings Institution found that between 1998 and 2006, jobs shifted away from the center and to the periphery in 95 out of 98 leading metropolitan regions—from Dallas and Los Angeles to Chicago and Seattle. Walter Siembab, a planning consultant, calls the process of creating sustainable work environments on the urban periphery "smart sprawl." Super-fuel-efficient cars of the future are likely to spur smart sprawl. They may be a more reasonable way to meet environmental needs than shifting back to the mass-transit-based models of the industrial age; just 5 percent of the U.S. population uses mass transit on a daily basis.

One of the urban legends of the 20th century—espoused by city planners and pundits (and a staple of Hollywood)—is that suburbanites are alienated, autonomous individuals, while city dwellers have a deep connection to their neighborhoods. As the 2001 book *Suburban Nation* puts it, once suburbanites leave the "refuge of their homes they are reduced to "motorist[s] competing for asphalt."

But suburban residents express a stronger sense of identity and civic involvement than city dwellers. A recent study by Jan Brueckner, a University of California at Irvine economist, found that density does not, as is often assumed, increase social contact between neighbors or raise overall social involvement; compared with residents of high-density urban cores, people in low-density suburbs were 7 percent more likely to talk to their neighbors and 24 percent more likely to belong to a local club.

Suburbs epitomize much of what constitutes the American dream for many people. Minorities, once largely associated with cities, tend to live in the suburbs; in 2008 they were a majority of residents in Texas, New Mexico, California and Hawaii. Nationwide, about 25 percent of suburbanites are minorities; by 2050 immigrants, their children and native-born minorities will become an even more dominant force in shaping suburbs.

The baby boom generation is poised for a large-scale "back to the city" movement, according to many news reports. But Sandra Rosenbloom, a University of Arizona gerontology professor, says roughly three-quarters of retirees in the first block of boomers appear to be sticking close to the suburbs, where the vast majority reside. "Everybody in this business wants to talk about the odd person who moves downtown," Rosenbloom observes. "[But] most people retire in place. When they move, they don't move downtown, they move to the fringes."

To be sure, there will be 15 million to 20 million new urban dwellers by 2050. Many will live in what Wharton business professor Joseph Gyourko calls "superstar cities," such as San Francisco, Boston, Manhattan and western Los Angeles—places adapted to business and recreation for the elite and those who work for them. By 2050, Seattle, Portland and Austin could join their ranks.

But because these elite cities are becoming too expensive for the middle class, the focus of urban life will shift to cities that are more spread out and, by some standards, less attractive. They're what I call "cities of aspiration," such as Phoenix, Houston, Dallas, Atlanta and Charlotte. They'll facilitate upward mobility, as New York and other great industrial cities once did, and begin to compete with the superstar cities for finance, culture and media industries, and the amenities that typically go along with them. The Wall Street Journal noted that commercial success has already turned Houston, once considered a backwater, into "an art mecca."

One of the least anticipated developments in the nation's 21st-century geography will be the resurgence of the region often dismissed by coastal dwellers as "flyover country." For the better part of the 20th century, rural and small-town communities declined in percentage of population and in economic importance. In 1940, 43 percent of Americans lived in rural areas; today it's less than 20 percent. But population and cost pressures are destined to resurrect the hinterlands. The Internet has broken the traditional isolation of rural communities, and as mass communication improves, the migration of technology companies, business services and manufacturing firms to the heartland is likely to accelerate.

Small Midwestern cities such as Fargo, North Dakota, have experienced higher than average population and job growth over the past decade. These communities, once depopulating, now boast complex economies based on energy, technology and agriculture. (You can even find good restaurants, boutique hotels and coffeehouses in some towns.) Gary Warren heads Hamilton Telecommunications, a call center and telecommunications-services firm that employs 250 people in Aurora, Nebraska. "There is no sense of dying here," Warren says. "Aurora is all about the future."

Concerns about energy sources and hydrocarbon emissions will also bolster America's interior. The region will be pivotal to the century's most important environmental challenge: the shift to renewable fuels. Recent estimates suggest the United States has the capacity to produce annually more than 1.3 billion dry tons of biomass, or fuels derived from plant materials—enough to displace 30 percent of the current national demand for petroleum fuels. That amount could be produced with only modest changes in land use, agricultural and forest-management practices.

Not since the 19th century, when the heartland was a major source of America's economic, social and cultural supremacy, has the vast continental expanse been set to play so powerful a role in shaping the nation's future.

What the United States does with its demographic dividend—its relatively young working-age population—is critical. Simply to keep pace with the growing U.S. population, the nation needs to add 125,000 jobs a month. The New America Foundation estimates. Without robust economic growth but with an expanding population, the country will face a massive decline in living standards.
Entrepreneurs, small businesses and self-employed workers will become more common. Between 1980 and 2000 the number of self-employed individuals expanded, to about 15 percent of the work force. More workers will live in an economic environment like that of Hollywood or Silicon Valley, with constant job hopping and changes in alliances among companies.

For much of American history, race has been the greatest barrier to a common vision of community; race still remains all too synonymous with poverty; considerably higher poverty rates for blacks and Hispanics persist. But the future will most likely see a dimming of economic distinctions based on ethnic origins.

Since 1960, the proportion of African-American households at or below the poverty line ($22,000 annually for a family of four in 2008 dollars) has dropped from 55 to 25 percent, while the black middle class has grown from 15 to 30 percent. From 1980 to 2008, the proportion who are considered prosperous—households making more than $100,000 a year in 2008 dollars—grew by half, to 10.3 percent. Roughly 50 percent more African-Americans live in suburbs now than in 1980; most of those households are middle class, and some are affluent.

The most pressing social problem facing mid-21st-century America will be fulfilling the historic promise of upward mobility. In recent decades certain high-end occupation incomes grew rapidly, while wages for lower-income and middle-class workers stagnated. Even after the 2008 economic downturn, largely brought on by Wall Street, it was primarily middle-class homeowners and jobholders who bore the brunt, sometimes losing their residences. Most disturbingly, the rate of upward mobility has stagnated overall, as wages have largely failed to keep up with the cost of living. It is no easier for poor and working-class people to move up the socio-economic ladder today than it was in the 1970s; in some ways, it’s more difficult. The income of college-educated younger people, adjusted for inflation, has been in decline since 2000.

To reverse these trends, I think Americans will need to attend to the nation's basic investments and industries, including manufacturing, energy and agriculture. This runs counter to the fashionable assertion that the American future can be built around a handful of high-end creative jobs and will not require reviving the old industrial economy.

A more competitive and environmentally sustainable America will rely on technology. Fortunately, no nation has been more prodigious in its ability to apply new methods and techniques to solve fundamental problems; the term "technology" was invented in America in 1829. New energy finds, unconventional fuel sources and advanced technology are likely to ameliorate the long-prophesied energy catastrophe. And technology can ease or even reverse the environmental costs of growth. With a population of 300 million, the United States has cleaner air and water now than 40 years ago, when the population was 200 million.

The America of 2050 will most likely remain the one truly transcendent superpower in terms of society, technology and culture. It will rely on what has been called America’s "civil religion"—its ability to forge a unique common national culture amid great diversity of people and place. We have no reason to lose faith in the possibilities of the future.

Adapted from The Next Hundred Million by Joel Kotkin. © 2010. With the permission of the publisher, The Penguin Press, a member of Penguin Group (USA) Inc.
The Met’s collection of Islamic art ranges in date from the 7th to the 19th century. Its nearly 12,000 objects reflect the great diversity and range of the cultural traditions of Islam, with works from as far westward as Spain and Morocco and as far eastward as Central Asia and India. Comprising sacred and secular objects, the collection reveals the mutual influence of artistic practices such as calligraphy, and the exchange of motifs such as vegetal ornament (the arabesque) and geometric patterning in both realms.

History of the Department

Although the Museum acquired some seals and jewelry from Islamic countries as early as 1874, and a number of Turkish textiles in 1878, it received its first major group of Islamic objects in 1897, as a bequest of Edward G. Moor. Since then, the collection has grown through gifts, bequests, and purchases, as well as through Museum-sponsored excavations at Nishapur, Iran, in 1935-39 and in 1947. Until 1932, when the Department of Medieval Art was established, all of these objects were overseen by the Department of Decorative Arts. By 1963, the number of objects had increased to the point that necessitated an official departmental division between the early Islamic and the Islamic portions of the collection, and the Department of Islamic Art was founded.

Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art Building Bridges Programs

From 2014 to 2016, the Met is presenting a wide range of programs that use the Museum’s historic collection as a touchstone to celebrate the robust living traditions of the Islamic world. Participate in multifaceted events to explore the vibrancy, beauty, and diversity of Islamic cultures.

Made possible by the Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art.

Renovation and Reinstallation

On November 9, 2011, the Museum reopened its fifteen galleries for the Art of the Arab Lands, Turkey, Iran, Central Asia, and Later South Asia, after an eight-year project in which the galleries were renovated and reorganized in accordance with current thinking in the field and with modern museological practices. The galleries had last been renovated and reinstalled in 1975.
The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, announces the appointment of Aimee E. Froom as Curator of Islamic Art.

The Museum—September 18, 2014—Gary Tinterow, director of the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, has announced the appointment of Aimee E. Froom as curator of Islamic art. She joins Mr. Tinterow and Mahrukh Tarapor, the Museum’s senior advisor for international initiatives, in expanding the Arts of the Islamic World program at the MFAH.

“After a lengthy international search, I am delighted that Aimee Froom has joined our staff,” Mr. Tinterow said in announcing the appointment. “Her credentials, curatorial experience, and scholarly accomplishments will provide an excellent platform from which she can grow our collection and deepen our programming based on the extraordinary loans from The al-Sabah Collection, in collaboration with Kuwaiti cultural organization Dar al-Athar al-Islamiyyah.”

“I am tremendously excited to be at the MFAH, and to be a part of the vibrant culture of Houston, working with my distinguished colleagues at the Museum and in the Houston community,” said Dr. Froom, who begins her appointment in Houston this week. “I look forward to expanding our collection and programming. It is an honor to present the outstanding loans from The al-Sabah Collection, one of the most comprehensive collections of Islamic art in the world.”

Most recently an independent scholar based in Paris, Dr. Froom has published and lectured widely on the topic of Islamic art, in particular decorative arts of the Islamic world. She has acted as a consultant to leading museums, including the Aga Khan Museum, Toronto; the British Museum, London; and the Reunion des Musées Nationaux, Paris.

In addition to scholarly articles, she is the author of Persian Ceramics from the Collections of the Asian Art Museum of San Francisco (2008) and wrote the catalogue entries for Spirit and Life: Masterpieces of Islamic Art from the Aga Khan Museum Collection (2007). She has contributed to major publications including the Los Angeles County Museum of Art exhibition catalogue Gifts of the Sultan: The Arts of Giving at the Islamic Courts (2011); God is Beautiful and Loves Beauty: The Object in Islamic Art and Culture (2013); and History of Design: Decorative Arts and Material Culture, 1400–2000 (2013). She is currently preparing a book project on the Ottoman Sultan Murad III album for Koç University Press.

As the Hagop Kevorkian Associate Curator of Islamic Art at the Brooklyn Museum from 2001 to 2005, Dr. Froom directed the first comprehensive survey of the museum’s collection of 150 Islamic carpets and spearheaded the exhibition, research, care, and growth of the Brooklyn Museum’s encyclopedic collection of Islamic art. Prior to that appointment, she served as a fellow in the Islamic art department at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.

Dr. Froom also brings many years of teaching experience at the undergraduate and graduate levels at institutions including Brown University, Bard Graduate Center, the Trinity College program in Paris, and The American University of Paris. In Houston, she has an adjunct appointment at Rice University. Dr. Froom earned her bachelor of arts degree in art history and French literature from Brown University; her master of arts in art history from the University of Massachusetts Amherst; and her PhD in art history from the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, with a thesis titled A Muragga for the Ottoman Sultan Murad III. She is a member of the College Art Association, Historians of Islamic Art Association, International Center for Medieval Art, and Medieval Academy of America.

About the Arts of the Islamic World at the MFAH

Now in its seventh year, the Arts of the Islamic World program at the MFAH was established as an institutional commitment to collect, exhibit, and interpret arts from the Islamic world. Since 2007, the Museum has begun to develop a focused collection with an emphasis on quality and rarity of the objects. Among the most significant acquisitions of the past seven years have been a 12th-century bronze incense burner in the form of a stylized feline figure from present-day Iran; a superb, elaborately illuminated 14th-century Qur’an from present-day Morocco; and a remarkable, early-16th-century tondino that originated in Iznik, south of Istanbul, then the center of production for one of the most distinctive types of ceramics in the Islamic world. The Museum’s long-term goal is to establish a collection reflecting the regional, chronological, and material diversity of the Islamic artistic tradition.

The program has also brought to the MFAH significant exhibitions, including Traces of the Calligrapher: Islamic Calligraphy in Practice, c. 1600–1900 (2007); Light of the Sufis: The Mystical Arts of Islam (2010); and Gifts of the Sultan: The Arts of Giving at the Islamic Courts (2011). In addition, a landmark agreement between the MFAH and the privately held al-Sabah Collection, Kuwait, initiated a long-term exchange of objects, staff, and expertise. The inaugural exhibition, Arts of Islamic Lands: Selections from The al-Sabah Collection, Kuwait, opened in January 2013. Related programming has provided extensive interpretive materials and expanded the reach of these exhibitions and their unique perspectives on the arts of the Islamic world throughout Houston and Texas.
The MFAH Highlights Arts of the Islamic World Beginning in January

This display—which includes objects from the 8th to the 18th centuries, made in the Iberian Peninsula, North Africa, the Middle East, Turkey, India, and Central Asia—expands installation more than triples the display, increasing the artworks on view to more than 250 objects that, together, present an impressive and comprehensive presentation of 67 objects ranging from carpets and architectural fragments to exquisite ceramics, metalwork, jewelry, scientific instruments, and manuscripts. An agreement, which was originally negotiated with the assistance of Mahrukh Tarapor, the Museum’s senior advisor for international initiatives, debuted in January 2013 by Museum director Gary Tinterow and al-Sabah Collection co-owners Sheikha Hussah Sabah al-Salem al-Sabah and Sheikh Nasser Sabah al-Ahmed al-Sabah. The landmark partnership with The al-Sabah Collection, one of the greatest privately held collections of Islamic art in the world, was first announced in November 2012 with a presentation of 67 objects ranging from carpets and architectural fragments to exquisite ceramics, metalwork, jewelry, scientific instruments, and manuscripts. An expanded installation more than triples the display, increasing the artworks on view to more than 250 objects that, together, present an impressive and comprehensive range of Islamic art. The installation was curated by The al-Sabah Collection curator, Sabah Kanoukji, with guest curator Giovanni Curatola.

The reinstallation of the Museum’s permanent collection will double the gallery space dedicated to the Arts of the Islamic World. In addition to masterpieces from the Museum’s expanding permanent collection, the installation will also feature important loans from private collections in Houston. Items on view include a 12th-century bronze incense burner in the form of a stylized feline figure from the Iranian world; a rare, elaborately illuminated 14th-century Qur’an from present-day Morocco; and a remarkable, early-16th-century tondino from Iznik, Turkey, the center of production for one of the most distinctive types of ceramics in the Islamic world. A new “Collections in Conversation” section will encourage visitors to look beyond the borders of the Islamic world and make global connections. The first installation will feature Bartolomeo Bettera’s Still Life with Musical Instruments (c. 1660), drawn from the Sarah Campbell Blaffer Foundation, in conversation with an Ottoman lute and a Nasrid Spanish scribe’s box similar to the objects depicted in the painting.

"We are thrilled to continue our collaboration with the prestigious al-Sabah Collection with this expanded installation," said Tinterow. "Since Houston is home to a large and diverse Muslim community, it is fitting that the art and culture of the Islamic world will be prominently featured in the al-Sabah installation and a complementary reinstallation of our permanent Arts of the Islamic World galleries."

"Since its inception in 1983, part of our vision for the Dar al-Athar al-Islamiyyah has been the sharing of works of art from The al-Sabah Collection with the public, in and out of Kuwait," said Sheikha Hussah. "These objects are tangible products of artists and artisans from Islamic lands, representing more than 13 centuries of art, history and culture. The expansion of the exhibition Arts of Islamic Lands: Selections from The al-Sabah Collection, Kuwait at the Museum represents Gary Tinterow’s vision for the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston. His efforts reflect his recognition that there is a community that deserves to be represented in the Museum and an audience that is open to learning more about the art and culture of the Islamic world. With more than 200 objects from The al-Sabah Collection on display at the MFAH, the Museum is where our visions meet."

"We are so delighted to expand our installation of the extraordinary al-Sabah Collection and our permanent galleries," said Dr. Froom. "This will give us a strong platform for presenting and studying the arts of the Islamic world in Houston. We look forward to expanding our programming as well."

The reinstallation of the Museum’s permanent collection will double the gallery space dedicated to the Arts of the Islamic World. In addition to masterpieces from the permanent collection, the installation will also feature important loans from private collections in Houston. Items on view include a 12th-century bronze incense burner in the form of a stylized feline figure from the Iranian world; a rare, elaborately illuminated 14th-century Qur’an from present-day Morocco; and a remarkable, early-16th-century tondino from Iznik, Turkey, the center of production for one of the most distinctive types of ceramics in the Islamic world. A new “Collections in Conversation” section will encourage visitors to look beyond the borders of the Islamic world and make global connections. The first installation will feature Bartolomeo Bettera’s Still Life with Musical Instruments (c. 1660), drawn from the Sarah Campbell Blaffer Foundation, in conversation with an Ottoman lute and a Nasrid Spanish scribe’s box similar to the objects depicted in the painting.

MFAH
BY THE NUMBERS
July 1, 2014–June 30, 2015

- 908,000 visits to the Museum, Bayou Bend Collection and Gardens, Rienzi, and the Glassell School of Art
- 112,000 visitors and students reached through learning and interpretation programs
- 10,300 local college students received free access to the MFAH
- 41,000 schoolchildren and their chaperones received free tours of the MFAH
- 98 citywide community partners collaborated with the MFAH
- 1.8 million visits recorded at mfah.org
- 134,000 people followed the MFAH on social media
- 191,000+ online visitors accessed the Documents of 20th-Century Latin American and Latino Art Website
- 71,490 visitors attended landmark exhibition Manet and the Seine: Impressions of a River
- 27,780 household members supported the MFAH
- 1,000+ volunteers served the community
- 630 permanent and temporary staff employed by the MFAH

Total Revenues: $63.4 million

Total Expenses: $61.1 million
MFAH - About the Museum

Established in 1900, the MFAH is the largest cultural institution in the southwest region. The Museum’s main campus is located in the heart of Houston’s Museum District, and comprises the Audrey Jones Beck Building, the Caroline Wiess Law Building, the Glassell School of Art, and the Lillie and Hugh Roy Cullen Sculpture Garden. Nearby, two remarkable house museums—Bayou Bend Collection and Gardens, and Rienzi—present collections of American and European decorative arts. Resources that can be found throughout the MFAH include a repertory cinema, two significant research libraries, public archives, and a conservation and storage facility. The encyclopedic collections of the MFAH cover world cultures dating from antiquity to the present and include in-depth holdings of American art, European paintings, pre-Columbian and African gold, decorative arts and design, photography, prints and drawings, Modern and Contemporary painting and sculpture, and Latin American art. The MFAH is also home to the International Center for the Arts of the Americas (ICAA), a leading research institute for 20th-century Latin American and Latino art.

Architectural Legacy
The MFAH campus unites the brilliant architectural and design work of Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Isamu Noguchi, and Rafael Moneo, part of a 75-year legacy of inspired commissions that span from 1924—and the construction of the original Museum building designed by William Ward Watkin in the Neoclassical style—to the year 2000, when the Museum completed the Rafael Moneo-designed Audrey Jones Beck Building.

The Future of the MFAH Campus
Steven Holl Architects is developing plans for a comprehensive project to create a new building for 20th- and 21st-century art and a new facility for the Glassell School of Art; those structures will link to the existing gallery buildings by Ludwig Mies van der Rohe and Rafael Moneo, as well as the sculpture garden by Isamu Noguchi, establishing a 14-acre public campus in the heart of Houston’s Museum District.

Upcoming Events
- **GALLERY TALK/TOURS** Highlights of the Caroline Wiess Law Building
  - Wednesday 11.23 @ 1 p.m.
- **PROGRAMS & ACTIVITIES** Holiday Market at Bayou Bend
  - Friday 11.25 @ 9 a.m.
- **PROGRAMS & ACTIVITIES** Highlights of the Audrey Jones Beck Building
  - Friday 11.25 @ 1 p.m.
- **GALLERY TALK/TOURS** Julian Onderdonk and the Texas Landscape
  - Friday 11.25 @ 2 p.m.
Cities are made up of many pieces such as neighborhoods and social groups. We can describe these pieces by income, race and gender among other factors. Where we live and the opportunities and challenges we face also differ by age and over generations. The Generationed City research project studies these divisions.

The Conference Board of Canada has recently claimed that "Age Rather than Gender" is "Becoming the New Income Divide". While gender inequalities, for instance in wages, have declined, we would maintain that gender inequalities remain significant barriers to attaining equality, and similar things can be said about race.

What is clear, however, is that there are growing divisions among generations in terms of employment prospects, earnings, housing situation, residential location, and various other characteristics. There are a number of projects that are examining these trends – for instance the Gen Squeeze project housed at the University of British Columbia that focuses on intergenerational inequalities in Canada. The US Census Bureau's web application "young adults then and now" also documents the changing characteristics of young adults over time at various levels of geography.
At **GENERATIONED CITY**

we aim to be a conduit for urban generational research

At Generationed City we aim to be a conduit for urban generational research in general. Much of the research we are conducting at the moment focuses on young adults and Millennials. But the overarching focus of the research is to bring age and generation into the debates and research on the factors shaping social/spatial divisions and economic opportunities along with the more traditional factors considered such as income, class, gender, race, ethnicity.

Our intent is not to argue that age and generational status are somehow more important than other factors shaping society—our aim is to suggest that we need to pay closer attention to how current employment and housing challenges are impacting different generations since we are living in a context of rapid societal change that makes generational differences more pronounced.

We also want to offer a word of caution about generalizations made across generations and age groups. Just like with other categorizations there is the risk of over-generalizing, and even if at times unintended, these generalizations can re-enforce or help create stereotypes and inequalities. Ageism, discrimination based on one's age, is a real issue, and some people are starting to speak of generalism – discrimination based on one's birth cohort. An example of the latter is assuming that everyone between the ages of 20 and 25 is noncommittal and lacks work ethic; these are values that are now often applied to all Millennials in the media without considering the negative stereotypes this can create.
The research on generational differences seems to have morphed into a competition in popular discourse and the media about 'who had it harder' and 'which generation is better, friendlier, more dedicated', and the list goes on. In our view, this is not particularly productive. The reality is of course that each generation does face very different kinds of opportunities and challenges. And generations have always had some degree of healthy competition about 'who walked uphill both ways.' However, turning these differences into some badge of honour on 'who had it the hardest' and is therefore 'more deserving' of social and economic benefits seems to have become more pronounced as the pace of societal change has increased. At Generationed City we maintain that this increasingly competitive discourse is hardly helpful in bringing people together to solve contemporary public policy issues. And we will need input from all generations if we are to deal with the growing economic uncertainty and inequalities around the globe affecting not just Millennials, but people across all current and future generations.

At **GENERATIONED CITY**
we aim to **inform** public and policy debates
by highlighting how societal changes are
**impacting** different generations in
**unique ways**

At Generationed City we aim to inform public and policy debates by highlighting how societal changes are impacting different generations in unique ways. Studying the housing and employment challenges of the youngest generation entering housing and job markets is also a bit like watching the canary in the coal mine—the young will be the first experiencing the loss of benefits, for instances, as union jobs are replaced with contract positions. But knowing the challenges facing different generations also helps in terms of developing policies that are responsive to the needs of different age groups—social and economic policy aiming to help people who are experiencing job losses ought to look different for someone aged 25 versus 63.
PROJECT DETAILS

Generationed City is a research project housed in the School of Planning, Faculty of Environment, at the University of Waterloo. Dr. Markus Moos founded Generationed City in 2014 as a means to disseminate his research, and that of his students and research assistants, to a broader audience.

Moos is a professor in the School of Planning and co-founder of the Atlas of Suburbanisms. His research mainly deals with the implications of changing urban economies and social structures for urban policy, particularly in the areas of social justice and sustainability.

The overarching aim of this research is to measure the impacts of socio-economic restructuring on the labour and housing market and commuting characteristics of different generations in major Canadian and US metropolitan areas. Conceptually and methodologically, the research attempts to critically examine and define the utility of youthification, generation, cohort, and generational change as analytical mechanisms, and contribute to advancing our understanding of the factors and processes shaping cities and societal change.
Appendix 36: PEW Hispanic Population in Metro Areas Report Excerpt

Hispanic Population and Origin in Select U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 2014

Top 60 metropolitan areas, by Hispanic population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>metro area</th>
<th>Hispanic population</th>
<th>Among Hispanic origin</th>
<th>Among non-Hispanic origin</th>
<th>Among total origin</th>
<th>Top three Hispanic origin groups (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach-Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>5,579,000</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>Mexican 70.1%, Salvadoran 3.9%, Guatemalan 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY</td>
<td>7,381,000</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>Mexican 50.1%, Salvadoran 3.6%, Guatemalan 3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land, TX</td>
<td>2,654,000</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>Mexican 42.9%, Salvadoran 3.4%, Guatemalan 5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ</td>
<td>1,596,000</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>Mexican 74.7%, Salvadoran 2.7%, Guatemalan 2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>San Antonio-New Braunfas, TX</td>
<td>1,248,000</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>Mexican 62.5%, Salvadoran 3.4%, Guatemalan 3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington, TX</td>
<td>1,270,000</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>Mexican 29.7%, Salvadoran 2.2%, Guatemalan 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>San Diego-Carlsbad-San Ysidro, CA</td>
<td>1,081,000</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>Mexican 26.5%, Salvadoran 2.1%, Guatemalan 2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA</td>
<td>1,035,000</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>Mexican 31.0%, Salvadoran 0.9%, Guatemalan 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>848,000</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>Mexican 29.7%, Salvadoran 0.9%, Guatemalan 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Denver-Aurora-C_lexandria, CO</td>
<td>790,000</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>Mexican 19.5%, Salvadoran 1.1%, Guatemalan 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Scranton-West Scranton, PA</td>
<td>859,000</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>Mexican 19.5%, Salvadoran 1.1%, Guatemalan 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Portland-Vancouver, OR-WA</td>
<td>748,000</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>Mexican 19.5%, Salvadoran 1.1%, Guatemalan 1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In some metropolitan areas, data were sufficiently complete to report race and Hispanic or Latino origin. In these cases, the Hispanic or Latino variable describes all races.
Appendix 37: PolicyLink and PERE Bay Area Equity Profile Excerpt

Summary

The Bay Area is already a majority people-of-color region, and communities of color will continue to drive growth and change into the foreseeable future. The region's diversity is a tremendous economic asset – if people of color are fully included as workers, entrepreneurs, and innovators. But while the Bay Area economy is booming, rising inequality, stagnant wages, and persistent racial inequities place its long-term economic future at risk.

Equitable growth is the path to sustained economic prosperity. To build a Bay Area economy that works for all, regional leaders must commit to putting all residents on the path to economic security through strategies to grow good jobs, build capabilities, remove barriers, and expand opportunities for the people and places being left behind.

Demographics

Highlights
Who lives in the region and how is this changing?

• The San Francisco Bay Area is the second most diverse region, with growing representation from all major racial/ethnic groups.

• The region has experienced dramatic growth and change over the past several decades, with the share of people of color increasing from 34 percent to 58 percent since 1980.

• Diverse communities, especially Asians and Latinos, are driving growth and change in the region and will continue to do so over the next several decades.

• The people-of-color population is expected to grow over the next few decades in every county except San Francisco County, where it will decline.

• There is a large racial generation gap between the region's mainly White senior population and its increasingly diverse youth population.

People of color: 58%

Diversity rank (out of largest 150 regions): #2

Number of counties that are majority people of color: 4/5
Demographics
Dramatic growth and change over the past several decades

The Bay Area has experienced significant population growth since 1980, growing from 3.3 million to 4.3 million residents.

In the same time period, it has become a majority people-of-color region, increasing from 34 percent people of color to 58 percent people of color.

People of color have driven the region’s growth over the past three decades, contributing 97 percent of the growth in the 1980s and driving all growth in the 1990s and 2000s.

Over the past decade, the Bay Area’s Latino population grew rapidly - 28 percent - adding 206,000 residents. The Asian population grew 27 percent, adding another 215,000 residents to the total population. The region’s Native American, African American, and non-Hispanic White populations all decreased over the decade.

Immigration played a larger role in the growth of the Bay Area’s Asian population than its Latino population: 52 percent of the growth in the Asian population was from foreign-born residents, while only 26 percent of growth in the Latino population was from immigrants.
The Happy Museum Project emphasizes the value of culture in developing a sustainable global future. Today I asked Ruth Quinn their Communications Officer to give our readers an overview of their work, including a peek at their future. Follow their work on Twitter: @HappyMuseum

The Happy Museum Project was set up by Tony Butler in 2011 with a vision to challenge museums to use their position in society to promote well-being, sustainability and resilience. Museums occupy a unique space in our world; they are popular and trusted spaces in society - where most visitors expect to have important interactions, free from commercial or political agendas. Advocates of the Happy Museum set out to become active stewards of the future as well as the past. Happy Museum thinking challenges the status of economic growth as the most meaningful measure of a society and investigates how alternative models of development, such as social return on investment might be better tools for transitioning to a more sustainable world.

The Thinking Project depicts ideas generated at the Happy Museum Symposium, 2014

The Paper 'The Happy Museum: A tale of how it could turn out all right' by Sam Thompson and Jody Aked, with Bridget McKenzie, Chris Wood, Maurice Davies and Tony Butler set out the Happy Museum's Manifesto for change, starting a conversation about how the UK museum sector could respond to the challenges presented by the need for creating a more sustainable future. In 2013 Happy Museum commissioned Daniel Fujiwara from the London School of Economics to investigate whether visiting a museum could play a part in boosting individual well-being. Fujiwara's report 'Museums and Happiness: the value of participating in museums and the arts' concluded that visiting museums can boost individual happiness and that in monetary terms, people placed their experiences of participating in arts & museums at around £3,200 annually.
The Happy Museum project sets out six key principles in our call to action:

- measure what matters
- pursue mutual relationships
- create the conditions for wellbeing
- value the environment
- be a steward of the future as well as the past
- be an active citizen
- learn for resilience

These principles provide the foundation for our research and evaluation.

What does all this actually mean for museums? What exactly is a Happy Museum then?

Happy Museums are about building a case for optimism - they are museums created to actively seek solutions to become more sustainable and in doing so, they promote the well-being of visitors, staff and communities. Since our inception in 2011 - we have worked with a host of organisations across England and Wales to support projects around well-being and sustainability in a variety of museums. Examples of Happy Museum projects include the community co-production and D.I.Y approach to a new museum at Derby Silk Mill; use sustainable land management to shed new light on collections; Manchester Museum, The Lightbox and the Beaney House of Art and Knowledge to conduct a 5 Year study. The museums will be brought together in a dynamic programme of action and supported peer programme using the LIFE methodology (research focused on learning, interaction, feelings and environmental care), Building on learning from the past four years of Happy Museum we will bring to deliver new ways of working for the museums of the future, very exciting year for the Happy Museum project Look out for brand new resources, open events and knowledge sharing as we work with museums at the cutting edge of well-being and sustainability in the UK to deliver new ways of working for the museums of the future.

The Happy Museum project sets out six Key principles In our call to action:

- value the environment
- pursue mutual relationships
- measure what matters
- team for resilience
- diversity and environmental trends
- economic trends Education and training

Our aim at the end of the 5 year period is for sustainability and well-being to be as embedded in these museums as learning and participation. The study group met together for the first time on 11th November 2015 at the Manchester Museum to start this very exciting journey together. The five year study brings together staff from Manchester Museum, The Lightbox and the Beaney House of Art and Knowledge to conduct a 5 Year study. The museums will be brought together in a dynamic programme of action and supported peer programme using the LIFE methodology (research focused on learning, interaction, connecting, learning and mentoring. The five year study brings together staff from Manchester Museum, The Lightbox and the Beaney House of Art and Knowledge to conduct a 5 Year study. The museums will be brought together in a dynamic programme of action and supported peer programme using the LIFE methodology (research focused on learning, interaction, connecting, learning and mentoring.

What next for Happy Museum?

We are also currently working with a core group of museums, Derby Museums, Ceredigion Museum, Woodburn Charitable Trust, Manchester Museum, The Lightbox and the Beaney House of Art and Knowledge to conduct a 5 Year study. The museums will be brought together in a dynamic programme of action and supported peer learning. It will be underpinned by a learning evaluation and research programme using the LIFE methodology (research focused on learning, interaction, connecting, learning and mentoring. The five year study brings together staff from Manchester Museum, The Lightbox and the Beaney House of Art and Knowledge to conduct a 5 Year study. The museums will be brought together in a dynamic programme of action and supported peer programme using the LIFE methodology (research focused on learning, interaction, connecting, learning and mentoring.
**Appendix 39: SF Center for Economic Development Demographics**

San Francisco Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Estimate #</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>852,469</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population percentage change (2010-2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex and Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>432,202</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>420,267</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>37,509</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>114,231</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and above</td>
<td>115,936</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median age (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race (alone)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>413,447</td>
<td>48.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>52,001</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>4,262</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>283,872</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>128,723</td>
<td>15.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Growth Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco- Oakland-Hayward, CA</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego-Carlsbad, CA</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles-Long Beach- Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: US Census Bureau, American Fact Finder

February 2016
Race (alone)

- White: 48.5%
- Black or African American: 6.1%
- American Indian and Alaska Native: 0.5%
- Asian: 33.3%
- Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander: 0.4%
- Hispanic or Latino: 15.1%

Age Distribution

- Under 5 years: 4.4%
- Under 18 years: 13.4%
- 65 years and above: 13.6%

Sources: US Census Bureau, American Fact Finder

February 2016
Appendix 40: Santa Cruz MAH – Jobs and Internships

Jobs and Internships

Jobs

Nothing open at the moment, check back later!

Internships

We have several internship opportunities at the MAH. An internship is different from volunteering in that we ask you to make a significant time commitment to the museum, take responsibility for a specific project, and learn to work across many areas of the museum. Each intern has a manager on staff who will work with you to develop a project plan, provide mentorship throughout the project, and provide feedback on your work. All MAH internships are unpaid. It is possible to get school credit if that works for your professors/teachers/administrators.

We offer internships in three time frames:

- summer
- school year
- other – usually short-term intensives for graduate students or professionals

Applications for open internships are accepted on a rolling basis. When we find the right person, we close the internship. If you're interested in something, don't wait to apply...

Please note that internships at the MAH are a full-contact sport. We don't have a comprehensive program to provide extensive training or structure, and things move quickly here. That can be exciting or chaotic depending on how you look at it. Successful MAH interns are self-directed, energized about the opportunity to take on significant projects, and undaunted by the unknown. Feel free to talk with us more about what the experience is like (or read blog posts by our interns!) to make sure it's right for you.

Marketing

Photo Internship

Reports to: Marketing & Engagement Coordinator
Start Date: Friday, October 2nd, 2015
End Date: December nth, 2015 (end date is flexible)
Deadline to apply: **Extended** Monday, September 21st
Positions Available: 3

Position Summary:
Capture dynamic and engaging media from our events, exhibitions, and day-to-day operations. Prioritize creative content. Must be comfortable interacting with people—sometimes in a hectic and crowded setting. Learn and practice the museum’s mission in a way that highlights the heart of the organization itself through your photography. Read the full description here.

How to Apply: Please send a cover letter, resume and link to your work via email to Elise Granata, Marketing & Engagement Coordinator at elise@santacruzmah.org. Please title the email 'Photo Intern Application' and clearly state your availability in the body of the email.

Youth Programs

School Programs Internship

Dates: Weekday mornings, must commit to a full academic school year (October-June)

Hours per week: 6 hours per week

Deadline to Apply: Accepting applications on an ongoing basis; final deadline Sept. 18th.

Description: As a School Programs intern, you will lead interactive field trips (grades 3-12) and help brainstorm new activities for future tours based on our exhibitions. You'll empower youth with immersive explorations throughout our entire museum, integrating both art and history to help them build a stronger, more connected Santa Cruz. This is an unpaid volunteer position and we are seeking enthusiastic individuals who are comfortable with public speaking, have some experience with kids and are excited about local art & history!

We will begin offering Bilingual Tours in Fall 2016 and are seeking bilingual applicants.

Send cover letter and resume to School Programs Coordinator, Jamie Keil at: jamie@santacruzmah.org

For more information call 831.429.1964 ext. 7020
Appendix 41: Santa Cruz MAH – Everybody’s Ocean

Santa Cruz Museum of Art & History

See & Do • Get Involved • About Us •

Today is Tuesday, November 22: Open 11am – 5pm
DIRECTIONS & ADMISSION

— Back to Past Exhibitions

Everybody’s Ocean: December 19th, 2014 – April 19, 2015

2nd Floor Solari Gallery

Opening reception of Wave II: Free First Friday, March 6th 5-9PM. Click here for more information. Words of thanks by curator Justin Hoover at 7:30.

The ocean represents anything from womb to tomb. We personify it as a wrathful god, a seductive spirit, or an indomitable force. The four oceans of the world cover 71% of the Earth’s surface and link us to primordial pasts. The ocean is a living, shared space and one of the greatest unexplored mysteries of the world. Everybody interprets the ocean in different ways. Your work has unique inspiration. Let’s share it with each other.

Everybody’s Ocean works just like our relationship to the ocean: it constantly evolves. That means this exhibition will feature art by you. All kinds of art by you. So much art that we’ll have to move it through the gallery in two waves. This exhibition is part crowd-sourced, part curated presenting your personal relationship with the sea.

Curated anchor pieces and select other community submitted artworks will remain for the duration of the exhibition with newly submitted work flowing past and around. All submission periods are currently closed with a total of 271 submission and curator selections. Not all artists listed below are featured in Wave II.

Image credit: Amelie Rider, Border Walled, 2014, acrylic on canvas, 18” x 24”
The Participatory Museum, Five Years Later

This week marks five years since the book *The Participatory Museum* was first released.

I wrote *The Participatory Museum* for two reasons:

1. to explore the 'how' of participatory design in museums, cultural centers, libraries, and science centers
2. to create a version of this blog that was more 'shareable' with organizational leaders and trustees

By many measures, the book has been a success. Over 20,000 copies have been sold around the world. Over 150,000 people have accessed the free online version. I’ve given talks and workshops about it all over the world. Weekly, I hear from someone who is putting ideas from the book into action.

Across the museum field, the questions about visitor participation have gone from "what?" and "why?" to "how?". I feel lucky to be a small part of that change.

That said, there are a couple big things I got wrong in the book—or at least, that I’ve changed my perspective on since writing it.

1. **HUMANS ARE THE BEST AGENTS OF PARTICIPATION**

When I wrote the book, I was coming from the perspective of an exhibit designer. I thought the pinnacle of participatory practice was an exhibit that could inspire collective visitor action without facilitation. A black box with people crowded around, talking and sharing and making and doing.

Now, I look back on the book and the biggest thing I see missing are the people inside that box.

If *participation* was my mantra from 2007-2011, community has been my mantra since then. Over the past four years, I've been running a small regional art and history museum in Santa Cruz, CA. Our museum is highly participatory: plenty of opportunities for visitors to contribute, for artists to collaborate, for community members to co-create. But almost ALL of those opportunities are facilitated by people. Those people are driven not by the design precept of participation. They are driven by the human precept of inclusion and involvement.

I no longer feel like the 'best' forms of participation are unfacilitated. Like many engineers, I think I was overly presumptuous about what design could do on its own. Since 2010 I have seen, again and again and again, how valuable human facilitation is to the participatory process. Humans empower each other. Make space for each other. Invite each other in. Cheer for each other. Build community.

Five years ago, I was fixated on unfacilitated participation because I thought it was much easier to scale than facilitated participation. It is. But I’ve learned that humans can be agents of scale too. Every time we encourage a volunteer to launch her own collections research, or empower teens to launch their own program series, or invite new partners into our projects, we invite them to participate. That participation is powerful and scalable. We just have to think differently about how we craft job positions and expectations. We tell all our new colleagues: you will not be judged on what you do but how you empower others to do. We need employees who focus less on creating experiences directly for visitors and more on creating platforms for visitors to share with each other. Then, participation can be scalable—and human, too.
PARTICIPATION IS POLITICAL

When I wrote *The Participatory Museum*, I wrote about participation as a design tool—a wrench that could be turned to reach certain goals in a cultural setting. As a designer, I wanted to present participation as "value-neutral," or, as I wrote, another technique "for the cultural professional's toolbox." I acknowledged that participatory projects best support goals like relevance, dynamism, personalization, socialization, and creativity—but I avoided much argument about why those goals might be more more important than others.

This choice was strategic. I didn't think the field needed another argument for "why" participation. I wanted to dive into the "how" instead. But this choice also belied my background as an engineer and designer—someone trained to think of tools as apolitical.

Over the past few years, I've learned that participation can be highly political. When you seriously value the diverse experience and knowledge of community members, you challenge the traditional assignment of knowledge authority. I always knew this cognitively, but over the past few years, I've experienced it directly and viscerally.

Our greatest champions and our loudest critics agree: our museum has become an inclusive community gathering place. Whether you think that's incredible or a disaster depends on your point of view.

Terms like "inclusive," which have become commonplace in the field, are still highly contested when put into action. I know we're doing something right when community members are arguing about it. Over the past year, our board and staff have leaned into the political nature of what we do, developing a theory of change with community impact at its heart. I've gotten more comfortable and more confident with the idea of the museum as political body that advocates for empowerment and social bridging. When we really live our mission, that's where it takes us.

But that's just our institution—not everyone's. I still feel strongly that there is no universal reason to encourage visitor participation. What is participation for? Is it intended to increase learning? Empowerment? Social bridging? I don't care what your reason is... as long as you have one.

The reason, the mission, the underlying goal—that's what fuels me now. I still identify as a designer/engineer the way I used to. But I identify as a community activist. And if I ever write another book, it will probably be about that.

I'm curious to know: has *The Participatory Museum* played a role in your work? What do you think has changed around these issues in the past five years?

If you are reading this via email and would like to share a comment, you can join the conversation here.

posted by Nina Simon
Crossing the Professional-Amateur Line

Think back to the last time you crossed a line. Did you feel brave? Deviant? Proud? Ashamed?

In art institutions, we typically treat the curator as the arbiter of quality. The curator draws the line between worthy and unworthy. He may explain the rationale behind where he drew the line—or not. Either way, visitors are expected to respect the line, respect the judgment, and appreciate the resulting display.

I'm not sure how well this is working for us in museum-land.

As our culture explodes in embracing creativity across the professional/amateur spectrum, museums have two choices:

1. we can sharpen the line.
2. we can embrace the embrace.

#1 is the weaker choice. It's the kid at the beach, frantically retracing the toe in the sand as the sea swallows it. It's him yetting, this is the way you are supposed to play! and his voice getting lost in the waves. It's him standing on the beach, alone, as everyone continues the game around him.

#2 is the powerful choke. If done critically and with intention, it advances understanding of different types of quality and different levels of expertise. It covers the entire beach, if done poorly (uncritically), it turns the museum into yet another place to watch cat videos.

I actually believe that we have MORE ability to advance scholarship and curatorial expertise with than #1. The line in the sand is not your expertise. It's a weak symbol of your expertise. And once everyone has trod over the line, it loses its power.

Expertise is worthy. Period. The classics don't lose their power when they share library shelf space with beach reads. Top boxers don't lose their status when they fight at the end of a long bill of lesser athletes. Why are we so afraid that great art will lose its power if we surround it with other work?

I've been grappling with this question as we enter the final month of a massively crowd sourced exhibition at my museum called *We The Ocean*. We took our inspiration for the exhibition's format from the vastness and complexity of the ocean. The ocean is a force. A home. An inspiration. A trash receptacle. We wanted to reflect this diversity of identities by inviting all kinds of artists and artworks into the gallery. The exhibition includes artwork about the ocean by over 250 artists of all backgrounds and abilities, grouped into ten poetic metaphors for the ocean.

When I hear this, I feel sad that the value of artistry is being reduced to a thin line of curatorial discretion between "in" and "out." I understand her concern. But I think it's a concern born out of weakness, not strength.

How can we be proud of the artistic ground that we are covering without worrying about where we draw the lines?
How can we go on the offensive instead of the defensive about the power of art and quality?
How can we cross lines joyously, thoughtfully, critically, and without fear?

If you are reading this via email and would like to share a comment, you can join the conversation here.
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LABELS DESIGN, EXHIBITION, INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE, MUSEUM OF ART AND History

WHAT IS MUSEUM 2.0?
Museum 2.0 explores ways that web 2.0 philosophies can be applied in museum design. For more information, click here.

This blog features weekly posts, which you can also access via RSS Feed or by email below.

I also have written two books, available for personal and purchase online.

The Participatory Museum
reviews: 22 (avg rating 4.1)

The Art of Relevance
reviews: 0 (avg rating 4.0)

SEARCH THIS BLOG

MOST POPULAR POSTS
The Future of Authority: Platform Power
Better Constraints Make Better Participatory Experiences
Social Participation via "Here-to-Here" Design
How I Got Here (my career thus far)
Design Techniques for Developing Questions for Visitor Participation
Deliberately Unsustainable Business Models
E. Carmen Ramos joined the Smithsonian American Art Museum staff as curator of Latino art in October 2010. Ramos is responsible for acquiring artworks for the museum’s permanent collection and producing a major exhibition and catalogue based on the museum’s Latino holdings. Her research interests include modern and contemporary Latino, Latin American, and African American art.

Ramos organized the exhibition *Our America: The Latino Presence in American Art*, which was on view in Washington, D.C. from October 25, 2013 through March 2, 2014 before starting a multi-city U.S. tour. Previous projects include *BLACKOUT: A Centennial Commission by Paul Henry Ramirez* (2010), a site-specific exhibition at The Newark Museum and *Cut, Build and Weld: Process in Works by Chakaia Booker* (2010) at the Visual Arts Center of New Jersey in Summit. She co-curated the fifth biennial at El Museo del Barrio in New York City in 2007 and also has organized exhibitions about Mexican popular arts (2007) and works by artists Franco Mondini-Ruiz (2007) and Freddy Rodriguez (2005). Before joining the museum’s staff, Ramos was the curator of exhibitions for the Arts Council of Princeton at the Paul Robeson Center for the Arts and assistant curator for cultural engagement at The Newark Museum.

Ramos earned a bachelor’s degree in art history and psychology from New York University (1988), and a master’s degree (1995) and a doctorate (2011) in art history from the University of Chicago. Her dissertation was titled “A Painter of Cuban Life: Victor Patricio de Landaluze and 19th-Century Cuban Politics.” Ramos was the author of the exhibition catalogues *Our America: The Latino Presence in American Art, America’s Pastime: Portrait of the Dominican Dream, Works by Freddy Rodriguez* and *Cut, Build and Weld: Process in Works by Chakaia Booker* as well as catalogue entries for El Museo del Barrio and The University of Texas at Austin’s Jack S. Blanton Museum of Art. She has also published in *American Art, African Arts* and the *New West Indian Guide.*

###
The Smithsonian American Art Museum, the nation’s first collection of American art, is an unparalleled record of the American experience. The collection captures the aspirations, character, and imagination of the American people throughout three centuries. The museum is the home to one of the largest and most inclusive collections of American art in the world. Its artworks reveal key aspects of America’s rich artistic and cultural history from the colonial period to today.

The museum has been a leader in identifying and collecting significant aspects of American visual culture, including photography, modern folk and self-taught art, African American art, Latino art, and video games. The museum has the largest collection of New Deal art and exceptional collections of contemporary craft, American impressionist paintings and masterpieces from the Gilded Age. In recent years, the museum has focused on strengthening its contemporary art collection, and in particular media arts, through acquisitions, awards, curatorial appointments, endowments, and by commissioning new artworks.

The museum’s main building, a National Historic Landmark located in the heart of Washington’s downtown cultural district, has been meticulously renovated with expanded permanent collection galleries and innovative public spaces. The Luce Foundation Center for American Art, the first visible art storage and study center in Washington, allows visitors to browse thousands of artworks from the collection. It adjoins the Lunder Conservation Center, which is shared with the National Portrait Gallery, the first art conservation facility to allow the public permanent behind-the-scenes views of the preservation work of museums. The Renwick Gallery, a branch of the museum that showcases the best craft objects and decorative arts from the 19th century to the present, reopened in November 2015 after a two year renovation.

The American Art Museum’s Mission

"The Smithsonian American Art Museum is dedicated to collecting, understanding, and enjoying American art. The Museum celebrates the extraordinary creativity of artists whose works reflect the American experience and global connections."
Appendix 46: SAAM – Arte Latino Exhibition

Arte Latino celebrates the vitality of Latino art traditions and innovations, from the 16th through the 20th centuries, represented by Carlos Alfonzo, Amalia Mesa-Bains, and Jesús Bautista Muroles.

ARTE LATINO
Treasures from the Smithsonian American Art Museum
Appendix 47: Smithsonian Archives – General History

On August 10, 1946, the United States Congress passed the legislation (H.R. 107) creating the Smithsonian institutions by an overwhelming majority in the House of Representatives and Senate. President Truman signed the bill into law on June 24, 1946, and it was met with much enthusiasm and pride that the United States' national museum had finally been established.

Throughout its history, the Smithsonian has played a pivotal role in the development of American society. From its founding, the institution has been dedicated to the advancement of knowledge and the preservation of cultural heritage. It has served as a platform for scientific inquiry, a center for artistic expression, and a repository for national treasures. Today, the Smithsonian continues to be a beacon of scholarly achievement, attracting millions of visitors from around the world who come to explore its vast collection of art, science, and history.

The Smithsonian Institution is composed of 19 museums and research centers across the United States. Each institution is dedicated to a specific field of study, ranging from anthropology and natural history to space exploration and engineering. The National Museum of Natural History, for example, houses one of the world's largest collections of plant and animal specimens, while the National Air and Space Museum celebrates the history of aviation and space travel.

In addition to its world-class museums, the Smithsonian also operates several research facilities and educational programs. The Smithsonian National Museum of African American History and Culture, for instance, offers a unique perspective on the African American experience in America, while the Smithsonian Institution Press publishes a wide range of scholarly works on various subjects.

The Smithsonian's impact on American society is immeasurable. It has not only contributed to the advancement of knowledge in many fields but has also played a role in shaping public policy, fostering innovation, and promoting cultural exchange. Through its exhibits, research, and educational initiatives, the Smithsonian continues to inspire curiosity and encourage exploration, making it a vital institution for the nation's future.
National Portrait Gallery Announces the Appointment of Taina Caragol as Curator for Latino Art and History | Newsdesk

April 24, 2013

The Smithsonian’s National Portrait Gallery has appointed Taina Caragol as its curator for Latino art and history. Caragol will be responsible for acquiring artworks for the museum’s permanent collection and is a part of the curatorial team that will produce an upcoming “Portraiture Now” exhibition focused on contemporary portraits by Latino artists slated for 2014.

“I am thrilled to bring Taina Caragol and her experience in Latino art and history to the team at the Portrait Gallery,” said Kim Sajet, director of the National Portrait Gallery. “The story of America—represented in our history and art—is broad. At the Portrait Gallery, we look for ways to tell the whole story through those who have made their mark on it.”

Caragol was most recently a consultant on academic programs for the Museo de Arte de Ponce in Puerto Rico, where she organized a yearlong series of conferences around the painting “The Battle of Treviño” (1878) by Francisco Oller. Previously she was the curator of education for the same museum. She has also worked as a consultant of art and archival collections for Lord Cultural Resources and as the Latin American bibliographer for the Museum of Modern Art Library.

Born in Puerto Rico and raised between there and France, Caragol expects to defend her dissertation at the City University of New York in fall 2013. Her dissertation is titled “Boom and Dust: The Rise of Latin American and Latino Art in New York Exhibition Venues and Auction Houses, 1970s-1980s.” She has focused on Latin American art from 1750 to the present for her doctoral degree. She earned her bachelor’s degree in modern languages (French and Italian) at the University of Puerto Rico (2000) and her master’s in French studies from Middlebury College in Vermont (2001). Caragol is co-curator with Johanna Fernandez and Yasmin Ramirez of a forthcoming exhibition for the Bronx Museum of the Arts about the Young Lords—Puerto Rican activists in 1960s New York and Chicago.

The National Portrait Gallery has 77 Latinos represented in its collections, including Joan Baez, César Chávez, Miguel Covarrubias, Carolina Herrera and Pedro Martinez. The museum previously presented two exhibitions that focused on Latino portraiture. The first, “Retratos: 2000 Years of Latin American Portraits” was organized by the National Portrait Gallery, the San Antonio Museum of Art and El Museo del Barrio in New York City (2005). Then “Legacy: Spain and the United States in the Age of Independence, 1763-1848,” was presented by the Portrait Gallery and the Smithsonian Latino Center, together with the Sociedad Estatal para la Acción Cultural Exterior and the Fundación Consejo España-Estados Unidos (2007).

National Portrait Gallery

The Smithsonian’s National Portrait Gallery tells the history of America through the individuals who have shaped its culture. Through the visual arts, performing arts and new media, the Portrait Gallery portrays poets and presidents, visionaries and villains, actors and activists whose lives tell the American story.

The Smithsonian Institution's Board of Regents announced today it elected Dr. David J. Skorton, president of Cornell University and a board-certified cardiologist, as the 13th Secretary of the Smithsonian, effective July 2015.

Skorton, 64, has been president of Cornell University since July 2006; he is also a professor in the Departments of Medicine and Pediatrics at Weill Cornell Medical College, and in the Department of Biomedical Engineering at the College of Engineering. His research focus is congenital heart disease, cardiac imaging and image processing. Skorton will be the first physician to lead the Smithsonian.

Before becoming Cornell University’s president, Skorton was president of the University of Iowa from 2003 to 2006. He was a member of its faculty for 26 years.

"David Skorton has demonstrated keen vision and skilled leadership as the president of two great American universities," said John G. Roberts, Jr., Smithsonian Chancellor and Chief Justice of the United States. "His character, experience and talents are an ideal match for the Smithsonian’s broad and dynamic range of interests, endeavors and aspirations. I look forward to working with David to increase the impact of an incomparable American institution across the spectrum of arts, sciences, education, and culture."

Skorton has called for fresh thinking and new alliances to serve society through science, technology, humanities and the arts to develop the next generation of thought leaders.

"Becoming a part of the Smithsonian is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to lead an institution that is at the heart of the country’s cultural, artistic, historical and scientific life," Skorton said. "I am honored by the Board of Regents’ decision. I look forward with great enthusiasm to partnering with the excellent staff and volunteers, and engaging with the Regents, Congress and the Smithsonian’s many friends, supporters and affiliates to further extend our reach. I am eager to work with the leaders of Washington’s art, science and cultural centers to emphasize the critical importance of these disciplines."

The Regents’ nine-member search committee was led by current Board Chair John McCarter, who said Skorton was selected because he is a well-rounded, accomplished leader.

"As a successful president of two universities, David has led complex organizations," McCarter said. "He is an accomplished research scientist and a strong advocate for the arts and humanities, which make him an extraordinary fit for the Smithsonian. I am confident David is the right leader for our future, as we stress continuity and aspire to further expand the Smithsonian’s presence nationally, internationally and in Washington, D.C."

Under Skorton’s leadership, Cornell partnered with Technion-Israel Institute of Technology to win an international competition to develop a new type of graduate school, Cornell NYC Tech, under development on Roosevelt Island in New York City. The graduate school, currently operating in space donated by Google Inc. in Manhattan, combines deep technical knowledge with real-world experience and an entrepreneurial culture.

An ardent and nationally recognized supporter of the arts and humanities, Skorton has called for a national dialogue to emphasize the importance of funding for these disciplines. He asserts that supporting the arts and humanities is a wise investment in the future of the country.

Skorton is a strong proponent of industry-university partnerships. He has been active in innovation and economic development at the state and national levels to bring business and universities together toward diversifying regional economies. He is a member and past chair of the Business-
Higher Education Forum, an independent, nonprofit organization of industry CEOs, leaders of colleges and universities, and foundation executives. He is a life member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

A highly effective fundraiser, Skorton led a team that raised more than $5 billion during his presidency at Cornell. At the University of Iowa, he completed the first billion-dollar campaign in the state.

Since 1980, Skorton has been part of a cohort of physicians around the world who specialize in caring for adolescents and adults with congenital heart disease. At the University of Iowa, he co-founded the university’s Adolescent and Adult Congenital Heart Disease Clinic. He also helped found the Society for Adult Congenital Cardiac Disease, now the International Society for Adult Congenital Heart Disease.

A pioneer in applying computer analysis and processing techniques to cardiac imaging, he has published two major texts and numerous articles, reviews and book chapters on cardiac imaging and image processing.

Skorton was elected to the Institute of Medicine of the National Academies and is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. A national leader in research ethics, he was the charter president of the Association for the Accreditation of Human Research Protection Programs Inc., the first group organized specifically to accredit human research protection programs.

His memberships and board service have included the American College of Cardiology, American Heart Association, Council on Competitiveness and Korea America Friendship Society.

Skorton earned his bachelor's degree in psychology in 1970 and his M.D. in 1974, both from Northwestern University. He completed his medical residency and fellowship in cardiology at the University of California, Los Angeles in 1979. He is married to Robin L. Davisson, The Andrew Dickson White Professor of Molecular Physiology at Cornell University. A jazz musician, Skorton plays the saxophone and flute.

Skorton succeeds Wayne Clough, who will retire from the Smithsonian at the end of 2014. An acting Secretary for the period between Clough’s departure and Skorton’s arrival will be named at a later date.

The Search Process

In September 2013, the Smithsonian’s Board of Regents formed a nine-member committee to search for a Secretary to succeed Clough. The committee was assisted by Russell Reynolds Associates. McCarter led the search committee; Regent Shirley Ann Jackson served as vice chair.

The Regents committee and search firm conducted meetings with key Smithsonian stakeholders, employees and the public to solicit their views on the next Secretary. The committee conducted interviews in December 2013 and January 2014; the full Board of Regents voted on the new Secretary Sunday, March 9.

About the Board of Regents

The 17-member Board of Regents is the governing body of the Smithsonian Institution. It consists of the Chief Justice of the United States and the Vice President of the United States, both ex officio members of the Board; three members of the Senate; three members of the House of Representatives; and nine citizen members, nominated by the Board and approved by Congress in a joint resolution signed by the President of the United States.

About the Smithsonian

The Smithsonian Institution was founded in 1846, with a generous bequest from British scientist James Smithson (1765-1829) to found at Washington an establishment for “the increase and diffusion of knowledge.” The Smithsonian is the world’s largest museum and research complex, with 19 museums and galleries and the National Zoological Park.

The Smithsonian’s collections document the nation’s history and heritage and represent the world’s natural and cultural diversity. The total number of objects, works of art and specimens at the Smithsonian is estimated at nearly 137 million, including more than 126 million specimens and artifacts at the National Museum of Natural History.

There were more than 30 million visits to the museums and National Zoo in 2013. The Smithsonian also has 140 million unique visitors to its websites.

The Smithsonian has 6,500 employees and 6,300 volunteers. It has 185 affiliate museums in 43 states, Puerto Rico and Panama. The Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service organizes exhibitions on art, history and science and circulates them around the country. Each year, SITES travels more than 50 exhibitions to hundreds of U.S. cities and towns from coast to coast, where they are viewed by millions of people.
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Our Mission
The increase and diffusion of knowledge

Our Vision
Shaping the future by preserving our heritage, discovering new knowledge, and sharing our resources with the world

Our Values

- Creativity: Stimulate our work with imagination and innovation
- Excellence: Deliver the highest-quality products and services in all endeavors
- Diversity: Capitalize on the richness inherent in differences
- Integrity: Carry out all our work with the greatest responsibility and accountability
- Service: Be of benefit to the public and our stakeholders

Our Priorities
Focusing on Grand Challenges: Four challenges provide an overarching strategic framework for Smithsonian programs and operations.

- Unraveling the Mysteries of the Universe
- Understanding and Sustaining a Biologically Diverse Planet
- Valuing World Cultures
- Understanding the American Experience

The challenges include a broad range of initiatives: exploring next-generation technologies and improving the visitor experience; using our resources across scientific museums and centers to significantly advance knowledge and understanding; fostering the American experience; and broadening our impact by developing next-generation technologies, improving the visitor experience, and measuring performance.

Four Grand Challenges

Unlocking the Mysteries of the Universe
We will continue to lead in the quest to understand the fundamental nature of the cosmos, using next-generation technologies to explore our own solar system, measure the Earth’s geological past and present, and the paleontological record of our planet.

Understanding and Sustaining a Biologically Diverse Planet
We will use our resources across scientific museums and centers to significantly advance our knowledge and understanding of life on Earth, respond to the growing threat of changing environments, and further human well-being.

Valuing World Cultures
As a fundamental and essential aspect of cultural connections, with a presence in some 150 countries and expertise and collections that span the globe, we will build bridges of mutual respect, and present the diversity of world cultures and the joy of creativity with authenticity, insight, and reverence.

Understanding the American Experience
America is an increasingly diverse society that shares a history, values, and an indomitable, innovative spirit. We will use our resources across disciplines to explore what it means to be an American and how the diverse experiences of individual groups strengthen the whole, and to share our story with people of all nations.
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The Board of Regents

The Smithsonian Institution was created by Congress in 1846 as "an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge."

Congress vested responsibility for the administration of the Smithsonian in a Board of Regents, consisting of the Chief Justice of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, three members of the United States Senate, three members of the United States House of Representatives, and nine citizens. The Board of Regents meets at least four times each year and typically convenes in the Regents Room.
James Smithson and the Founding of the Smithsonian

The Smithsonian Institution was established with funds from James Smithson (1765-1829), a British scientist who left his estate to the United States to found "at Washington, under the name of the Smithsonian Institution, an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge."

Smithson, the illegitimate child of a wealthy Englishman, had traveled much during his life, but had never once set foot on American soil. Why, then, would he decide to give the entirety of his sizable estate—which totaled half a million dollars, or 1/66 of the United States' entire federal budget at the time—to a country that was foreign to him?

Some speculate it was because he was denied his father's legacy. Others argue that he was inspired by the United States' experiment with democracy. Some attribute his philanthropy to ideals inspired by such organizations as the Royal Institution, which was dedicated to using scientific knowledge to improve human conditions. Smithson never wrote about or discussed his bequest with friends or colleagues, so we are left to speculate on the ideals and motivations of a gift that has had such significant impact on the arts, humanities, and sciences in the United States.

Visitors can pay homage to Smithson with a visit to his crypt, located on the first floor of the Smithsonian Castle.

Smithsonian Institution General History

Smithson died in 1829, and six years later, President Andrew Jackson announced the bequest to Congress. On July 1, 1836, Congress accepted the legacy bequeathed to the nation and pledged the faith of the United States to the charitable trust. In September 1838, Smithson's legacy, which amounted to more than 100,000 gold sovereigns, was delivered to the mint at Philadelphia. Re-coined in U.S. currency, the gift amounted to more than $500,000.

After eight years of sometimes heated debate, an Act of Congress signed by President James K. Polk on Aug. 10, 1846, established the Smithsonian Institution as a trust to be administered by a Board of Regents and a Secretary of the Smithsonian. Since its founding, more than 164 years ago, the Smithsonian has become the world's largest museum and research complex, with 19 museums, the National Zoo, and nine research facilities.

Learn more about the founding of the Smithsonian »

Learn more about the Smithsonian's history from Smithsonian Institution Archives »

Encyclopedia Smithsonian: Smithsonian History »

Architectural History & Historic Preservation Division »
The Smithsonian Institution is a museum and research complex of 19 museums and galleries and the National Zoological Park, as well as research facilities.

- Anacostia Community Museum
- Arts and Industries Building*
- Cooper Hewitt, Smithsonian Design Museum (New York City)
- Freer Gallery of Art
- Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden
- National Air and Space Museum
- National Air and Space Museum's Steven F. Udvar-Hazy Center (Chantilly, Va.)
- National Museum of African American History and Culture
- National Museum of African Art
- National Museum of American History
- National Museum of the American Indian
- National Museum of the American Indian's George Gustav Heye Center (New York City)
- National Museum of Natural History
- National Portrait Gallery
- National Postal Museum
- Renwick Gallery
- Arthur M. Sackler Gallery
- Smithsonian American Art Museum
- Smithsonian Institution Building ("Castle")

*Closed for renovation.

Budget—The Smithsonian's federal appropriation for fiscal year 2016 (Oct. 1, 2015–Sept. 30, 2016) is $840 million. The Institution is about 60 percent federally funded (a combination of the congressional appropriation and federal grants and contracts). In addition, the Smithsonian has trust funds or non-federal funds, which include contributions from private sources (endowments, donations from individuals, corporations and foundations; and memberships) and revenues from the Smithsonian Enterprises operation (magazines, mail-order catalog, product development, entertainment, shops, restaurants and concessions).
Visitors—There were more than 28 million visits to the museums and the National Zoo in 2015. Admission to all Smithsonian museums in Washington is free. The museums are open seven days a week. (The Smithsonian is closed on Christmas Day.) A visitor’s center is located in the Castle.

Smithsonian Collections—The total number of objects, works of art and specimens at the Smithsonian is estimated at nearly 154 million, of which 145 million are scientific specimens at the National Museum of Natural History.

Smithsonian Affiliations—Through this ambitious program of long-term loans of collections of artifacts and the expertise of its staff, the Smithsonian shares its vast collection and programmatic resources with museums and educational institutions around the country. There are more than 200 affiliates in nearly every state, Puerto Rico and Panama. For more information, visit www.affiliations.si.edu.

Traveling Exhibitions—The Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service (SITES) organizes exhibitions on art, history and science and circulates them around the country. Each year, SITES travels more than 40 exhibitions to hundreds of U.S. cities and towns in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, where they are viewed by millions of people.

Research Facilities—These include Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute, Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, Smithsonian Environmental Research Center, Museum Conservation Institute, Smithsonian Libraries, Smithsonian Institution Archives, Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute and the Marine Station at Fort Pierce, Fla.

Digital—The Smithsonian home page, www.smithsonian.org, offers a wide range of information, from planning a visit to exploring the collections online. The Smithsonian had 116 million unique visitors to its websites in 2015, and has more than 30 mobile apps, digital magazines and more than 9.6 million images and records on the Collections Search Center site. The Smithsonian is fully engaged in all social media with more than 8 million social media followers.

Website—www.smithsonian.org

History—Established with funds from James Smithson (1765-1829), a British scientist who left his estate to the United States to found “at Washington, under the name of the Smithsonian Institution, an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge.”

# # #

SI-15BC-2016
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Smithsonian Collections

- 156 million artifacts, works of art, and specimens in the Smithsonian’s collections
- 149 million of these specimens and artifacts are held by the National Museum of Natural History
- 9.9 million digital records available online through the Collections Search Center
- 2 million library volumes held by Smithsonian Libraries
- 156,830 cubic feet of archival material held by Archives across the Smithsonian

Why Are Collections Important?

The Smithsonian’s collections represent our nation’s rich heritage, art from across the globe, and the immense diversity of the natural and cultural world. The scope of objects in Smithsonian collections is staggering—from ancient Chinese bronzes to the Star-Spangled Banner; from a 3.5 billion-year-old fossil to the Apollo lunar landing module; from the ruby slippers featured in The Wizard of Oz to presidential memorabilia. Scholars and scientific researchers at the Smithsonian, and around the world, use these vast collections in their research to expand human knowledge.

Collections Search Center » Search over 9.9 million digital records with more than 1.4 million images, video and sound files, electronic journals, and other resources.
Smithsonian Libraries » Browse the Libraries’ holdings, from printed books, ephemera, and manuscripts to digital publications and collections.
Smithsonian Archives » The Smithsonian’s vast archival research collections cover nearly every facet of our nation’s history.
Smithsonian Online Virtual Archives (SOVA) » A showcase for digitization projects at the Smithsonian.
Smithsonian X 3D Explorer »

Collections Stewardship

The Smithsonian is a leader in the field of protecting and preserving our national heritage. Researchers at the Smithsonian’s Museum Conservation Institute (MCI) work to better understand how materials and composite objects deteriorate in order to develop and improve conservation techniques and technologies critical for conserving museum collections.

Conserving your Items »

More about the Museum Conservation Institute »

Conservation in Action

Visitors to the Smithsonian have the unique opportunity to watch conservators at work in the Lunder Conservation Center at the National Portrait Gallery and Smithsonian American Art Museum.

Learn about visiting the Lunder Conservation Center »
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The Smithsonian Latino Center was created in 1997 to promote Latino presence within the Smithsonian. The Center is not represented in one physical location; rather, it works collaboratively with the Institution's museums and research centers, ensuring that the contributions of the Latino community in the arts, history, national culture and scientific achievement are explored, presented, celebrated and preserved. We support scholarly research, exhibitions, public and educational programs, web-based content and virtual platforms, and collections and archives. We also manage leadership and professional development programs for Latino youth, emerging scholars and museum professionals.

Are there exhibitions on display at the Smithsonian Latino Center?
The Latino Center is an education and outreach unit of the Smithsonian. We support Latino exhibitions and collaborate with Smithsonian museums in bringing them to the public. Please visit our exhibitions page for current exhibitions as well as information on previous ones.

Can I donate an art piece or object to the Smithsonian Latino Center?
Download a PDF version of the FAQs.
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The Smithsonian Latino Center develops programs that increase the Latino presence throughout the Smithsonian; advance Latino arts and artists nationwide and offer professional development for the next generation of Latino museum professionals.

INTERNAL SMITHSONIAN RESOURCES

Latinx Initiative Pool (LIP)
LIP is a source of internal funds that supports research, exhibitions, public and educational programs, web content, and collections throughout the Smithsonian’s museums, research centers and programming. Proposals for funding are reviewed through a competitive grant process and approved by the Smithsonian Under Secretary for History, Art, and Culture. Outside agencies are not eligible to receive funds but are encouraged to collaborate with Smithsonian museums, research centers and programs.

Latino Curatorial Initiative
Since 2010, the Latino Center has provided funding for Smithsonian museums to hire curators with expertise in Latino history, art and culture. These curators conduct research, organize exhibitions and public programs, inform educational programs and web content, and build collections and archives that reflect the contributions of Latinos to the U.S. Funding is provided in a five-year phased approach, allowing each museum to raise enough funds to permanently establish the positions.

Latino Working Committee (LWC)
The LWC represents Latino and Latina employees at the Smithsonian, acting as an information clearinghouse and promoting the recruitment, hiring, selection and promotion of Latino and Latina staff, fellows and interns at the Institution. The Committee can assist outside entities interested in learning more about Latino happenings at the Smithsonian, and in identifying Smithsonian scholars and other experts, including those who can participate in Hispanic Heritage Month programs.

EXTERNAL RESOURCES

Latino Art Now (LAWN)
LAWN is a bi-annual national convention of artists, curators, critics, scholars, art writers, museum and gallery professionals, and educators designed to advance the Latino Art field in the U.S. The Smithsonian Latino Center’s principal partner in the Inter-University Programs for Latino Research (EUPR), currently based at the University of Illinois-Chicago. LAWN offers venues to ensure geographic representation, and enjoy the generous support of local Latino cultural organizations, government arts agencies, foundations, and corporations.

Latino Network: American Alliance of Museums
The Alliance’s Latino Network is a growing assembly of Latino and Latinx museum professionals that functions as an information clearinghouse. Its programs, which include gatherings at the Alliance’s annual convening supported by the Smithsonian Latino Center, are designed to build the network and advance the professional development of its members. Traditionally, Smithsonian Latino Center staff and Smithsonian Latino and Latinx curators function in leadership roles within the network.

Inter-University Program for Latino Research (EUPR)
EUPR is a national network of university Latino studies programs dedicated to raising the quality and scope of research about Latino communities, building institutional presence for Latino research, maintaining the value of Latino researchers in academic tenure, and establishing a line between the Latino research community and the public policy arena. EUPR is also principal sponsor and co-organizer of Latino Art Now! EUPR is currently based at the University of Illinois, Chicago. The Smithsonian Latino Center is a member of the network.

National Association of Latino Arts and Culture (NALAC)
NALAC is a national service organization for the Latino arts and cultures field, engaging and facilitating intergenerational dialogues among disciplines, languages, and traditions and contemporary expressions, advocating for funding equity within the public and private sectors, and supporting the organizational and programmatic development of Latino arts and cultural organizations. NALAC convenes a conference and regular, regional training institutes for emerging Latino and Latina professionals in the arts and cultural field. NALAC is based in San Antonio, Texas.

Marvette Pérez, an anthropologist by training and curator of Latinx History and Culture at the Smithsonian National Museum of American History, died peacefully in her sleep on August 19, 2013. Born in Arecibo, Puerto Rico, on June 27, 1961, Pérez earned a B.A. from Fonda State University in 1981. She went on to receive a M.A. at Catholic University of America in 1986, where she was a doctoral candidate.

For the past 16 years she was engaged in collecting, researching, publishing, curating, and developing programs related to Latinos in the United States as well as the connections with other Latin American and Caribbean countries.

Through many exhibitions, Pérez was able to share stories about the U.S. Latino experience with broad audiences from around the world. Pérez curated or co-curated a number of important exhibitions, including Alter: La Vida, La Cultura: La Fundación del Arte en Puerto Rico, 1935-1975, 2014 and Puente: Cumbia, Grupera, and the Music of Latin Popular Culture, 2015. She has also curated exhibitions related to Latin American music, such as the Latinx Music Oral History Project, which documented the lives of Latino musicians through extensive Oral History interviews.

In recognition of her contributions, Pérez was instrumental in acquiring important collections related to Latino pop culture and music, such as the set of tamboras belonging to Tito Puente as well as full costumes from the legendary Latinx musician Celia Cruz. Pérez also collected precious art from New Mexico and posters from the Division of Community Education in Puerto Rico. In 1999, she acquired the Vidal Collection of Puerto Rican material culture, capturing the island's history from the 16th to the 20th centuries through thousands of objects, making it the most important and complete collection of its kind.

In addition to her collecting, Pérez led the Latinx Music Oral History Project, which documented the lives of Latino musicians through extensive Oral History interviews. In 1998, she served as the curatorial consultant for the exhibition Latin Jazz: La Combinación Perfecta, which toured throughout the U.S. with the Smithsonian Traveling Exhibition Service. She also served as consultant to the exhibition Substance and Soul: A History of the Conservation and Historical Importance of Latin American Santos, or carved wood images of saints.

Pérez was an accomplished musician and vocalist who performed locally with groups such as Cántacte and Coral Cantigá. She will be remembered for her creativity and vision, along with her passion to see the story of Latin Americans told. She was an invaluable member of the museum community and will be deeply missed by her friends and colleagues.
National Portrait Gallery Focuses on Dolores Huerta, Leader in the Farm Workers’ Movement

“One Life: Dolores Huerta” Is First Exhibition in Series Devoted to a Latina

May 27, 2015

The National Portrait Gallery is part of the Donald W. Reynolds Foundation. The Smithsonian’s National Portrait Gallery portrays poets and presidents, visionaries and villains, actors and activists whose lives tell the American story. The National Portrait Gallery is located at 8th and F streets NW. Washington, D.C. Smithsonian Institution. (202) 357-2700. Website: npa.si.edu. Follow the museum on social media at BLOG, Facebook, YouTube, Instagram and Twitter.
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“Dolores Huerta’s confrontational style at the table negotiating contracts and her sincere commitment to social justice earned her the name La Pasionaria, or “the passionate one.” At a time when organized labor was dominated by males, and Mexican American women were expected to dedicate themselves to family, Huerta advanced new models of womanhood, all while rearing 11 children. Huerta’s work for the union was far-reaching, encompassing the farm field, the picket line, the legislature and the bargaining table.

Huerta is the second living figure in the “One Life” series. In 1998, President Bill Clinton awarded her with the Eleanor Roosevelt Award for Human Rights. In 2012, President Barack Obama presented her with the Presidential Medal of Freedom. Curated by Taiye Campbell, the museum’s curator of Latino art and history, “One Life: Dolores Huerta” will feature more than 40 objects, including documentary photographs, original speeches presented by her to Congress, UFW ephemera and Chicano artworks.

“One Life: Dolores Huerta” is made possible through federal support from the Latino Initiative Fund, administered by the Smithsonian Latino Center; by the Friends of the National Museum of the American Latino; and by the Guenther and Secheln Sommer Endowment Fund.

The National Portrait Gallery’s “One Life” series has focused on the lives and influence of Katharine Graham, Martin Luther King Jr., President Abraham Lincoln, Sandra Day O’Connor, Thomas Paine, Evie Honezly, President Ronald Reagan and U.S. generals Ulysses S. Grant and Robert E. Lee.

National Portrait Gallery

The Smithsonian’s National Portrait Gallery tells the history of America through the individuals who have shaped its culture. Through the visual arts, performing arts and new media, the Portrait Gallery portrays poets and presidents, visionaries and villains, actors and activists whose lives tell the American story.

The National Portrait Gallery is part of the Donald W. Reynolds Center for American Art and Portraiture at Eighth and F streets NW. Washington, D.C. Smithsonian Institution. (202) 357-2700. Website: npa.si.edu. Follow the museum on social media at BLOG, Facebook, YouTube, Instagram and Twitter.
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About Us

Experience portraiture beyond the frame. Our collections present people of remarkable character and achievement. These Americans—artists, politicians, scientists, inventors, activists, and performers—form our national identity. They help us understand who we are and remind us of what we can aspire to be. Get to know us at the National Portrait Gallery. We look forward to sharing the faces and stories of inspiring Americans with you.

Our Mission

The mission of the National Portrait Gallery is to tell the story of America by portraying the people who shape the nation's history, development and culture.

Our Collection

The National Portrait Gallery was authorized and founded by Congress in 1962 with the mission to acquire and display portraits of "men and women who have made significant contributions to the history, development, and culture of the people of the United States." Today, the Smithsonian's National Portrait Gallery continues to narrate the multi-faceted and ever-changing story of America through the individuals who have shaped its culture. Through the visual arts, performing arts, and new media, the Portrait Gallery presents poets and presidents, visionaries and villains, actors and activists whose lives form our national identity.

As the nation's only complete collection of presidential portraits outside the White House, the "America's Presidents" exhibition lies at the heart of the Portrait Gallery's mission to tell the country's history through the individuals who have shaped it. Gilbert Stuart's "Lansdowne" painting of George Washington is the grand introductory image to this exhibition. In 2000, the Portrait Gallery was in danger of losing this painting—which had been on loan since the museum's opening in 1968—when its owner decided to sell it. A generous gift from the Donald W. Reynolds Foundation allowed the "Lansdowne" painting to be purchased as a gift to the nation. "America's Presidents" continues to acquire portraits—including paintings, sculpture, photographs, caricatures, video, and time-based media—of each succeeding president.

Over the years the collections, which were initially restricted to paintings, prints, drawings, and engravings, have grown to over 22,000 items in all media, from daguerreotypes to digital. In the late 1990s, the Portrait Gallery began commissioning portraits of presidents, beginning with George H. W. Bush. In 2006, the Portrait Gallery hosted the first Ovation Boochever Portrait Competition, now a prestigious triennial event, which also brings commissioned works into the collection. The 2013 winner was Bo Gehring, whose close-up video and sound portrait of jazz musician Esperanza Spalding draws delight and praise from visitors.
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Culture

History of the Arabic Language

The Arabic language is spoken today by over 250 million people in the Middle East and North Africa. A number of other native languages are also spoken in this part of the world such as Kurdish, Berber, and Mahr. Arabic is also used as a religious language by the world’s Muslims, who total around one billion people. Arabic is therefore also learned to varying levels of proficiency, as a venerated, liturgical language, by many Muslims mainly in Asia (e.g., Pakistan, Malaysia, China) and Africa (e.g., Senegal).

The language that is spoken by the native speakers of Arabic is usually referred to as “dialect”. The numerous dialects are purely spoken and are used in parallel to another form of the language that is primarily written but is also spoken in the media today. This co-existence of two forms of the same language to serve different purposes is known as diglossia. This form of Arabic goes back to pre-Islamic poetry and is commonly referred to as ُفُسْهَا (elegant or clear language) in Arabic. In English it is called Modern Standard Arabic, Classical Arabic and sometimes literary Arabic or Qur‘anic Arabic. While these multiple designations in English seem to offer a breakdown of the different kinds of ُفُسْهَا that co-exist today, the Arabic designation sees the different types within a large continuum. This Standard Arabic is standard in that it remains almost exclusively the only recognized language of literacy across the Arabic speaking world. It also enjoys a special position for Arabic speakers because of the large body of texts that has been produced in this form of the language particularly around the golden age of the Islamic civilization. In addition to the Islamic religious texts and the classical Arabic literary texts, major scholarly contributions to the fields of science, medicine, astronomy, mathematics, and sociology for instance were written in the middle ages in this standard Arabic language. Most students learning Arabic as a foreign language tend to get exposure to this standard written language first before they learn a dialect.

Educated speakers of Arabic do mix the standard language and their own dialects to varying degrees depending on the situation. While roughly four major regional dialects of Arabic spoken in the Arab world today have been identified, a multitude of dialectic variations can be noted even within one single country. The four regional dialects are divided into the following general categories: Arabic of the Maghreb (North Africa), Egyptian Arabic (Egypt and the Sudan), Levantine Arabic (Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Palestine/Palestinians in Israel), and Iraqi/Gulf Arabic. These dialects can differ greatly from one another to the point of mutual unintelligibility.
In terms of language typology, Arabic belongs to the Semitic family of languages. Some of the members of this language family that are spoken today include Arabic, Aramaic (relatively small communities mostly in Iraq and Syria), Amharic (the national language of Ethiopia), Tigré (spoken in Eritrea), and Hebrew (spoken in Israel). There were many other members of this language family which have disappeared over time. These include, for example, Akkadian (spoken in ancient Mesopotamia), Phoenician (spoken in what is today Lebanon), and Eblaitic (spoken in ancient Syria).

The Semitic languages first came to light in the Arabian Peninsula. Over the course of millennia these languages spread as different groups left the Arabian Peninsula, carrying their languages with them, into various parts of the Middle East and neighboring areas.

Beginning in the 7th century CE, the Arab Conquests (also known as Islamic or Muslim Conquests) carried speakers of various Arabic dialects, with their religion of Islam and their language of Arabic, out of the Arabian Peninsula into almost all of the Middle East and North Africa, west into the Iberian Peninsula and all the way east to China. Over time, as the incoming Arabs intermarried with indigenous peoples mostly in the Middle East and North Africa, the Arabic language became the prominent language of these regions. While some of the native languages such as Kurdish (Iraq and Syria), Berber (Algeria and Morocco), Mehri (Yemen), and Jezbeli (Oman) are still spoken in this area, some languages have gradually shrunk. Aramaic, for example, the language that was spoken most widely in the Middle East before the Conquests, is still spoken in pockets in today's Syria and Iraq. In Egypt, the language that was spoken before the Muslims came was Coptic, a direct descendant of the Ancient Egyptian language. Today it only survives as a liturgical language of the Coptic Church.

As a result of the contact Arabic has had with other languages over the past 16 centuries, many languages of the world have borrowed words from Arabic. Persian (a member of the Indo-European language family) and Turkish (a member of the Altaic language family), for example, are replete with Arabic words. The very name of the language “Swahili,” spoken in East Africa, is an Arabic word. Spanish and Portuguese have a large Arabic vocabulary (approximately 4000 words) dating back to the eight centuries of contact in the Iberian Peninsula under Muslim rule. English too has its share of words borrowed from Arabic - typically words starting with “al.” Some of these words had been borrowed by Arabic speakers themselves from other languages. For example, the English word “alchemy” comes from the Arabic ٌكيمياء. But the Arabic word itself comes from Kemet, which was the name of Ancient Egypt, literally meaning the dark, fertile soil irrigated by the Nile.

The Arabic Writing System

© 2004 UC Consortium for Language Learning and Teaching. All rights reserved.
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Patterns of Metropolitan and Micropolitan Population Change: 2000 to 2010

About the Report
This 2010 Census Special Report examines population distribution for 2010 and population change from 2000 to 2010 for core-based statistical areas (metro and micro areas) in the United States and Puerto Rico. The findings highlight the demographic characteristics of the largest, fastest-growing, and fastest-declining metro and micro areas. A more detailed view of these statistical areas is available at the links below.

Footnotes
1 On Thursday, September 27, 2012 the Census Bureau released the 2010 Census Special Report, Patterns of Metropolitan and Micropolitan Population Change: 2000 to 2010, and associated online content. An error was discovered in the zoning of metropolitan statistical area cities in the online population density distance profile. This error affected data for 44 metro areas. A revised press release and an updated PDF of the report (with a corrected Table 3.7) were issued on Friday, September 28, and a corrected version of the density profile was re-released on Wednesday, October 3, 2012.

(PDF) or HTML denotes a file in Adobe’s Portable Document Format. To view the file, you will need the Adobe Acrobat Reader which is available free from Adobe. (Excel) or the letter [x] indicates a document in the Microsoft Excel® format (XLS). To view the file, you will need the Microsoft Excel Viewer which is available free from Microsoft. (Word) or the letters [doc] indicates a document is in the Microsoft Word® format (DOC). To view the file, you will need the Microsoft Word Viewer which is available free from Microsoft.
Appendix 62: U.S. Census Bureau – Statistical Abstract

The Statistical Abstract of the United States, published from 1878 to 2012, is the authoritative and comprehensive summary of statistics on the social, political, and economic organization of the United States. It is designed to serve as a convenient volume for a reference, and as a guide to other statistical publications and sources both in print and on the Web. These sources of data include the U.S. Census Bureau, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bureau of Economic Analysis, and many other federal agencies and private organizations.

Section 1. Population
This section presents statistics on the growth, distribution, and characteristics of the U.S. population.

Section 2. Births, Deaths, Marriages, and Divorces
This section presents vital statistics data on births, deaths, abortions, fetal deaths, fertility, life expectancy, marriages, and divorces.

Section 3. Health and Nutrition
This section presents statistics on health expenditures, health insurance, hospitals, injuries, diseases, disability status, nutrition, and food consumption.

Section 4. Education
This section presents data primarily concerning formal education as a whole, at various levels, and for public and private schools.

Section 5. Law Enforcement, Courts, and Prisoners
This section presents data on crimes committed, victims of crimes, arrests, and data related to criminal violations and the criminal justice system.

Section 6. Geography and Environment
This section presents information on the physical environment of the United States, starting with basic area measurement data and ending with climatic data.

Section 7. Elections
This section relates primarily to presidential, congressional, and gubernatorial elections.

Section 8. State and Local Government Finances and Employment
This section presents data on revenues, expenditures, debt, and employment of state and local governments.

Section 9. Federal Government Finances and Employment
This section presents statistics relating to the financial structure and the civilian employment of the federal government.

Section 10. National Security and Veterans Affairs
This section displays data for national security (national defense and homeland security) and benefits for veterans.

Download Entire 2012 Statistical Abstract (PDF - 36.0 MB)
Section 14. Prices
This section presents indexes of producer and consumer prices, actual prices for selected commodities, and energy prices.

Section 15. Business Enterprise
This section relates to the place and behavior of the business firm and to business initiative in the American economy.

Section 16. Science and Technology
This section presents statistics on scientific, engineering, and technological resources, funding; personnel; education; and employment.

Section 17. Agriculture
This section presents statistics on farms and farm operators; land use; income, expenditures, and debt; farm output; crops; and livestock and poultry.

Section 18. Forestry, Fishing, and Mining
This section presents data on the area, ownership, production, trade, reserves, and disposition of natural resources.

Section 19. Energy and Utilities
This section presents statistics on fuel resources, energy production and consumption, and the electric and gas utility industries.

Section 20. Construction and Housing
This section presents data on the construction industry; housing units both characteristics and occupants; and vacancy rates for commercial buildings.

Section 21. Manufacture
This section presents summary data for manufacturing as a whole and more detailed information for major industry groups and selected products.

Section 22. Wholesale and Retail Trade
This section presents statistics relating to the distributive trades, specifically wholesale trade and retail trade.

Section 23. Transportation
This section presents data on civil air transportation, water transportation, ocean-borne commerce, the merchant marine, cargo, and vessel tonnages.

Section 24. Information and Communications
This section presents statistics on information and communications media and telecommunications, and information services, such as libraries.

Section 25. Banking, Finance, and Insurance
This section presents data on the nation's finances, various types of financial institutions, money and credit, securities, insurance, and real estate.

Section 26. Arts, Recreation, and Travel
This section presents data on the arts, entertainment, recreation, personal recreational activities, the arts and humanities, and domestic and foreign travel.

Section 27. Accommodation, Food Services, and Other Services
This section presents statistics on services not covered elsewhere on domestic trade, transportation, communications, financial services, & recreation services.

Section 28. Foreign Commerce and Aid
This section presents data on goods, services, & capital between the United States & other countries; international investments; & foreign assistance programs.

Section 29. Puerto Rico and the Island Areas
This section presents summary economic and social statistics for Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands.
Appendix 63: U.S. Census Bureau - About “Hispanic Origin”
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About Hispanic Origin

The U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) requires federal agencies to use a minimum of two ethnicities in collecting and reporting data: Hispanic or Latino and Not Hispanic or Latino. OMB defines “Hispanic or Latino” as a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin regardless of race.

People who identify with the terms “Hispanic” or “Latino” are those who classify themselves in one of the specific Hispanic or Latino categories listed on the decennial census questionnaire and various Census Bureau survey questionnaires - “Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano” or “Puerto Rican” or “Cuban” - as well as those who indicate that they are “another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin.”

The 2010 Census question on Hispanic origin included five separate response categories and one area where respondents could write in a specific Hispanic origin group. The first response category was intended for respondents who do not identify as Hispanic. The remaining response categories — Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano; Puerto Rican; Cuban; and another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin — and write-in answers can be combined to create the OMB category of Hispanic.

Products by Hispanic origin and race

U.S. federal government agencies must adhere to standards issued by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), which specify that race and Hispanic origin (also known as ethnicity) are two separate and distinct concepts. These standards generally reflect a social definition of race and ethnicity recognized in this country, and they do not conform to any biological, anthropological, or genetic criteria. The standards include two minimum categories for data on ethnicity: "Hispanic or Latino" and "Not Hispanic or Latino." Persons who report themselves as Hispanic can be of any race and are identified as such in our data tables. The following sources provide population data on Hispanic origin and race:

• Data on race and the Hispanic population from the 2010, 2000, and 1990 decennial censuses also are available. Data can be accessed for the 2010 and 2000 Censuses using American FactFinder.

Data on Hispanic subgroups other than Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban

The American Community Survey (ACS) has data on these groups. In the survey questionnaire, the Hispanic-origin question obtained write-in responses of Hispanic subgroups other than the major groups of Mexican, Cuban, and Puerto Rican. Persons with other Hispanic origins (e.g., Salvadoran, Nicaraguan, Argentinean) were able to write in their specific origin group. The Census Bureau’s code list contains over 30 Hispanic or Latino subgroups.

The American Community Survey (ACS) provides sample data from the 1-year, 3-year, and 5-year estimates based on population size. Selected Population Profiles enable you to select characteristics by Race or Ethnic Groups (Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, etc.) and by Country of Birth.

Data on race and the Hispanic population from the 2010, 2000, and 1990 decennial censuses also are available. Data can be accessed for the 2010 and 2000 Censuses using American FactFinder.

• Data on the 2010 Census brief Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin describes these concepts and also provides information on how the race categories used in the 2010 Census were defined.

• Data on Hispanic subgroups other than Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban

• The Current Population Survey (CPS) provides national-level data on the economic, and demographic characteristics of selected race groups, both current and past. Tables on the Hispanic population in the United States are also available, both current and past.

• The American Community Survey (ACS) provides sample data from the 1-year, 3-year, and 5-year estimates based on population size. Selected Population Profiles enable you to select characteristics by Race or Ethnic Groups (Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, etc.) and by Country of Birth.

Contact Us

For assistance, please contact the Census Call Center at 1-800-923-8282 (toll-free) or visit ask.census.gov for further information.
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