MUSEUMS AOTEAROA

2014 SECTOR SURVEY REPORT

Prepared by Iain Shaw and Lee Davidson, Museum & Heritage Studies, Victoria University of Wellington

October 2015

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings from the 2014 museum sector survey commissioned by Museums Aotearoa. The purpose of the sector survey is to build a profile of museums and galleries in New Zealand to inform decision-making and planning and support advocacy for the sector. This survey builds on earlier work undertaken by Museums Aotearoa and others, and its content and format is partly determined by the desire to align with previous surveys. It is anticipated that the sector survey will continue to be conducted on a regular basis so that trends and changes in the sector can be observed, monitored and addressed as required.

Consistent with earlier sector surveys, the definition of 'museum' is broad and includes traditional museums, art galleries, historic houses, open-air museums, science centres, cultural centres and marae-based whare taonga. We have segmented the sector by museum 'size' according to the number of paid full-time (PFT) employees (i.e. 30 hours or more per week):

- 0 PFT - Micro museum
- 1 – 5 PFT - Small museum
- 6 – 20 PFT - Medium museum
- 20+ PFT - Large museum

Characteristics of participating museums

- The survey was undertaken by Museums Aotearoa between November 2014 and July 2015. A total of 95 responses were received, which represents around 27 per cent of the overall number of institutions currently active in New Zealand.
- Small and micro museums, which make up the majority of the sector, submitted the majority (80 percent) of survey responses, representing a response rate of 38 per cent from small museums and 20 per cent from micro museums.
- Medium museums accounted for 8 per cent of respondents, a significant decrease from the 19 per cent of total responses received in 2012. This represents a 35 per cent response rate from medium institutions in 2014, as opposed to 66 per cent in 2012.
- Large museums accounted for 11 per cent of all responses received in 2014, representing a 79 per cent response rate (up from 50 per cent in 2012). The high rate of response from large institutions is likely to impact upon overall findings of the survey, since large institutions account for just 4 per cent of total museums in New Zealand.
- The majority (65 per cent) of responding institutions were established from 1970 onwards.
- There was a reasonable geographical spread among participating museums. As in 2012, just under half of survey responses came from the main regions: Auckland (17 per cent); Wellington (11 per cent); Canterbury (12 per cent); and Otago (7 per cent). Waikato (12 per cent) and Northland (11 per cent) were also well-represented.

Institutional information

- Museums most commonly described their legal status as 'charitable trust' (55 per cent) and/or 'incorporated society' (41 per cent).
- Just over half (54 per cent) of museum governing bodies meet at least once per month.
- Almost two-thirds (64 per cent) of governing bodies are made up entirely of volunteers.
- Most (61 per cent) museums review their internal missions and goals at least once per year.

- Around one-third (37 per cent) of respondents reported no specific relationship with Iwi groups, including two-thirds of micro institutions. Almost a quarter (23 per cent) of museums relied upon a Kaihautu or equivalent to manage their relationship with local Iwi.
- The most common primary function was as a 'history museum/social history/community museum' (35 per cent), with a further 18 per cent identifying this as a secondary function. The most common secondary function was 'archive' (25 per cent).
- Forty per cent of museums offer free entry for all visitors; the same proportion (40 per cent) encourage visitors to make a donation; and over a quarter (28 per cent) charge all visitors using a tiered pricing structure.
- Museums reported a total of 571 active buildings, almost a third (31 per cent) of which are exhibiting sites. Total exhibition floor space amongst the sample was 95,110 sqm, with 56 per cent of this space belonging to large institutions.
- Museums had a range of other on-site facilities, the most common of which was a functions area (42 per cent), followed by a café or restaurant (21 per cent) and on-site theatre facilities (20 per cent). A quarter of responding museums had no facilities other than their exhibition space.

Collections and Exhibitions

- Responding museums reported a total of 10,423,601 objects in their collections, with the majority (87 per cent) of these held by large institutions. Over half (56 per cent) of respondents had fewer than 5,000 objects in their collection. Only 8 per cent of museums reported having more than 100,000 items in their collection.
- The most common types of objects represented in collections are: photographs (80 per cent); clothing/costumes and textiles (73 per cent); social history (73 per cent); books and printed materials (69 per cent); and archives and manuscripts (66 per cent). Almost half (48 per cent) of responding institutions have Taonga Māori objects within their collections, whilst a quarter hold Pasifika objects.
- Just over a quarter (27 per cent) of museums reported that less than 10 per cent their collection was on public display, including the majority (89 per cent) of large institutions. The same proportion noted that at least 90 per cent of their collection was on display, including half of all micro institutions. Conversely, 39 per cent of museums had less than 20 per cent of their collection in storage.
- Just over a third (35 per cent) of museums have less than 10 percent of their collection on permanent exhibition, with these most likely to be large (89 per cent) and medium (75 per cent) sized institutions. Those most likely to have 80 per cent of more of their collection on permanent display were micro museums (61 per cent), compared to 34 per cent of small, 13 per cent of medium and no large museums.
- More than half (55 per cent) of respondents had at least one object on inward loan at the end of the last financial year. Overall, there were 15,665 objects on inward loan within the survey sample.
- Almost a third (31 per cent) of institutions reported having objects on outward loan. A total of 2886 outward loans was roughly equally divided between long term (1,456) and short term (1,430) outward loans.
- The majority (70 per cent) of museums had held temporary exhibitions during the last financial year, including all large and medium institutions, three-quarters of small institutions and just under half (48 per cent) of micro institutions.

- In total, 417 temporary exhibitions were hosted, with large and medium museums each accounting for just over a third (34 per cent and 35 per cent respectively) of this total.
- Touring exhibitions were hosted or initiated by a quarter of museums in the last financial year, including the majority of large (78 per cent) and medium (63 per cent) sized museums. A total of 47 touring exhibitions were hosted, with over half (55 per cent) of these at large institutions. Similarly, large museums were responsible for over half (52 per cent) of the 22 touring exhibitions initiated during this period.
- A total of 770,407 visits to touring exhibitions were reported, with the vast majority (94 per cent) of these being to large institutions.
- Almost half (48 per cent) of respondents have a dedicated touring exhibition space. Of these 38 institutions, around a third (32 per cent) have less than 50 sqm in total dedicated to touring exhibitions.
- A total of 23,531 objects were acquired by respondents during the last financial year, with the majority (84 per cent) being gifted or donated to institutions. The majority (77 per cent) of these objects were acquired by large institutions
- The total value of acquisitions by survey respondents during this period was $7,638,174, with 56 per cent of this value coming from objects donated or gifted to institutions and the remaining 44 per cent from purchased items. Large institutions accounted for 88 per cent of the total value of acquisitions.
- The majority of museums have key policies in place, including a collection management policy (81 per cent), an acquisitions policy (86 per cent) and a deaccession policy (74 per cent). However, less than half (44 per cent) of respondents have a disaster response plan, and only 28 per cent have a digitisation policy.
- Almost one-third (31 per cent) of respondents had electronically documented at least 90 per cent of their collection, while almost half (49 per cent) noted that at least 90 per cent of their collection had been manually documented.
- Museums reported using a range of digital collection management systems. Vernon was the most common, at 33 per cent, followed by Past Perfect (19 per cent) and Ehive (12 per cent), while 15 per cent of museums use another digital system.
- In terms of manual systems, 29 per cent of museums reported using Excel and 26 per cent use a hardcopy system such as a card index. Just over a third (37 per cent) of museums use a mix of digital and hardcopy collection management systems.
- Levels of collection documentation were similarly varied. Fewer than half (42 per cent) of museums had documented more than 90 per cent of their collection to inventory level, while only 14 per cent had documented the same proportion to full catalogue level. Whilst all respondents had some proportion of their collection documented to full catalogue level including digitised images of objects, just over half (54 per cent) had less than 10 per cent documented to this level.
- Almost half (49 per cent) of museums do not have any collection items online and a further 31 per cent (n=23) have less than 10 per cent available online. Only 5 per cent of responding institutions have at least 90 per cent of their collection accessible to online visitors.
- Only 37 per cent of respondents reported that 90 per cent or more of their collection was in a stable condition, while the majority (70 per cent) indicated that up to 29 per cent of their collection required conservation.
- Fewer than half (41 per cent) the respondents had undertaken conservation on at least one object during the last financial year. A total of 5,827 objects were treated during this period,

with 83 per cent conserved at large institutions. Over half (59 per cent) of museums had met their conservation targets and expectations during the last financial year. Reasons for not meeting conservation goals included limited finances, lack of conservation planning, or conserving objects as required rather than proactively.

- Fewer than half (45 per cent) of museums reported that 90 per cent or more of their collection was adequately stored, while around one fifth (21 per cent), including museums of all sizes, indicated that less than 10 per cent of their collection was stored adequately.
- Around two-thirds (68 per cent) of museums reported that less than 10 per cent of their total collection had been valued as heritage assets for public accounting purposes in the last five years. Only 18 per cent reported that 90 per cent or more of their collection had been valued, while 7 per cent were unsure what proportion had been valued. Thirty-six per cent reported that the last valuation had been undertaken during 2014, while 86 per cent indicated it had taken place within the past five years.
- Almost half (48 per cent) of respondents whose collection had been valued stated that the total value of their collection was less than $1 million. A further 19 per cent reported a value of between $1 million and $9 million. Three large institutions have collections valued in excess of $100 million.
- When asked for the most pressing concerns with regards to their collection, unsuitable storage facilities was by far the most common response regardless of museum size, being mentioned by 41 per cent of respondents. Lack of staffing resources was a concern for 18 per cent of museums.

Access, Visitation and Engagement

- A manual door count system was the most common main way that museums count their visitors (40 per cent), while 27 per cent institutions use admission charges or ticket sales as their main counting method. Over three-quarters (78 per cent) of large institutions use an electronic door count, along with 38 per cent of medium institutions. Only 10 per cent of museums do not count their visitors, including 20 per cent micro institutions.
- A total of 4,927,410 on-site visits were reported by respondents for the last financial year, with 82 per cent of this visitation occurring at large institutions.
- Around half (52 per cent) of respondents received up to 10,000 visits, with a further 19 per cent receiving between 10,000 and 100,000 visits. Only 16 per cent of museums reported visitation in excess of 100,000, including all large institutions.
- Local visits from the town/city or region in which the museum was located made up the majority (75 per cent on average) of museum visitation. Overall, an average of 17 per cent of visits were from elsewhere in New Zealand and 19 per cent from overseas, although the proportion of visits from overseas was higher for large and medium museums.
- Forty-nine museums indicated that they held education programmes in the last financial year, with a total of 182,947 students attending these programmes. Around two-thirds of this total attended programmes at large institutions.
- Almost two-thirds (65 per cent) of museums undertook public programming other than education, with most hosting curator talks and tours (69 per cent) and openings (67 per cent).
- Almost two-thirds (n=49, 63 per cent) of museums have a Friends or Members programme, including all large museums, who have an average of 2,674 members each. Of those with

programmes, just over two-thirds held events for Friends and Members during the past financial year.

- The majority (76 per cent) of museums have a website, including all large and medium institutions. Those museums with a website reported a total of 3,441,310 website visits during the last financial year.
- All museums with websites indicated that they used them to provide visitor information, while the majority also include information on public programmes and events (80 per cent) and information about current exhibitions (61 per cent).
- In terms of social media presence, almost two-thirds (67 per cent) of museums have a public Facebook page, while 36 per cent have a Twitter account and 26 per cent maintain a YouTube channel. Only small (19 per cent) and micro (53 per cent) museums reporting using no social media channels.
- Almost a quarter (24 per cent) of museums offer WIFI to the public, while 17 per cent have computers available for use by visitors. Almost half (49 per cent) offer WIFI for staff, and 71 per cent provide computers for staff.
- When asked for their most pressing concerns with regards to access, visitation and engagement, the most common concern was the need to increase visitation (22 per cent), followed by the need to improve public access to their collection and/or institution (16 per cent). Making better use of technology was a concern for 14 per cent of museums.

Financial Information

- Forty-nine respondents reported a total operating expenditure of $155,940,525 for the last financial year, with large institutions accounting for 91 per cent of this total. In common with the 2012 survey, staff costs (31.3 per cent) and depreciation (16.5 per cent) were the two biggest operational expenditures encountered by institutions.
- The capital expenditure of respondents totalled $10,389,309 during the last financial year, with large institutions accounting for 41 per cent of this total.
- Other plant and equipment accounted for 26.7 per cent of total capital expenditure overall, while capital works on buildings accounted for 24.1 per cent and IT/software for 19.3 per cent.
- On average, 21.1 per cent of revenue received by museums came from central government sources, 46.9 per cent from local authorities and 30.6 per cent from community sources such as charitable trusts and gifts.
- Admission fees accounted for the highest proportion (23.9 per cent) of revenue generation on average, followed by retail income (17.4 per cent) and voluntary donations/koha (13.9).
- Overall reported asset value from respondents was $2,265,790,600, with 71 per cent of this value being apportioned to collections.
- When asked for their most pressing concerns with regards to finances, the most common concern for museums, regardless of size, related to funding to sustain current operations (80 per cent). Just over a quarter (26 per cent) of respondents stated that generating revenue was also a pressing concern.

Staffing

- The total number of staff employed by respondents over the last financial year was 1,427. Just over half (51 per cent) of paid employees were permanent full time staff, 18 per cent were permanent part-time staff, 21 per cent were casual staff and 10 per cent were employed on a fixed term basis. Overall, 1,021 FTEs were employed by respondents during this period.

- Casual staff were employed by 40 per cent of institutions with paid staff, and accounted for 46,285 hours worked in the sector in the last financial year.
- Staff turnover in the sector tended to be low, with two-thirds of respondents reporting a turnover of less than 10 per cent of their total staff during this period.
- The majority (83 per cent) of museums used the services of volunteers, who worked a total of 143,445 hours for responding institutions during the past financial year.
- Eleven museums hired a total of 17 interns during the last financial year, just over one-third (35 per cent) of whom were paid. Respondents reported that interns had worked a total of 1,750 hours during this period.
- The most common no cost services received by institutions during the last financial year were IT services (13 per cent), human resource services (11 per cent), and financial management services (10 per cent).
- By far the most pressing staffing related concern for museums was a lack of staff or volunteer resources (60 per cent). Other pressing concerns were funding (28 per cent), training and development (19 per cent) and an aging roster of staff/volunteers (15 per cent).

Further comments and concerns

- Final comments from respondents reflected concerns expressed throughout earlier sections of the survey. Funding was a pressing concern in the coming year for one-third of museums, while building or improving their public profile was a concern for 18 per cent of institutions. Current staffing resources were a concern for 18 per cent of museums, while 17 per cent were concerned about growing their volunteer base.

Conclusion

Museums Aotearoa acknowledges the work and support of Iain Shaw and Lee Davidson from the Museum & Heritage Studies programme at Victoria University of Wellington, staff at the Ministry for Culture and Heritage, members of the sector reference group and Museums Aotearoa Board who have put many hours into developing and processing this survey. We particularly thank all the staff and volunteers at all the museums who gathered their information to contribute to the survey. We appreciate your feedback and look forward to continuing to improve the survey, the process, and the analysis and presentation of information.

This report represents comprehensive analysis of the data collected between November 2014 and July 2015, and some comparison with previous survey data. It is our intention to use this as the basis for further synthetic analysis, extrapolation and interpretation. We invite readers to make as much use of the reported data as possible, and to continue to provide feedback as we continue to gather, interpret and publish vital information about our museums and galleries.

Museums Aotearoa

October 2015

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

Museums Aotearoa, The Tari o Nga Whare Taonga o Te Motu, is New Zealand's independent professional organisation for museums and those who work in, or have an interest in, museums. Its mission is to raise the profile, strengthen the performance, and increase the value of museums and galleries to their stakeholders and the community. Of the estimated 470 museums and galleries in New Zealand, approximately 170 are members of Museums Aotearoa.

Museums Aotearoa commissioned a baseline survey of the sector in 2012, with the view to conducting regular and consistent research to assist in its mission supporting, and advocating for, the museum sector in New Zealand. The 2014 sector survey builds on this baseline and has been jointly funded by Museums Aotearoa and the Ministry for Culture and Heritage.

The aim of the sector survey is to develop a profile of the museums and galleries in New Zealand, and specifically those that are currently members of Museums Aotearoa. This information will be used to:

- Provide a comprehensive understanding and overview of the museums and galleries, specifically those that are members of Museums Aotearoa
- Identify factors that can be used to measure sector trends
- Assist with advocacy
- Inform strategic and business planning

RESEARCH AIMS

The sector survey aims to provide a detailed picture of the museum sector in New Zealand. Specifically it:

- Provides a profile of museums in New Zealand, including the key organisational, operational and governance characteristics of museums
- Identifies collection management, care and conservation practices
- Describes staffing structures and resourcing requirements
- Describes funding and revenue sources
- Identifies ways in which the public are able to access collections
- Identifies visitation trends

RESEARCH APPROACH

The 2014 sector survey builds on and extends the 2012 survey. The overall research approach and the development of the survey questions were undertaken in consultation with a reference group comprising representatives from the Ministry for Culture and Heritage and the museum sector.

An online version of the survey was developed using Survey Monkey™, with the survey also available in PDF and Word format for respondents who were unfamiliar with completing an online survey or who preferred to complete a hard copy of the survey. The survey was also available on the Museums Aotearoa website. (Refer to Appendix 1 for a copy of the invitation and the survey).

The survey was sent as a link on an invitation e-mail to a total of 471 museums, 169 of which were Museums Aotearoa members. A total of 95 responses were received between November 2014 and July 2015. This represents a response rate of around 27 per cent from all institutions currently active in New Zealand.

ETHICS STATEMENT

Participants were informed of the purpose of the research and how the information will be used. All research data of a confidential nature, particularly data that contain personal and identifying information, are locked in a secure cabinet, and electronic data of this nature are password-protected. This report contains aggregated, non-identifying data, which have been reported thematically to ensure that respondents' anonymity is preserved.

At the conclusion of the research raw electronic data was provided to Museums Aotearoa and researchers at the Ministry for Culture and Heritage. Participating museums were notified in the survey invitation that the survey data was to be shared with these organisations, and that the data will be treated confidentially. The purpose of sharing this information is to enable Museums Aotearoa to track sector changes and changes in the circumstances of individual museums; and for the Ministry for Culture and Heritage to analyse relevant data to inform their policy development.

DATA LIMITATIONS AND CAVEATS

There are several caveats to keep in mind when reading this report. These are briefly discussed below:

- The quality of some of the information provided by museums is variable. There are no sector standards on what data should be collected; how they should be collected; and how they should be recorded and reported. As such there are inconsistencies among museums.
- There may be differences in the ways that museums describe and count their acquisitions. For example, a museum may have reported a gift of 100 objects as one item or as 100 items (which may also depend on what kind of objects they are e.g. cars, artworks or photos).
- Similarly there may be differences in the ways that museum describe and count their collections. For example, a box of photos may be described and counted as one collection item, or each photo within the box may be counted as a collection item.
- Information about museums' opening hours and days was not collected in this survey. It is likely that this will impact on visitation data i.e. a museum may have more visitors as a consequence of being open more often and/or for longer hours.
- Many museums are part of larger organisations (e.g. local authorities or universities) and as such they may not have access to all of the data that were requested in the survey. Additionally data that are collected by the museums' governance and/or management organisations may be collected in ways that are appropriate for their monitoring and reporting requirements, but may not be presented or disaggregated in the way that is useful for this survey.
- The proportion of medium, small and micro museums that participated in the survey is relatively small, meaning we cannot be confident that their responses reflect the broader population of such institutions. The low response rate among these museums may reflect a lack of capacity and/or interest in national statistics.
- Although a total of 95 museums responded to this survey, not all museums answered every question. The number of respondents for each question is included in the table title, and percentages are calculated using those numbers.
- Percentage figures presented in the majority of tables have been rounded.
- This report includes comparisons by museum size, which, for ease of reading, have been presented as percentages; however it is important to note that when broken down by size

the actual number of museums in each group is small, particularly the medium and large museum groups.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPATING MUSEUMS

This section provides an overview of participating museums by size, year of establishment and location.

PARTICIPATING MUSEUMS BY SIZE

Small and micro museums comprised the vast majority of total survey responses (n=76, 80 per cent). Micro museums accounted for 38 per cent (n=36) of responses in 2014, a 2 per cent reduction from the 2012 survey, whilst small institutions accounted for 42 per cent (n=40) of responses, a 7 per cent increase from 2012. Medium museums comprised 8 per cent (n=8) of respondents in 2014, a significant decrease from the 19 per cent of total responses received in 2012. Large museums accounted for 12 per cent (n=11) of all responses received in 2014, and this may have some impact upon overall findings of the survey, since large institutions account for just 4 per cent of total museums in New Zealand.

Table 1: Size of participating museums (n=95)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Survey respondents	12%	8%	42%	38%	100%
Proportion of sector[1]	4%	6%	34%	51%	

YEAR MUSEUMS WERE ESTABLISHED

Whilst 65 per cent (n=62) of responding institutions were established from 1970 onwards, this differed significantly depending on the size of the institution. Almost two-thirds of large (n=7, 64 per cent) and medium (n=5, 63 per cent) institutions were established before 1970, compared with less than a third of small institutions (n=12, 30 per cent) and a quarter (n=9) of micro institutions. There were two responses received from institutions established since 2010.

Table 2: Year of museum establishment (n=95)

Year Established	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Unknown	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%
Pre-1900	36%	13%	0%	0%	5%
1900-1949	9%	38%	3%	0%	5%
1950-1959	0%	0%	5%	3%	3%
1960-1969	18%	13%	23%	19%	20%
1970-1979	0%	13%	25%	33%	24%
1980-1989	9%	0%	18%	14%	14%
1990-1999	18%	13%	15%	8%	13%
2000-2009	0%	13%	13%	17%	13%
2010-	9%	0%	0%	3%	2%

LOCATION OF PARTICIPATING MUSEUMS

The Auckland region accounted for 17 per cent (n=16) of all responses received, including 36 per cent (n=4) of all responses from large institutions. Canterbury and Waikato each accounted for 12 per cent (n=11) of respondents, whilst Northland and Wellington each accounted for 11 per cent

[1] The remaining five per cent of the sector are private museums without a size classification.

(n=10). Responses from medium institutions were split evenly across the regions. Wellington accounted for 18 per cent (n=7) of responses from small institutions, whilst Canterbury accounted for 19 per cent (n=7) of responses from micro institutions.

Table 3: Location of participating museums (n=95)

Region	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Northland	0%	13%	13%	11%	11%
Auckland	36%	13%	15%	14%	17%
Waikato	9%	13%	10%	14%	12%
Bay of Plenty	0%	0%	3%	0%	1%
Gisborne	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Hawkes Bay	9%	0%	5%	0%	3%
Taranaki	0%	13%	3%	11%	6%
Manawatu/Whanganui	0%	0%	5%	11%	6%
Wairarapa	0%	0%	3%	6%	3%
Wellington	9%	13%	18%	3%	11%
Nelson/Marlborough	0%	13%	5%	0%	3%
West Coast	0%	0%	3%	3%	2%
Canterbury	18%	0%	5%	19%	12%
Otago	18%	13%	8%	3%	7%
Southland	0%	13%	8%	6%	6%

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

This section provides institutional information including:

- The legal status of museums
- Governance
- Frequency of mission reviews
- Management of Iwi relations
- Primary and secondary functions of museums
- Admission charging regimes
- Number of buildings
- Total exhibition floor space
- On-site facilities

LEGAL STATUS

Museums were asked to specify the current legal status of their institution from the list of options provided in Table 4. Respondents were able to select all applicable categories, resulting in a total of 129 responses. The most commonly selected categories were 'charitable trust' (n=52, 55 per cent) and 'incorporated society' (n=39, 41 per cent). The 'other' category (n=11, 12 per cent) included:

- autonomous crown entity (n=7, 7 per cent)
- unit within a central government body (n=2, 2 per cent).

When broken down by size, 45 per cent (n=3) of large institutions stated that they were a unit of council, 88 per cent (n=7) of medium institutions and 40 per cent (n=16) of small institutions stated they were a charitable trust/registered charity. For micro institutions, 'incorporated society' and 'charitable trust/registered charity' each accounted for 72 per cent (n=26) of responses.

Table 4: Legal status of museums (n=95)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Charitable Trust/Registered Charity	27%	88%	40%	72%	55%
Incorporated society	9%	13%	28%	72%	41%
Council Controlled Organisation (CCO)/Unit of Council	45%	75%	30%	0%	24%
Other	0%	0%	23%	6%	12%
Statutory Board or Trust (i.e. Act of Parliament)	18%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Private company	0%	0%	5%	0%	2%
Limited Liability Company	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Iwi authority	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

GOVERNANCE

Respondents were asked to specify what type of governing body their institution was governed by from the categories in Table 5, and were again able to select all those that were applicable, resulting in 102 responses. The two most commonly selected categories were 'elected committee' (n=35, 37 per cent) and 'trust board' (n=34, 36 per cent). The 'other' category (n=16, 17 per cent) included 7 per cent (n=7) of respondents who stated that their governing body was appointed by a Crown Minister or other central government agency.

Just over two-thirds (n=24, 67 per cent) of micro museums are governed by an elected committee, with a quarter (n=10) of small institutions governed in the same manner. Almost two-thirds (n=5, 63 per cent) of medium museums are governed by a trust board, whilst 45 per cent (n=5) of large institutions are governed in the same way.

Table 5: Governing body of institution (n=95)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Elected Committee	0%	13%	25%	67%	37%
Trust Board	45%	63%	33%	31%	36%
Council	27%	25%	23%	0%	15%
Board of Directors	27%	0%	0%	0%	3%
Other	9%	0%	33%	6%	17%

Eighty-nine respondents indicated how frequently their institution's governing body met each year, with 54 per cent (n=48) stating that this was at least once per month, including 40 per cent (n=4) of large institutions, 75 per cent (n=6) of medium institutions, 57 per cent (n=20) of small institutions and 50 per cent (n=18) of micro institutions. A further 19 per cent (n=17) of institutions hold governance meetings at least twice per year, including 20 per cent (n=2) of large institutions, 13 per cent (n=1) of medium institutions, 26 per cent (n=9) of small institutions and 14 per cent (n=5) of micro institutions.

Table 6: Frequency of governance meetings (n=89)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Meet at least once per month	40%	75%	57%	50%	54%
Meet 10-11 times per year	0%	0%	3%	0%	1%
Meet 7-9 times per year	30%	13%	0%	3%	6%
Meet 6 times per year	20%	13%	26%	14%	19%
Meet 3-5 times per year	10%	0%	3%	25%	12%
Meet 2 times per year	0%	0%	3%	3%	2%
Governance meetings held sporadically, or as required	0%	0%	9%	6%	6%

There were 92 responses indicating the payment arrangements for governing bodies. Almost two-thirds (n=59, 64 per cent) of these stated that their governing body was entirely made up of volunteers, including 30 per cent (n=3) of large institutions, 29 per cent (n=2) of medium institutions, 50 per cent (n=20) of small institutions, and 97 per cent (n=34) of micro institutions. Twenty-seven per cent (n=25) of respondents stated that their governing body was paid, including 50 per cent (n=5) of large institutions, 57 per cent (n=4) of medium institutions and 40 per cent (n=16) of small institutions. The remaining 8 per cent (n=7) of respondents stated that their governing body had a mix of paid and volunteer members.

Table 7: Payment of governing body (n=92)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Volunteer	30%	29%	50%	97%	64%
Paid	50%	57%	40%	0%	27%
Mixed	20%	14%	8%	3%	8%
As per LGA	0%	0%	3%	0%	1%

FREQUENCY OF MISSION REVIEWS

As shown in Table 8, 61 per cent (n=58) of respondents indicated that they reviewed their internal missions and goals at least once per year, including 54 per cent (n=6) of large institutions, 63 per cent (n=5) of medium institutions, 65 per cent (n=26) of small institutions and 58 per cent (n=21) of micro institutions. Annual reviews were most common, being carried out by 48 per cent (n=46) of respondents overall.

Table 8: Frequency of mission reviews (n=95)

	Large	medium	Small	Micro	Total
Reviewed quarterly	0%	0%	3%	3%	2%
Reviewed bi-annually	9%	13%	8%	14%	11%
Reviewed annually	45%	50%	55%	42%	48%
Reviewed every 3 years	0%	13%	10%	3%	6%
Reviewed every 5 years	18%	0%	5%	6%	6%
Reviewed less frequently than every 5 years	0%	13%	5%	19%	11%
Reviewed as required	18%	13%	8%	8%	9%
No formal review process	0%	0%	8%	6%	5%

RELATIONSHIP WITH IWI GROUPS

Museums were asked to specify who within their institution was responsible for managing relations with iwi groups from the categories outlined in Table 9. Respondents were able to select all those that were relevant to them, resulting in a total of 120 responses. Just over a third (n=35, 37 per cent) indicated that they currently had no specific relationship with iwi groups, including two-thirds (n=24) of micro institutions. A similar number (n=32, 34 per cent) stated that their board or governing body was at least partially responsible for this relationship, including 45 per cent (n=18) of small institutions. A Kaihautu or equivalent staff member managed iwi relations for 23 per cent (n=22) of museums, including almost two-thirds (n=7) of large institutions. Included in the 'other' category (n=26, 27 per cent) were 50 per cent (n=4) of medium institutions who indicated that they rely upon senior management to manage these relationships.

Table 9: Management of iwi relations (n=95)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
No specific relationship with iwi groups	9%	13%	23%	67%	37%
Board/governing body	27%	13%	45%	28%	34%
Kaihautu or equivalent staff member	64%	13%	33%	3%	23%
Maori Komiti	27%	13%	0%	3%	5%
Other	45%	50%	35%	8%	27%

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY FUNCTIONS OF MUSEUMS

Institutions were asked to select their primary and secondary functions from the categories shown in Table 10. The most commonly identified primary function was ‘history museum/social history/community museum’ (n=33, 35 per cent), which was also identified by 18 per cent (n=17) as a secondary function. Just over a third (n=4, 36 per cent) of large institutions describe their primary function as being ‘multidisciplinary’.

Table 10: Primary functions (n=95)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
History museum/social history/community museum	18%	0%	35%	47%	35%
Art museum/gallery	27%	38%	25%	3%	18%
Historic site/building	0%	50%	20%	3%	14%
Special theme museum	9%	13%	8%	17%	12%
Other	0%	0%	8%	14%	8%
Multidisciplinary	36%	0%	5%	0%	6%
Archive	0%	0%	0%	11%	4%
Science museum/science and technology centre	9%	0%	0%	6%	3%
Natural history	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

‘Archive’ was the most common secondary function (n=24, 25 per cent), followed by ‘historic site/building’ (n=19, 20 per cent). Overall, the most commonly selected function was ‘history museum/social history/community museum’, accounting for 53 per cent (n=50) of responses across both primary and secondary functions, while ‘historic site’ accounted for 34 per cent (n=32) of combined responses and ‘archive’ for 29 per cent (n=28).

Table 11: Secondary functions (n=95)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Archive	18%	25%	25%	28%	25%
Historic site/building	0%	13%	28%	19%	20%
History museum/social history/community museum	0%	0%	20%	25%	18%
Other	45%	25%	8%	17%	17%
Multidisciplinary	27%	25%	3%	6%	8%
Special theme museum	0%	0%	10%	3%	5%
Art museum/gallery	0%	13%	8%	0%	4%
Science museum/science and technology centre	9%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Natural history	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%

ADMISSION CHARGING REGIMES

Museums were asked to indicate their admission charging regimes, selecting all that were applicable from the categories in Table 12. A total of 135 responses were recorded by 95 respondents. Forty per cent (n=38) of institutions have no admission charge, including 55 per cent (n=6) of large institutions, 63 per cent (n=5) of medium institutions, 33 per cent (n=13) of small institutions and 39 per cent (n=14) of micro institutions. The same proportion (n=38, 40 per cent) of institutions encourage visitors to make a donation in exchange for admission, including 64 per cent (n=7) of large institutions, 38 per cent (n=3) of medium institutions, 25 per cent (n=10) of small institutions, and 39 per cent (n=18) of micro institutions.

Twenty-eight per cent (n=27) of respondents charge for admission using a tiered pricing structure, including 40 per cent (n=16) of small institutions and 25 per cent (n=9) of micro institutions. Just 17 per cent (n=16) of institutions charge for special or touring exhibitions, including 91 per cent (n=10) of large institutions and 50 per cent (n=4) of medium institutions.

Table 12: Admission charging regimes (n=95)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
No admission charge / free entry for all	55%	63%	33%	39%	40%
Voluntary donation / koha	64%	38%	25%	50%	40%
Admission charge for all, with a tiered pricing structure	9%	13%	40%	25%	28%
Admission charge for special / touring exhibitions	91%	50%	3%	3%	17%
Free entry for locals, entry charges for domestic and international tourists	18%	25%	10%	0%	8%
Admission charge for adults only	9%	0%	0%	6%	3%
Not applicable - closed	0%	13%	3%	3%	3%
Other	0%	0%	3%	3%	2%

NUMBER OF BUILDINGS

Respondents reported a total of 571 active buildings. More than half (339, 59 per cent) of these buildings were on-site buildings that were separate from exhibiting sites. This high number of separate buildings was influenced by particular respondents, including the Museum of Transport and Technology which has 70 separate buildings, the Taranaki Pioneer Village with 40 additional buildings and Founders Heritage Park in Nelson with 32 separate buildings. Almost a third (179, 31 per cent) of buildings were exhibiting sites, whilst 9 per cent (53) consisted of separate off-site buildings.

Table 13: Number of buildings (n=95)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Number of exhibiting sites	24	18	85	52	179
Number of separate on-site buildings	86	11	146	96	339
Number of separate off-site buildings	16	9	26	2	53

EXHIBITION FLOOR SPACE

Respondents reported a total of 95,110 sqm of exhibition floor space, with 56 per cent (53,498 sqm) of this space belonging to large institutions. In terms of average exhibition floor space by institution size, large institutions have an average of 5,350 sqm, medium institutions have an average of 1,455 sqm, small institutions have an average of 473 sqm, and micro museums have an average of 549 sqm.

Table 14: Exhibition floor space – total, average and proportion by size (n=76)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Total exhibition floor space (sqm)	53,498	11,650	14,657	15,306	95,110
Proportion of sample total	56%	12%	15%	16%	100%
Average exhibition floor space (sqm)	5,350	1,455	473	612	1,285

ON-SITE FACILITIES

Museums were asked to specify which of the on-site facilities outlined in Table 15 were available at their institution. Respondents were able to select all those applicable, resulting in 157 responses from 95 respondents. The most common on-site facility was a functions area (n=40, 42 per cent). Almost all (n=10, 91 per cent) large institutions had a functions area, along with 50 per cent (n=4) of medium institutions, 35 per cent (n=14) of small institutions and 33 per cent (n=12) of micro institutions. Just over a fifth (n=20, 21 per cent) of respondents offered café or restaurant facilities, including 73 per cent (n=8) of large institutions, whilst a similar number (n=19, 20 per cent) have on-site theatre facilities. Almost a third (n=29, 31 per cent) of respondents reported 'other' facilities, including:

- Archive, private library or research facilities (n=8)
- Retail facilities, i.e. a gift shop (n=7)
- Office space and meeting rooms (n=3)

A quarter (n=24) of respondents stated that they had no facilities other than their exhibition space, including one medium institution, 25 per cent (n=10) of small institutions and 36 per cent (n=13) of micro institutions.

Table 15: On-site facilities (n=95)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Functions area	91%	50%	35%	33%	42%
Cafe/restaurant	73%	25%	23%	3%	21%
Theatre	73%	25%	18%	6%	20%
Artist studio	9%	13%	15%	3%	9%
Public library	36%	0%	0%	6%	6%
i-site/information centre	0%	38%	5%	0%	5%
Not applicable - Closed for redevelopment	0%	0%	3%	6%	3%
Not applicable - Virtual institution	0%	13%	3%	0%	2%
Other	9%	38%	35%	31%	31%
No other facilities	0%	13%	25%	36%	25%

COLLECTIONS AND EXHIBITIONS

This section provides information about museum collections and exhibition, including:

- Collection size
- Focus of collections
- Proportion of collection on display and in storage
- Inward and outward loan status
- Temporary exhibitions
- Touring exhibitions
- Acquisitions (number and value)
- Policy and planning
- Collection documentation and management system
- Online accessibility of collection
- Collection condition, conservation and storage
- Valuation
- Collection concerns

COLLECTION SIZE

Institutions were asked to state the approximate size of their collection. Respondents reported a total of 10,423,601 objects in their collections, with 87 per cent of this total held by large institutions. The low response rate from medium institutions may mean that their contribution to the total is under-reported. It is also important to note, as mentioned above, that there may be inconsistencies in the way that museums count collection items.

Table 16: Total/average number of collection objects and proportion of total by size (n=80)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Total number of objects	9,052,928	259,385	938,628	172,660	10,423,601
Average number of objects	1,005,881	32,423	29,332	5,570	128,695
Proportion of sample total	87%	2%	9%	2%	100%

Thirty per cent (n=24) of respondents had fewer than 1,000 items in their collection, whilst a further 26 per cent (n=21) had fewer than 5,000 items. Only 8 per cent (n=6) of respondents reported having more than 100,000 items in their collection, including four large and two small institutions. Just three museums, all large, had in excess of one million objects.

Table 17: Approximate size of collection (n=80)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
0-999 objects	0%	50%	22%	42%	30%
1,000-4,999 objects	0%	0%	34%	32%	26%
5,000-9,999 objects	11%	0%	16%	6%	10%
10,000-24,999 objects	11%	13%	19%	13%	15%
25,000-49,999 objects	11%	0%	3%	3%	4%
50,000-99,999 objects	22%	38%	0%	3%	8%
100,000-1mn objects	11%	0%	6%	0%	4%
Over 1mn objects	33%	0%	0%	0%	4%

FOCUS OF COLLECTIONS

Respondents were asked to state which types of objects were represented within their collection, selecting all applicable categories listed in Table 18. Photographs were the most commonly represented item, with 80 per cent (n=64) of institutions having them within their collections, including all nine large institutions, 75 per cent (n=6) of medium institutions, 72 per cent (n=23) of small institutions and 84 per cent (n=26) of micro institutions. Almost three-quarters (n=58, 73 per cent) of institutions reported having clothing/costumes and textiles, with the same number reporting the inclusion of social history objects in their collections.

Almost half (n=38, 48 per cent) of responding institutions have Taonga Māori objects within their collections, whilst 25 per cent (n=20) hold Pasifika objects. Only 14 per cent (n=11) of institutions reported holding non-New Zealand ethnography (Africa, Asia, Australia, the Americas) objects in their collections.

Table 18: Categories represented in collections (n=80)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Photographs	100%	75%	72%	84%	80%
Clothing/costumes and textiles	89%	63%	69%	74%	73%
Social history	78%	63%	75%	71%	73%
Books and printed materials	78%	75%	63%	71%	69%
Archives and manuscripts	78%	75%	56%	71%	66%
Decorative arts	78%	63%	59%	35%	53%
Agriculture	56%	50%	47%	55%	51%
Visual and fine arts	78%	63%	63%	23%	49%
Taonga Maori	67%	63%	47%	39%	48%
Military	67%	63%	34%	48%	46%
Technology	78%	63%	34%	42%	45%
Transport	67%	50%	31%	48%	44%
Archaeology	56%	63%	50%	23%	41%
Natural history (e.g. zoology, botany, geology)	56%	63%	28%	29%	35%
Maritime	67%	50%	28%	23%	33%
Science	67%	50%	22%	16%	28%
Pacific	56%	63%	22%	10%	25%
Other	33%	50%	9%	29%	24%
Non-New Zealand ethnography (Africa, Asia, Australia, the Americas)	56%	25%	6%	6%	14%

PROPORTION OF COLLECTIONS ON DISPLAY AND IN STORAGE

Just over a quarter (n=21, 27 per cent) of museums reported that less than 10 per cent their collection was on public display in the last financial year, including 89 per cent (n=8) of Large institutions and 63 per cent (n=5) of medium institutions. The same proportion (n=21, 27 per cent) noted that at least 90 per cent of their collection was on display, including 50 per cent (n=15) of micro institutions.

Table 19: Proportion of collection on display (n=77)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
0%-9%	89%	63%	17%	10%	27%
10%-19%	0%	13%	7%	0%	4%
20%-29%	11%	0%	13%	3%	8%
30%-39%	0%	0%	17%	0%	6%
40%-49%	0%	0%	3%	3%	3%
50%-59%	0%	0%	3%	10%	5%
60%-69%	0%	13%	0%	3%	3%
70%-79%	0%	0%	7%	3%	4%
80%-89%	0%	0%	17%	17%	13%
90% and above	0%	13%	17%	50%	27%

Eighteen per cent (n=14) of respondents reported that less than 10 percent of their collection was in storage in the last financial year, including 25 per cent (n=2) of medium institutions and 35 per cent (n=11) of micro institutions. A further 21 per cent (n=16) stated that between 10 and 19 per cent of their collection was in storage, including 31 per cent (n=9) of small institutions. In contrast, 26 per cent (n=20) of respondents noted that at least 90 per cent of their collection was in storage, including 89 per cent (n=8) of large institutions and 50 per cent (n=4) of medium institutions.

Table 20: Proportion of collection in storage (n=77)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
0%-9%	0%	25%	3%	35%	18%
10%-19%	0%	13%	31%	19%	21%
20%-29%	0%	0%	3%	6%	4%
30%-39%	0%	0%	7%	3%	4%
40%-49%	0%	13%	0%	6%	4%
50%-59%	0%	0%	0%	16%	6%
60%-69%	0%	0%	7%	0%	3%
70%-79%	0%	0%	17%	3%	8%
80%-89%	11%	0%	10%	3%	6%
90% and above	89%	50%	21%	6%	26%

Just over a third (n=27, 35 per cent) of respondents have less than 10 percent of their collection on permanent exhibition (i.e. for four or more years), including 89 per cent (n=8) of large institutions and 75 per cent (n=6) of medium institutions. Eighteen per cent (n=14) of museums noted that between 80 and 89 per cent of their collection was on permanent exhibition, including 24 per cent (n=7) of small institutions, whilst 21 per cent (n=16) had at least 90 per cent of their collection on permanent display, including 42 per cent (n=13) of micro institutions.

Table 21: Proportion of collection on permanent exhibition (n=77)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
0%-9%	89%	75%	28%	16%	35%
10%-19%	11%	0%	0%	6%	4%
20%-29%	0%	0%	14%	0%	5%
30%-39%	0%	0%	10%	0%	4%
40%-49%	0%	0%	7%	0%	3%
50%-59%	0%	0%	0%	13%	5%
60%-69%	0%	13%	0%	3%	3%
70%-79%	0%	0%	7%	0%	3%
80%-89%	0%	13%	24%	19%	18%
90% and above	0%	0%	10%	42%	21%

INWARD AND OUTWARD LOAN STATUS

More than half (n=53, 55 per cent) of respondents reported having at least one object on inward loan at the end of the last financial year. Overall, there were 15,665 objects on inward loan within the survey sample. As shown in Table 22, the vast majority (14,728, 94 per cent) of these objects were on long term loan (for two or more years), with the remaining 6 per cent (937) on short term loan. Most (13,664, 87 per cent) inward loans were to Large institutions, with 9 per cent (1,420) to small institutions.

Table 22: Proportion of objects on short/long term inward loan (n=53)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Short term	57%	8%	15%	20%	6%
Long term	89%	1%	9%	2%	94%
Total inward loans	87%	1%	9%	3%	

Almost a third (n=30, 31 per cent) of institutions reported having objects on outward loan. A total of 2886 outward loans was roughly equally divided between long term (1,456) and short term (1,430) outward loans. As shown in Table 23, the majority (2,054, 71 per cent) of total outward loans were from large institutions, with 16 per cent (455) from medium institutions and 12 per cent (337) from small institutions.

NB: This table excludes approximately 500,000 objects that are technically on outward load from Canterbury Museum post-earthquakes. [TO BE CONFIRMED]

Table 23: Proportion of objects on short/long term outward loan (n=30)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Short Term	67%	2%	7%	48%	50%
Long Term	33%	98%	93%	53%	50%
Total Outward Loans	71%	16%	12%	1%	

TEMPORARY EXHIBITIONS

Respondents were asked whether or not they had held any temporary exhibitions (i.e. lasting 2 years or less, and excluding touring exhibitions) in the last financial year. Seventy per cent (n=56) of responding museums stated that they had held temporary exhibitions within that time, including all large (n=9) and medium (n=8) institutions, three-quarters of small (n=24) institutions and just under half (n=15, 48 per cent) of micro institutions.

In total, 417 temporary exhibitions were held by responding institutions in the last financial year. As shown in Table 24, large institutions accounted for 34 per cent (143) of the sample total, whilst small institutions accounted for a further 35 per cent (147). Medium institutions held 22 per cent (90) of total temporary exhibitions, and micro institutions the remaining 9 per cent (37).

Table 24: Temporary exhibitions (n=56)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Held a temporary exhibition	100%	100%	75%	48%	70%
Proportion of total temp. exhibitions	34%	22%	35%	9%	

TOURING EXHIBITIONS

Museums were asked whether or not their institution had hosted or initiated any touring exhibitions (excluding temporary exhibitions) within the last financial year. A quarter (n=20) of responding institutions reported hosting or initiating touring exhibitions within that time, including 78 per cent (n=7) of large institutions, 63 per cent (n=5) of medium institutions, 22 per cent (n=7) of small institutions and one micro institution.

A total of 47 touring exhibitions were hosted, with 55 per cent (26) being hosted by large, 23 per cent (11) by medium and 21 per cent (10) by small museums. Twenty-two touring exhibitions were initiated during this period, 52 per cent (14) of these by large institutions.

A total of 770,407 visits to these exhibitions were reported, with 94 per cent of this total visitation occurring at large institutions. However, 60 per cent (n=3) of medium institutions and 71 per cent (n=5) of small institutions were unsure of visitor numbers to their exhibitions, impacting upon the overall spread of visitor share between institution types.

Table 25: Touring exhibitions hosted or initiated (n=80)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Hosted or initiated touring exhibition	78%	63%	22%	3%	20
Hosted touring exhibitions	55%	23%	21%	0%	47
Initiated touring exhibitions	52%	15%	26%	7%	27
Proportion of total visitation to touring exhibitions	94%	5%	1%	0%	770,407
Unsure of visitation to touring exhibitions	14%	60%	71%	0%	9

Museums were asked whether or not they had dedicated space for hosting touring exhibitions. Almost half (n=38, 48 per cent) of respondents have a dedicated touring exhibition space, including 89 per cent (n=8) of large, 100 per cent (n=8) of medium, 53 per cent (n=17) of small and 16 per cent (n=5) of micro institutions.

Of these 38 institutions offering dedicated space for touring exhibitions, 32 per cent (n=12) have less than 50 sqm in total, including 47 per cent (n=8) of small institutions and 60 per cent (n=3) of micro institutions. Eleven per cent (n=4) of respondents have a touring exhibition space in excess of 1,000 sqm, including 38 per cent (n=3) of large institutions and one medium institution.

Table 26: Dedicated space for touring exhibitions (n=80)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Have dedicated space for temporary exhibitions	89%	100%	53%	16%	48%
Dedicated space - less than 50 sqm	0%	13%	47%	60%	32%
Dedicated space - 50-99 sqm	25%	0%	18%	20%	16%
Dedicated space - 100-499 sqm	0%	38%	29%	0%	21%
Dedicated space - 500-999 sqm	38%	25%	0%	0%	13%
Dedicated space - More than 1,000 sqm	38%	13%	0%	0%	11%
Dedicated space - Don't know size	0%	13%	6%	20%	8%

NUMBER OF ACQUISITIONS

The majority (n=64, 80 per cent) of respondents acquired objects during the last financial year, with acquisitions by these museums totalling 23,531. Most (19,789, 84 per cent) of these objects were gifted or donated to institutions, whilst 10 per cent (2,406) were purchased and 5 per cent (1,230) collected during fieldwork.

As shown in Table 27, 77 per cent (18,019) of these objects were acquired by large institutions and 5 per cent (1,189) by medium institutions, with the remaining 18 per cent equally divided between small (2,112) and micro (2,211) museums.

Table 27: Means of acquisition by museum size (n=80)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Proportion gifted / donated	81%	99%	97%	92%	84%
Proportion purchased	13%	1%	2%	1%	10%
Proportion collected in field work	7%	0%	0%	2%	5%
Other	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%
Total	77%	5%	9%	9%	

VALUE OF ACQUISITIONS

The total value of acquisitions by survey respondents during this period was $7,638,174, with 56 per cent of this value coming from objects donated or gifted to institutions and the remaining 44 per cent from purchased items. Large institutions accounted for 88 per cent of the total value of acquisitions. Thirty-one per cent (n=20) of the 64 respondents to this question stated that they did not know the value of these acquisitions. This includes 13 per cent (n=8) of small institutions and 16 per cent (n=10) of micro institutions.

Table 28: Value of acquisitions by museum size (n=64)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Value of items gifted/donated %	50%	0%	4%	2%	56%
Value of items purchased %	38%	1%	4%	0%	44%
Total Value %	88%	1%	9%	2%	100%
Unknown/do not value acquisitions	0%	3%	13%	16%	31%

POLICIES

The majority of respondents (n=65, 81 per cent) have a collection management policy, ranging from 61 per cent (n=19) of micro institutions, up to 100 per cent (n=9) of large institutions. Most museums also have an acquisitions policy (n=69, 86 per cent) and a deaccession policy (n=59, 74 per cent). Whilst all large and medium institutions who reported having an acquisitions policy also reported having a deaccession policy, this was not the case with small and micro institutions.

Less than half (n=35, 44 per cent) of respondents have a disaster response plan, ranging from 89 per cent (n=8) of large institutions to 26 per cent (n=8) of micro institutions. Twenty-eight per cent (n=22) of respondents indicated that they have a digitisation policy, including 39 per cent (n=12) of micro institutions.

Table 29: Policies (n=80)

Size	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Collection management policy	100%	75%	97%	61%	81%
Acquisitions policy	100%	75%	97%	74%	86%
Deaccession policy	100%	75%	88%	52%	74%
Disaster Recovery Plan	89%	50%	47%	26%	44%
Digitisation policy	44%	13%	16%	39%	28%
None of the above	0%	25%	0%	16%	9%

COLLECTION DOCUMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Respondents were asked what proportion of their collection had been electronically and manually documented. Of the 68 respondents to this question, 31 per cent (n=21) reported that they had electronically documented at least 90 per cent of their collection, while 49 per cent (n=33) noted that at least 90 per cent of their collection had been manually documented. Around one fifth (n=14, 21 per cent) of institutions had electronically documented less than 10 per cent of their collection, whilst 19 per cent (n=13) had less than 10 per cent of their collection manually documented.

Table 30: Collection documentation methods (n=68)

	Manually					Electronically				
	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
0-9%	0%	43%	22%	15%	19%	0%	38%	10%	40%	21%
10-19%	13%	0%	4%	8%	6%	0%	0%	7%	15%	7%
20-29%	0%	0%	0%	4%	1%	11%	0%	13%	10%	10%
30-39%	0%	0%	0%	4%	1%	11%	0%	3%	5%	4%
40-49%	0%	0%	7%	4%	4%	0%	0%	3%	0%	1%
50-59%	13%	14%	0%	4%	4%	11%	25%	0%	5%	6%
60-69%	13%	0%	0%	4%	3%	11%	13%	3%	0%	4%
70-79%	0%	0%	0%	8%	3%	11%	0%	3%	5%	4%
80-89%	13%	14%	11%	4%	9%	11%	0%	13%	5%	9%
90% or above	50%	29%	56%	46%	49%	33%	25%	43%	15%	31%

Museums were also asked which of the methods collection management systems outlined in Table 31 were in use by their institution, resulting in 134 responses from 78 respondents. A third (n=26) of respondents reported that their institution uses Vernon, although notably no micro institutions currently use this system. Nineteen per cent (n=15) of respondents use Past Perfect, 12 per cent (n=9) use Ehive and 15 per cent (n=12) use another digital system.

In terms of manual systems, 29 per cent (n=23) of respondents reported using Excel, while 26 per cent (n=20) use a hardcopy system such as a card index. Thirty-seven per cent (n=29) reported using a mix of digital and hardcopy systems, examples of which included Microsoft packages such as Excel, Access and Word; asset management software; and manual methods such as index cards.

Table 31: Collection management systems (n=78)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Digital system - Vernon	89%	50%	45%	0%	33%
Digital system - Past Perfect	0%	25%	19%	23%	19%
Digital system - Ehive	11%	0%	16%	10%	12%
Digital system - Other	22%	0%	16%	17%	15%
Manual - Excel	22%	50%	29%	27%	29%
Manual - hardcopy e.g. card index	33%	13%	10%	43%	26%
A mix of digital and manual	33%	50%	32%	40%	37%

LEVEL OF DOCUMENTATION

Respondents were asked what proportion of their collection had been documented to inventory level[2], full catalogue level[3], and full cataloguing including digitised images of the collection. As shown in Table 32, 42 per cent (n=31) of respondents stated that more than 90 per cent of their collection had been documented to inventory level, whilst 23 per cent (n=17) stated that they had documented less than 10 per cent of their total collection to inventory level.

Table 32: Level of documentation - inventory (n=74)

Inventory level %	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
0-9%	0%	29%	25%	27%	23%
10-19%	0%	14%	4%	7%	5%
20-29%	0%	0%	4%	3%	3%
30-39%	0%	0%	4%	0%	1%
40-49%	11%	0%	4%	0%	3%
50-59%	11%	0%	4%	3%	4%
60-69%	11%	14%	4%	0%	4%
70-79%	22%	0%	0%	7%	5%
80-89%	11%	14%	14%	3%	9%
90% or above	33%	29%	39%	50%	42%

Only 14 per cent (n=11) of museums had documented at least 90 per cent of their collection to full catalogue level, compared to 38 per cent (n=29) who had less than 10 per cent of their collection documented to this level, including two-thirds (n=19) of micro institutions and 57 per cent (n=4) of medium institutions.

[2] Definition of inventory level: 'This includes sufficient key information to allow any object(s) in your care to be individually identified and verified. All accessioned items, loans inward and outward, and any other unaccessioned objects as appropriate are documented at this level.'

[3] Definition of full catalogue level: 'Departments will identify the collections that merit further, more detailed, documentation, thus raising the standard of information to catalogue level. Such documentation will include the known history of a specimen, and references to any relevant publication etc.'

Table 33: Level of documentation – fully catalogued (n=74)

Full catalogue level %	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
0-9%	13%	57%	16%	66%	38%
10-19%	13%	0%	16%	3%	9%
20-29%	13%	0%	13%	7%	9%
30-39%	0%	14%	6%	3%	5%
40-49%	13%	0%	6%	0%	4%
50-59%	38%	0%	3%	0%	5%
60-69%	0%	0%	3%	3%	3%
70-79%	0%	14%	13%	3%	8%
80-89%	0%	14%	6%	0%	4%
90% or above	13%	0%	19%	14%	14%

Whilst all respondents to this question had some proportion of their collection documented to full catalogue level including digitised images of objects, just over half (n=41, 54 per cent) had less than 10 per cent documented to this level. Only 11 per cent (n=8) of museums had succeeded in documenting more than 90 per cent of their collection in this manner, including 16 per cent (n=5) of small institutions.

Table 34: Level of documentation – fully catalogued including digitised images (n=74)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
0-9%	38%	63%	32%	79%	54%
10-19%	25%	0%	10%	0%	7%
20-29%	0%	13%	13%	7%	9%
30-39%	25%	0%	3%	0%	4%
40-49%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
50-59%	0%	13%	6%	0%	4%
60-69%	0%	0%	0%	7%	3%
70-79%	0%	13%	10%	0%	5%
80-89%	0%	0%	10%	0%	4%
90% or above	13%	0%	16%	7%	11%

ONLINE ACCESSIBILITY OF COLLECTION

Respondents were asked what proportion of their collection was accessible to online visitors at the end of the last financial year. Almost half (n=36, 49 per cent) of museums indicated that they did not have any collection items online, including half (n=3) of medium institutions, 45 per cent (n=14) of small institutions and 64 per cent (n=18) of micro institutions. A further 31 per cent (n=23) of respondents had less than 10 per cent of their collection available online. Only 5 per cent (n=4) of responding institutions have at least 90 per cent of their collection accessible to online visitors.

Table 35: Online accessibility of collection (n=74)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
0%	11%	50%	45%	64%	49%
0.1-0.9%	22%	17%	23%	7%	16%
1-9%	22%	0%	19%	11%	15%
10-19%	11%	17%	0%	7%	5%
20-29%	0%	0%	3%	4%	3%
30-39%	11%	0%	3%	4%	4%
40-49%	0%	0%	3%	0%	1%
50-59%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
60-69%	0%	0%	3%	0%	1%
70-79%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
80-89%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
90% or above	22%	17%	0%	4%	5%

COLLECTION CONDITION

Respondents were asked what proportion of the objects in their collection were in a stable (i.e. require no conservation treatment) or unstable (i.e. require conservation treatment) condition, at the end of the last financial year. Only 37 per cent (n=28) of respondents reported that at least 90 per cent of their collection was in a stable condition, whilst 13 per cent (n=10) of respondents reported that less than 10 per cent was in a stable condition.

Table 36: Proportion of collection in a stable condition (n=76)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
0-9%	13%	25%	10%	14%	13%
10-19%	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%
20-29%	0%	0%	3%	7%	4%
30-39%	0%	0%	3%	0%	1%
40-49%	13%	0%	3%	0%	3%
50-59%	13%	0%	10%	10%	9%
60-69%	0%	13%	10%	3%	7%
70-79%	38%	13%	16%	0%	12%
80-89%	0%	0%	13%	21%	13%
90% or above	25%	50%	32%	41%	37%

Just over a third (n=25, 35 per cent) of respondents reported that less than 10 per cent of their collection was in an unstable condition. One fifth (n=5) of micro museums indicated that 90 per cent or more of their collection was in an unstable collection.

Table 37: Proportion of collection in an unstable condition (n=71)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
0-9%	43%	57%	29%	35%	35%
10-19%	0%	29%	16%	12%	14%
20-29%	29%	0%	29%	15%	21%
30-39%	29%	0%	6%	4%	7%
40-49%	0%	14%	6%	4%	6%
50-59%	0%	0%	10%	12%	8%
60-69%	0%	0%	3%	0%	1%
70-79%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
80-89%	0%	0%	0%	8%	3%
90% or above	0%	0%	0%	12%	4%

CONSERVATION

Fewer than half (n=33, 41 per cent) the respondents had undertaken conservation on at least one object during the last financial year. A total of 5,827 objects were treated during this period, with 83 per cent (4,835) of objects conserved at large institutions and a further 14 per cent (831) by micro institutions.

Table 38: Objects receiving conservation treatment (n=33)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Number of objects treated by conservators	4,835	6	155	831	5,827
Average number of objects treated	537	0.8	5	27	73
Proportion of sample total	83%	0%	3%	14%	100%

All responding large institutions undertook conservation on at least one object, and 44 per cent (n=4) undertook conservation on at least 100 objects.

Those who had not undertaken conservation on any objects during the previous financial year (n=47, 59 per cent), included 75 per cent (n=6) of medium institutions, 56 per cent (n=18) of small institutions and 74 per cent (n=23) of micro institutions.

Table 39: Museums not undertaking conservation by size (n=47)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
No conservation undertaken	0%	75%	56%	74%	59%

Museums were asked if they had successfully met their conservation targets or expectations for the last financial year. Over half (n=47, 59 per cent) of respondents reported that they had met their conservation goals during this period, including 67 per cent (n=6) of large institutions, 63 per cent (n=5) of medium institutions, 56 per cent (n=18) of small institutions, and 58 per cent of micro institutions. Those respondents who did not meet their conservation goals were asked to indicate the reasons for this and these included limited finances, lack of conservation planning, or conserving objects as required rather than proactively.

Table 40: Conservation goals met during last financial year (n=80)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Yes	67%	63%	56%	58%	59%
No	33%	38%	44%	42%	41%

STORAGE

Respondents were asked what proportion of their collection was stored in areas they considered adequate, that is, in secure premises, large enough to accommodate collections safely, to prevent their deterioration and/or damage, and allow safe access for staff. Fewer than half (n=35, 45 per cent) of respondents reported that at least 90 per cent of their collection was adequately stored, including 38 per cent (n=3) of large institutions, 75 per cent (n=6) of medium institutions, 35 per cent (n=11) of small institutions, and 50 per cent (n=15) of micro institutions. Around one fifth (n=16, 21 per cent) of respondents, including museums of all sizes, reported that less than 10 per cent of their collection was stored adequately.

Table 41: Proportion of collection stored in adequate conditions (n=77)

	Large	Medium	small	Micro	Total
0-9%	25%	13%	23%	20%	21%
10-19%	0%	13%	10%	10%	9%
20-29%	0%	0%	3%	3%	3%
30-39%	13%	0%	3%	0%	3%
40-49%	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%
50-59%	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%
60-69%	0%	0%	3%	3%	3%
70-79%	13%	0%	19%	0%	9%
80-89%	13%	0%	3%	7%	5%
90% or above	38%	75%	35%	50%	45%

VALUATION

Museums were asked what proportion of their collection had been valued as heritage assets for public accounting purposes in the last five years. Of the 74 responses to this question, around two-thirds (n=50, 68 per cent) of museums reported that less than 10 per cent of their total collection had been valued, including 56 per cent (n=5) of large institutions, 75 per cent (n=6) of medium institutions, 46 per cent (n=13) of small institutions and 90 per cent (n=26) of micro institutions. These responses indicate a polarisation in collection valuation, across all museum sizes, with just 8 per cent (n=6) of respondents stating that between 10 and 89 per cent of their collection had been valued. Only 18 per cent (n=13) of respondents reported that at least 90 per cent of their collection had been valued, whilst 7 per cent (n=5) were unsure what proportion had been valued.

Table 42: Proportion of collection valued (n=74)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
0-9%	56%	75%	46%	90%	68%
10-19%	0%	0%	4%	0%	1%
20-29%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
30-39%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
40-49%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
50-59%	11%	0%	4%	0%	3%
60-69%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
70-79%	0%	0%	4%	0%	1%
80-89%	0%	0%	7%	0%	3%
90% or above	22%	25%	29%	3%	18%
Don't know	11%	0%	7%	7%	7%

Respondents were then asked when their collection was last valued, with 35 responses received. Thirty-four per cent (n=13) reported that the last valuation had been undertaken during 2014, whilst a further 51 per cent (n=18) indicated it had taken place between 2010 and 2013.

Table 43: Date of latest valuation (n=35)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Pre-2000	0%	25%	18%	0%	11%
2000-2009	17%	0%	0%	0%	3%
2010	17%	0%	12%	13%	11%
2011	0%	25%	0%	13%	6%
2012	17%	0%	24%	25%	20%
2013	0%	0%	18%	25%	14%
2014	50%	50%	29%	25%	34%

Finally, these respondents were asked the declared asset value at their latest valuation. Of the 31 responses received, almost half (n=15) stated that this value was less than $1 million, with 67 per cent (n=10) of small institutions and 80 per cent (n=4) of micro institutions falling into this category. A further 19 per cent (n=6) of institutions reported a value of between $1 million and $9 million, including 29 per cent (n=2) of large institutions. Forty-three per cent (n=3) of large institutions have a collection valued in excess of $100 million.

Table 44: Declared asset value of collection (n=31)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Less than $1mn	0%	25%	67%	80%	48%
$1mn - $9mn	29%	25%	20%	0%	19%
$10mn-$49mn	14%	50%	13%	20%	19%
$50mn-$99mn	14%	0%	0%	0%	3%
More than $100mn	43%	0%	0%	0%	10%

COLLECTION CONCERNS

When ask for the most pressing concerns with regards to their collection, unsuitable storage facilities was by far the most common response regardless of museum size, with 41 per cent (n=33) of respondents listing it as a concern. Lack of staffing resources was a concern for 18 per cent (n=14) of respondents, with small museums being over-represented (n=11, 34 per cent) in this category. A third (n=3) of large institutions considered the cataloguing of their collection to be a pressing concern, whilst a quarter (n=2) of medium institutions were concerned about the need to undertake conservation.

Table 45: Most pressing collection concerns (n=80)

Issue	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Unsuitable storage	56%	63%	47%	26%	41%
Lack of staff	11%	0%	34%	6%	18%
Cataloguing	33%	13%	16%	10%	15%
Display of collection	22%	13%	16%	13%	15%
Need to undertake conservation	0%	25%	9%	16%	13%
Collection not valued	22%	13%	3%	13%	10%
Cost of maintenance/conservation	11%	0%	6%	16%	10%
Creation of accession/deaccession policy	11%	13%	16%	3%	10%
Seismic strengthening required	11%	0%	3%	3%	4%
Ownership of building	0%	0%	3%	3%	3%
Age of volunteers	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%
Lack of space	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%
Need to increase income stream	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%
Potential for collection to be damaged	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%
No budget for acquisitions	0%	0%	3%	0%	1%
None	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%

ACCESS, VISITATION AND ENGAGEMENT

This section provides an overview of information relating to visitation and other forms of public engagement, including:

- The ways in which museums count visitors
- Visitation
- Visitor origin
- Education programmes
- Public programming
- Friends and Members programmes
- Website
- Social media presence
- On-site technology facilities
- Access, visitation and engagement concerns

COUNTING VISITORS

Museums were asked to indicate the main way in which they count visitors. Of the 78 responses received, 40 per cent (n=31) employed a manual door count system, including 25 per cent (n=2) of medium institutions, 52 per cent (n=16) of small institutions, and 43 per cent (n=13) of micro institutions. Twenty-seven per cent (n=21) of institutions reported using admission charges or ticket sales as their main counting method, including 38 per cent (n=3) of medium museums. Over three-quarters (n=7, 78 per cent) of large institutions use an electronic door count, along with 38 per cent (n=3) of medium institutions. Only 10 per cent (n=8) of respondents stated that they did not count visitors, including 20 per cent (n=6) of micro institutions.

Table 46: The main way in which museums count in-person visitation (n=78)

Method	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Manual door count	0%	25%	52%	43%	40%
Admissions / charges / ticketing	22%	38%	32%	20%	27%
Electronic door count	78%	38%	3%	0%	14%
We do not count our visitors	0%	0%	6%	20%	10%
Estimate	0%	0%	6%	10%	6%
Visitor book	0%	0%	0%	7%	3%

VISITATION

Respondents reported a total of 4,927,410 on-site visits during the last financial year, with 82 per cent of this visitation occurring at large institutions, 10 per cent at medium, 7 per cent at small and 1 per cent at micro institutions.

Table 47: Total on-site visits in past financial year (n=77)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Total number of visitors	4,020,151	494,058	361,276	51,925	4,927,410
Average number of visitors	446,683	82,343	12,458	2,473	75,806
Proportion of visitor total	82%	10%	7%	1%	100%

As shown in Table 48, around half (n=40, 52 per cent) of respondents reported receiving up to 10,000 visits during the last financial year, with a further 19 per cent (n=14) receiving between 10,000 and 100,000 visits. Only 16 per cent (n=12) of respondents reported visitation in excess of 100,000, including all large institutions (n=9).

Table 48: Visitation by banding (n=77)

Annual Visitation	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
0-99	0%	0%	3%	10%	5%
100-999	0%	0%	6%	31%	14%
1,000-9,999	0%	0%	55%	28%	32%
10,000-49,999	0%	50%	23%	3%	16%
50,000-99,999	0%	0%	6%	0%	3%
100,000-199,999	33%	25%	0%	0%	6%
200,000-299,999	22%	13%	0%	0%	4%
300,000-399,999	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
400,000-499,999	11%	0%	0%	0%	1%
500,000-999,999	22%	0%	0%	0%	3%
Over 1 million	11%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Institution closed	0%	13%	0%	7%	4%
Unknown	0%	0%	6%	21%	10%

VISITOR ORIGIN

Table 49 shows the average proportions of total visitation by visit origin. Local visits from the town/city or region in which the museum was located made up the majority (75 per cent on average) of museum visitation. Overall, an average of 17 per cent of visits were from elsewhere in New Zealand and 19 per cent from overseas, although the proportion of visits from overseas was higher for large and medium museums.

Table 49: Visitor origin – average proportion of total visitation (n=78)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Overall
Your local area (i.e. town / city)	54%	56%	48%	35%	46%
Your local area (i.e. region)	7%	29%	28%	38%	29%
Elsewhere in New Zealand	12%	12%	21%	19%	17%
Overseas	32%	27%	18%	12%	19%
Don't know the breakdown	0%	0%	20%	24%	20%

The majority (n=8, 89 per cent) of large institutions based their figures for visitor origin on data, as did half (n=4) of medium institutions. In contrast, around two-thirds of small and micro institutions based their figures on estimates.

Table 50: Information source for origin of visitors (n=78)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Based on data	89%	50%	32%	33%	41%
Estimate	11%	50%	68%	67%	59%

EDUCATION PROGRAMMES

Forty-nine museums indicated that they held education programmes in the last financial year. According to this sample, a total of 182,947 students attended these education programmes. Around two-thirds of this total attended programmes at large institutions. Table 51 shows the proportion of school holiday and curriculum focused programmes, school groups and student numbers by museum size. Whilst the figures suggest that 72 per cent of curriculum focus programmes were run by medium institutions, this is due to different institutions reporting their data in different ways, rather than being a true reflection of the proportion of activities. [TO BE CONFIRMED]

Table 51: Institutions hosting education programmes (n=49)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro
School holiday programmes	31%	52%	11%	6%
Curriculum focus programmes	20%	72%	7%	0%
Number of school groups visited	62%	22%	15%	2%
Total number of students in these groups	67%	21%	11%	2%

PUBLIC PROGRAMMING

Almost two-thirds (n=51, 65 per cent) of museums undertook public programming other than education, including all large (n=9) and medium (n=8) institutions, 74 per cent (n=23) of small and 37 per cent (n=11) of micro institutions.

Table 52: Public programmes (n=78)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Public Programmes	100%	100%	74%	37%	65%

The 51 respondents who had undertaken public programmes were asked what form these had taken. Sixty-nine per cent (n=35) reported hosting curator talks and tours, whilst 67 per cent (n=34) held openings.

Table 53: Types of public programmes (n=51)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Curator talks and tours	89%	88%	52%	73%	69%
Openings	89%	63%	65%	55%	67%
Other	56%	50%	52%	64%	55%
Film evenings	56%	25%	26%	9%	27%
Concerts	67%	38%	13%	9%	25%
Behind the Scenes	56%	25%	17%	0%	22%

FRIENDS AND MEMBERS PROGRAMMES

Almost two-thirds (n=49, 63 per cent) of respondents have a Friends or Members programme, including all (n=9) large museums who have an average of 2,674 members each. Three-quarters (n=6) of medium institutions have Friends or Members schemes, along with 68 per cent of small institutions and 43 per cent of micro institutions.

Of those with programmes, just over two-thirds (n=34, 69 per cent) reported holding events for Friends and Members during the past financial year, with an average of eight friends and members events per institution. Almost two-thirds (n=7, 64 per cent) of large institutions held events, with each institution holding an average of 19 events.

Table 54: Friends/Members programmes and events (n=78)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Have Members/Friends programme	100%	75%	68%	43%	63%
Hold Members/Friends events	78%	63%	42%	30%	44%
Average number of Members/Friends	2,674	236	120	97	782
Average number of Members/Friends events	19	4	5	4	8

WEBSITE

The majority (n=59, 76 per cent) of museums have a website, including all large (n=9) and medium (n=8) institutions.

Table 55: Proportion of museums with a website (n=78)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Have Website	100%	100%	81%	57%	76%

Those museums with a website reported a total of 3,441,310 website visits during the last financial year. Almost one-third (n=9, 32 per cent) of institutions reported between 50,000 and 99,999 visits during that period, including 50 per cent (n=4) of large institutions and 60 per cent (n=3) of medium institutions. Just four institutions reported more than 100,000 visits to their websites.

Table 56: Number of website visits in the last financial year (n=59)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
1-999	0%	0%	22%	0%	7%
1,000-9,999	0%	0%	22%	67%	21%
10,000-49,999	13%	40%	33%	17%	25%
50,000-99,999	50%	60%	11%	17%	32%
100,000-499,999	13%	0%	11%	0%	7%
500,000-999,999	13%	0%	0%	0%	4%
Over 1 Million	13%	0%	0%	0%	4%

All museums with websites indicated that they used them to provide visitor information, while 80 per cent (n=47) also include information on public programmes and events and 61 per cent (n=42) offer information about current exhibitions. Almost half (n=29, 49 per cent) include governance and policy information, whilst 25 per cent (n=15) provide a collections database, including 29 per cent (n=5) of micro institutions.

Table 57: Information and services provided by website (n=59)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Visiting information e.g. opening hours, entry costs, parking, map	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Public programmes and events	100%	88%	84%	59%	80%
Current exhibitions	100%	100%	52%	71%	71%
Social media sites e.g. Facebook	89%	88%	48%	53%	61%
Membership or 'Friends' information	89%	63%	52%	35%	54%
Gifting or donating information	78%	63%	52%	35%	53%
Corporate information e.g. staff and governance details, annual reports/plans, employment	89%	88%	48%	12%	49%
Facilities e.g. venue hire	89%	50%	44%	29%	47%
Archives of past exhibitions	67%	75%	24%	47%	44%
Education programmes	89%	88%	4%	24%	34%
Collections database	67%	13%	12%	29%	25%
Online retail	56%	38%	8%	24%	24%
Information about research being conducted by museum staff	56%	0%	4%	29%	19%
Blog	44%	25%	8%	6%	15%
Podcasts	22%	13%	0%	6%	7%
Other	22%	0%	8%	6%	8%

SOCIAL MEDIA PRESENCE

Respondents were asked which of the social media channels listed in Table 58 they used. Almost two-thirds (n=52, 67 per cent) of respondents have a public Facebook page, including 77 per cent (n=24) of small institutions and 40 per cent (n=12) of micro institutions. Just over a third (n=28, 36 per cent) have a Twitter account, although this included just 7 per cent (n=2) of micro institutions. Around a quarter (n=20, 26 per cent) maintain a YouTube channel, including 56 per cent (n=5) of large institutions and 63 per cent (n=5) of medium institutions. Twenty-eight per cent (n=22) of museums reported using none of these five options, including 19 per cent (n=6) of small institutions, and 53 per cent (n=16) of micro institutions, with none of these respondents using an alternative social media channel.

Table 58: Social media presence (n=78)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Facebook	89%	100%	77%	40%	67%
Twitter	67%	75%	45%	7%	36%
YouTube	56%	63%	23%	10%	26%
LinkedIn	44%	13%	6%	7%	12%
Instagram	44%	38%	3%	3%	12%
None of the above	0%	0%	19%	53%	28%
Other	22%	0%	0%	7%	5%

ON-SITE TECHNOLOGY FACILITIES

Museums were asked what technology facilities they provide on-site for staff and visitors. For visitors, 17 per cent (n=13) of respondents offer computers, including 56 per cent (n=5) of large and

38 per cent (n=3) of medium institutions. Almost a quarter (n=19, 24 per cent) of museums currently offer WIFI to the public, including 67 per cent (n=6) of large and 50 per cent (n=4) of medium institutions.

For staff needs, 71 per cent (n=55) of respondents provide computers, including 84 per cent (n=19) of small institutions and 47 per cent (n=14) of micro institutions. Almost half (n=38, 49 per cent) offer WIFI for staff, including 61 per cent (n=19) of small institutions and 20 per cent (n=6) of micro institutions.

Table 59: Onsite technology facilities (n=78)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
For visitors - Computers	56%	38%	6%	10%	17%
For visitors - Public WIFI access	67%	50%	23%	7%	24%
For staff - Computers	89%	88%	84%	47%	71%
For staff - WIFI access	67%	88%	61%	20%	49%

ACCESS, VISITATION AND ENGAGEMENT CONCERNS

Respondents were given the opportunity to indicate their most pressing concerns with regards to access, visitation and engagement. The need to increase visitation was the most common concern, reported by 22 per cent (n=16) of museums, including 25 per cent (n=2) of medium institutions, 35 per cent (n=9) of small institutions and 17 per cent (n=5) of micro institutions. The next most common concern was the need to improve public access to their collection and/or institution (n=12, 16 per cent), with eight of these respondents having concerns around the provision of physical access to their institution, and the remainder concerned about how visitors move about within their institution. Making better use of technology was a concern for 14 per cent (n=10) of museums, including five respondents who felt their institution needed to improve their online presence during the year ahead.

Table 60: Access, visitation and engagement concerns (n=73)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Increase visitation	0%	25%	35%	17%	22%
Improve public access	11%	50%	15%	10%	16%
Make better use of technology	33%	25%	8%	10%	14%
Improve visitor experience	22%	38%	8%	7%	12%
Building no longer fit for purpose	11%	13%	8%	13%	11%
Insufficient staffing	0%	0%	4%	20%	10%
No further concerns	0%	0%	4%	20%	10%
Improve public programming	0%	13%	8%	3%	5%
Lack of visitor research	0%	25%	8%	0%	5%
Improve use of resources	0%	0%	0%	10%	4%
Budget restrictions	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%
Lack of professional support	0%	0%	0%	3%	1%

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

This section contains information on the funding and revenue sources of museums, including:

- Operating expenditure
- Capital expenditure
- Revenue
- Overall institution value
- Financial concerns

OPERATING EXPENDITURE

Respondents were asked to state their total operating expenditure for the last financial year. Forty-nine respondents reported a total operating expenditure of $155,940,525 during this period, with large institutions accounting for 91 per cent of this total.

Table 61: Total operating expenditure for the last financial year (n=49)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Total operating expenditure	$142,019,051	$10,882,270	$2,543,606	$495,598	$155,940,525

Twenty-two per cent (n=11) of respondents reported operating expenditure of less than $10,000, with this figure accounted for entirely by micro institutions. A further 38 per cent (n=19) reported operating expenditure of between $10,000 and $250,000, including 79 per cent (n=11) of small institutions and 43 per cent (n=8) of micro institutions. Eighteen per cent (n=9) of respondents reported operating expenditures of between $1mn and $5mn dollars, including 44 per cent (n=4) of large institutions and 71 per cent (n=5) of medium institutions. Just over half (n=5, 56 per cent) of large institutions had an operating expenditure in excess of $5mn.

Table 62: Operating expenditure by grading band for the last financial year (n=49)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
$0-$9,999	0%	0%	0%	58%	22%
$10,000-$49,999	0%	0%	7%	21%	10%
$50,000-$99,999	0%	0%	36%	11%	14%
$100,000-$249,999	0%	0%	36%	11%	14%
$250,000-$999,999	0%	29%	21%	0%	10%
$1mn-$5mn	44%	71%	0%	0%	18%
Over $5mn	56%	0%	0%	0%	10%

Respondents were asked to detail their expenditure by type, with 50 responses received. Staff costs accounted for the highest proportion (31.3 per cent) of expenditure by type overall, and for all but micro museums when analysed by museum size. The biggest operating expenditure for micro institutions was operational occupancy costs (16.5 per cent), followed by the maintenance of buildings and exhibitions (14.6 per cent). In common with the 2012 survey, staff costs and depreciation were the two biggest operational expenditures encountered by institutions for the last financial year.

Table 63: Operating expenditure by type for the past financial year (n=50)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Staff costs	36.1%	38.6%	41.8%	8.8%	31.3%
Depreciation	19.3%	12.0%	9.3%	12.6%	13.3%
Occupancy e.g. rent / rates	8.9%	7.7%	8.0%	9.6%	8.6%
Operational occupancy costs e.g. electricity, water, gas, cleaning, security	4.6%	6.4%	6.8%	16.5%	8.6%
General administration	4.5%	11.5%	5.5%	9.3%	7.7%
Exhibitions	7.4%	8.9%	6.7%	6.5%	7.4%
Maintenance of buildings and exhibitions	3.3%	3.8%	2.5%	14.6%	6.1%
Conservation	0.4%	0.6%	7.3%	8.1%	4.1%
Insurance	3.0%	2.7%	2.3%	6.2%	3.6%
Acquisitions	1.3%	0.3%	7.9%	4.5%	3.5%
Storage facilities	1.4%	0.8%	0.1%	0.0%	0.6%
Training/professional development	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%	0.9%	0.6%
Other	9.2%	6.1%	1.6%	2.3%	4.8%

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

Museums were asked to report their total capital expenditure in the last financial year, with 67 responses received. The capital expenditure of respondents totalled $10,389,309 during this period, with large institutions accounting for 41 per cent of this total. Almost three-quarters of respondents (n=48) stated that capital expenditure had been less than $10,000 during the previous financial year, whilst a further 9 per cent (n=6) reported capital expenditure of less than $50,000 during that period. Only 7 per cent (n=5) of respondents reported capital expenditure in excess of $1mn, including 44 per cent (n=4) of large institutions and one medium institution.

Table 64: Capital expenditure during the past financial year (n=67)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
$0-$9,999	11%	14%	92%	88%	72%
$10,000-$49,999	0%	57%	0%	8%	9%
$50,000-$99,999	0%	0%	0%	4%	1%
$100,000-$499,999	33%	14%	0%	0%	6%
$500,000-$999,999	11%	0%	8%	0%	4%
$1mn-$5mn	22%	14%	0%	0%	4%
More than $5mn	22%	0%	0%	0%	3%

Museums were then asked to detail their capital expenditure by type for the previous financial year, with 34 responses received. Other plant and equipment accounted for 26.7 per cent of total capital expenditure overall, and was the biggest cost for large, medium and micro institutions. Capital works on buildings accounted for 24.1 per cent of total spend, and was the second biggest spend for small institutions, behind exhibition renewal and maintenance. Collection acquisition accounted for 9.1 per cent of total capital expenditure.

Table 65: Capital expenditure during the past financial year (n=34)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Other plant and equipment	30.9%	43.8%	8.2%	23.7%	26.7%
Capital works - buildings	23.6%	30.7%	26.2%	16.0%	24.1%
IT / software	19.7%	22.9%	15.4%	19.3%	19.3%
Exhibition renewal and/or maintenance	3.7%	1.7%	26.6%	22.2%	13.6%
Collection acquisition	14.7%	0.8%	13.2%	7.7%	9.1%
Other	7.4%	0.1%	10.5%	11.1%	7.3%

REVENUE

Museums were asked how much revenue they received in the last financial year from the sources outlined in Table 66. On average, 21.1 per cent of revenue received came from central government sources, and this accounted for around one-third of revenue received for large and micro institutions. Almost half (46.9 per cent) of revenue received came from local authorities and this made up the highest proportion of revenue received by large, medium and small institutions. In contrast, micro institutions relied upon community sources, accounting for 43.1 per cent of their total funding on average.

Table 66: Revenue received in the last financial year (n=48)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Central Government e.g. Ministry for Culture and Heritage, Ministry of Education, Creative NZ, Lotteries Commission	31.1%	6.2%	12.2%	34.8%	21.1%
Local Council	62.2%	64.0%	44.7%	16.7%	46.9%
Community sources e.g. charitable trusts, gifts	6.8%	29.8%	42.5%	43.1%	30.6%
None of the above	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	5.4%	1.5%

Respondents were then asked to report how much revenue they generated in the last financial year from the sources outlined in Table 67. Admission fees accounted for the highest proportion (23.9 per cent) of revenue generation on average. Retail income provided 17.4 per cent of generated revenue on average, whilst voluntary donations/koha accounted for 13.9 per cent, and 32.6 per cent of revenue generated by micro institutions.

Table 67: Revenue generated in the last financial year (n=54)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Admission fees	24.0%	15.4%	35.4%	20.9%	23.9%
Retail	20.4%	17.1%	16.1%	15.8%	17.4%
Visitor donations/koha	3.8%	4.9%	14.2%	32.6%	13.9%
Functions	17.0%	4.2%	15.4%	3.3%	10.0%
Rental facilities	8.7%	19.1%	1.7%	4.0%	8.4%
Membership/Friends programme	0.9%	0.4%	7.2%	20.8%	7.3%
Sponsorship	8.9%	11.9%	6.8%	0.0%	6.9%
Education programmes	4.7%	14.6%	0.0%	0.4%	4.9%
Food services	6.5%	7.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
Public Programmes	3.2%	2.1%	0.0%	0.4%	1.4%
E-commerce	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
None of the above	1.8%	0.0%	3.1%	1.8%	1.7%

OVERALL INSTITUTION VALUE

Respondents were asked to report the total value of their institution's assets, and how this was apportioned between collections and on- and off-site buildings, with 45 responses being received. Overall reported asset value from these respondents was $2,265,790,600, with 71 per cent of this value being apportioned to collections. Large institutions accounted for 94 per cent of reported value, although this was influenced in part by the fact that all responding large institutions were able to report the value of their institution.

Table 68: Contribution to overall institution value (n=45)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Collections	72%	55%	49%	56%	71%
Buildings on-site	28%	29%	51%	44%	29%
Buildings off-site	0%	16%	0%	0%	1%

FINANCIAL CONCERNS

Respondents were then given the opportunity to indicate their most pressing concerns with regards to finances, generating 76 responses from 46 respondents. By far the most common concern (n=37, 80 per cent) for museums, regardless of size, related to funding to sustain current operations. Just over a quarter (n=12, 26 per cent) of respondents stated that generating revenue was also a pressing concern.

Table 69: Financial concerns (n=76)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Funding to sustain operations	88%	100%	67%	74%	80%
Revenue generation	13%	14%	17%	42%	26%
Need to invest in facilities	13%	29%	17%	16%	17%
Value of assets unknown	0%	0%	8%	21%	11%
Maintaining existing sponsors	13%	14%	17%	0%	9%
Increasing operating expenses	0%	43%	0%	0%	7%
Staffing levels	0%	0%	8%	11%	7%
None	0%	0%	8%	5%	4%
Depreciation costs	13%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Paying off loans	0%	0%	8%	0%	2%

STAFFING

This section provides an overview of staffing structures and resourcing requirements for museums, including information relating to:

- Paid employees
- Volunteers
- Interns
- No cost services
- Staffing concerns

PAID EMPLOYEES

Just over two-thirds (n=45, 68 per cent) of respondents have paid staff, including all large and medium institutions and 96 per cent (n=23) of small institutions. Only 23 per cent (n=6) of micro institutions have paid staff.

Table 70: Museums with paid employees by size (n=66)

	Have paid employees
Large	100%
Medium	100%
Small	96%
Micro	23%
Total	68%

Respondents were asked to indicate the types of staff they employed in the last financial year, selecting from the categories outlined in Table 71. Overall, 1,021 FTEs were employed by respondents during this period, with 86 per cent (880) of paid FTE staff employed by large, 8 per cent (85) by medium and 5 per cent (52) by small institutions, although the low response rate for medium institutions is likely to have impacted upon this figure.

The overall number of staff employed by respondents was 1,427. Just over half (721, 51 per cent) of these were employed as permanent full time staff. Permanent part-time staff accounted for 18 per cent (263) of respondents employees, including almost half (67) of staff from small institutions. Casual staff account for 21 per cent (304) of staff currently employed by responding institutions, whilst the remaining 10 per cent (139) were employed on a fixed term basis.

Table 71: Proportion of employees by type (n=45)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Permanent full-time staff	57%	35%	22%	8%	51%
Permanent part-time staff	11%	38%	48%	67%	18%
Casual staff	21%	21%	27%	0%	21%
Fixed term staff	11%	6%	3%	25%	10%
Overall proportion of paid FTEs	86%	8%	5%	0%	100%

Forty per cent (n=18) of respondents with paid staff reported employing casual staff during the previous financial year, including two-thirds (n=6) of large institutions, 57 per cent (n=4) of medium institutions, 26 per cent (n=6) of small institutions and 33 per cent (n=2) of micro institutions.

Table 72: Employment of casual staff (n=45)

	Institutions employing casual staff
Large	67%
Medium	57%
Small	26%
Micro	33%
Total	40%

Casual staff worked 46,285 hours in the sector in the last financial year, with the overall average of 2,496 hours per institution being heavily skewed by hours worked in large and medium institutions, which accounted for 94 per cent of total hours worked by casual staff.

Table 73: Hours worked by casual staff (n=18)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Average hours worked by casual staff	5,601	3,825	466	92	2,496
Proportion of total hours worked by casual staff	61%	33%	6%	0%	100%

Respondents from institutions with paid employees were asked to state their level of staff turnover during the past financial year. Two-thirds of respondents (n=30) reported a turnover of less than 10 per cent of their total staff during this period, including 83 per cent of both small (n=19) and micro (n=5) institutions. A further 16 per cent (n=7) reported staff turnover of between 10 and 19 per cent, including 44 per cent (n=4) of large institutions, whilst 22 per cent (n=2) of large institutions saw staff turnover of between 20-29 per cent. One institution reported staff turnover in excess of 50 per cent, although the small nature of this institution means that this could have occurred with relatively few members of staff actually leaving.

Table 74: Staff turnover during the past financial year (n=45)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
0-9%	33%	43%	83%	83%	67%
10-19%	44%	29%	0%	17%	16%
20-29%	22%	14%	0%	17%	9%
30-39%	0%	0%	4%	0%	2%
40-49%	0%	14%	9%	0%	7%
More than 50%	0%	0%	4%	0%	2%

VOLUNTEERS

The majority (n=55, 83 per cent) of museums indicated that their institution currently uses the services of volunteers, including 89 per cent (n=8) of large, 57 per cent (n=4) of medium, 79 per cent (n=19) of small, and 92 per cent (n=24) of micro institutions.

Table 75: Institutions using volunteers (n=66)

	Institutions using volunteers
Large	89%
Medium	57%
Small	79%
Micro	92%
Total	83%

Volunteers at large institutions accounted for 48 per cent (833) of all volunteers, with 22 per cent (375) volunteering at small institutions and 29 per cent (504) volunteering at micro institutions. The figures for medium institutions in Tables 76 and 77 should be treated cautiously given the low response rate from this sized institution.

Table 76: Overall share of volunteers (n=66)

	% of all volunteers
Large	48%
Medium	2%
Small	22%
Micro	29%
Total	100%

A total of 143,445 hours were worked by volunteers in responding institutions during the past financial year. Two-thirds of these hours (94,886) were completed by volunteers working at large institutions, whilst a further 24 per cent (34,123) volunteer hours were worked at micro institutions.

Table 77: Hours worked by volunteers (n=66)

	Total Hours Worked by Volunteers	%
Large	94,886	66%
Medium	1,430	1%
Small	13,006	9%
Micro	34,123	24%
Total	143,445	100%

INTERNS

Eleven institutions hired interns in the last financial year, including 78 per cent (n=7) of large institutions, 14 per cent (n=1) of Medium institutions, and 13 per cent (n=3) of small institutions. No micro institutions reported hiring interns during this period.

Table 78: Institutions hiring interns (n=11)

	Institutions hiring interns
Large	78%
Medium	14%
Small	13%
Micro	0%
Total	17%

From a total of 17 interns hired by responding institutions during the past financial year, 35 per cent (n=6) had been paid for their time, including 40 per cent (n=4) of interns at large institutions. One medium and one small institution reported paying their interns. The majority (n=5, 83 per cent) of interns at small institutions were unpaid during this period.

Table 79: Payment of interns by museum size (n=17)

	Paid	Unpaid
Large	40%	60%
Medium	100%	0%
Small	17%	83%
Micro	0%	0%
Total	35%	65%

Finally, respondents reported that interns had worked a total of 1,750 hours during the past financial year, with 51 per cent (900) of these hours undertaken at large institutions. Forty per cent (700) of hours were undertaken at small institutions.

Table 80: Total hours worked by interns

	Total Hours	%
Large	900	51%
Medium	150	9%
Small	700	40%
Micro	0	0%
Total	1,750	100%

NO COST SERVICES

Respondents were asked which functions or support services, from the categories in Table 81, had been provided to them at no cost in the last financial year. IT services were the most common no cost service received by institutions during this period, with 13 per cent (n=11) of all respondents taking advantage of this, including 19 per cent (n=3) of large, 9 per cent (n=1) of medium, 13 per cent (n=4) of small and 10 per cent (n=3) of micro institutions. Eleven per cent (n=10) of respondents received human resource services at no cost, including 19 per cent (n=3) of large institutions, 18 per cent (n=2), 10 per cent (n=3) of small institutions and 7 per cent (n=2) of micro institutions. Ten per cent (n=9) of respondents received financial management services, whilst 8 per cent (n=7) received communications or marketing services at no cost.

Table 81: No cost services used during previous financial year (n=87)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
IT	19%	9%	13%	10%	13%
Human resources	19%	18%	10%	7%	11%
Financial management	13%	18%	16%	0%	10%
Communications / marketing	13%	18%	6%	3%	8%
Other	6%	9%	3%	3%	5%

STAFFING CONCERNS

Museums were asked what were their most pressing concerns regarding staff. Lack of staff or volunteer resources was by far the most commonly raised concern, with 60 per cent (n=28) of respondents highlighting this as a concern, including 57 per cent (n=4) of medium, 77 per cent (n=10) of small and 67 per cent (n=14) of micro institutions. Funding was again raised as a serious concern by 28 per cent (n=13) of respondents, whilst training and development was highlighted as a concern by 19 per cent (n=9) of respondents, including 57 per cent (n=4) of medium institutions. Fifteen per cent (n=7) of respondents stated that an aging roster of staff or volunteers was becoming an issue, especially among micro institutions, with 24 per cent (n=5) mentioning this. Talent management was considered to be the most pressing issue for large institutions, with 67 per cent (n=4) highlighting it as a concern.

Table 82: Staffing concerns (n=47)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Lack of staff/volunteers	0%	57%	77%	67%	60%
Funding	17%	29%	31%	29%	28%
Training and development	17%	57%	15%	10%	19%
Aging staff/volunteer roster	17%	0%	8%	24%	15%
Talent management	67%	0%	8%	5%	13%
None	33%	14%	8%	5%	11%
Job security of staff	17%	29%	0%	5%	9%
Increasing leadership capability	33%	0%	8%	0%	6%
Employment law	0%	14%	0%	0%	2%
Lack of building security	0%	0%	8%	0%	2%
Women in leadership	17%	0%	0%	0%	2%

FURTHER CONCERNS AND COMMENTS

In the final section of the survey museums were asked what their most pressing concerns were for the coming year and offered the opportunity to make any additional comments. A total of 122 comments were received from 66 respondents. Funding was a key concern for one-third (n=22) of respondents, including half (n=4) of large institutions. Building or improving the institution's public profile was a key concern for 18 per cent (n=12) of museums, including 38 per cent (n=3) of medium institutions. Current staffing resources were a concern for 18 per cent (n=12) of respondents, whilst growing a volunteer base was a key concern for 17 per cent (n=11), including 35 per cent (n=9) of micro institutions. A further 17 per cent (n=11) stated that they had no further concerns for the future, including 35 per cent (n=8) of small institutions.

Table 83: General concerns for the coming financial year (n=66)

	Large	Medium	Small	Micro	Total
Funding	50%	25%	33%	31%	33%
Building public profile	25%	38%	17%	12%	18%
Staffing numbers	13%	13%	21%	19%	18%
Growing volunteer base	0%	0%	8%	35%	17%
No other concerns	0%	0%	33%	12%	17%
Remaining viable	13%	13%	4%	23%	14%
Professional expertise	13%	13%	4%	15%	11%
Building not fit for purpose	0%	25%	4%	12%	9%
Improving storage	25%	13%	13%	0%	9%
Exhibitions	13%	0%	13%	8%	9%
Operating structure	25%	13%	8%	0%	8%
Public programming	0%	25%	8%	4%	8%
Collection readiness	13%	13%	0%	4%	5%
Disaster planning	13%	0%	4%	4%	5%
Cataloguing	0%	0%	8%	0%	3%
Conservation	0%	0%	0%	4%	2%
Outcome of review process	13%	0%	0%	0%	2%

APPENDIX ONE - SURVEY

To be added – survey/invitation

APPENDIX TWO – COLLECTION CONCERNS

Question: What (if any) are your most pressing concerns with regards to your collection? (Verbatim answers)

- Do not value collection as heritage assets for public accounting
- Improving housing and storage conditions
- Improving catalogue information
- Digitisation and accessibility
- Lack of an acquisitions budget
- Lack of a budget for conservation of objects
- Lack of permanent dedicated collections staff and conservation
- Environmental controls
- Display/interpretation concerns
- Storage
- Full conservation audit
- Finding suitable temporary storage during building work
- Having inadequate storage conditions with inappropriate temperature and humidity control in these rooms/storage rooms.
- Adequate storage facilities to safely house the collection and allow for growth
- Lack of time conservators have for the collection
- Its future in terms of management
- Poor storage - i.e., in boxes in accession number order
- Stored in adequate buildings without alarms, smoke alarms, sprinklers, and the public have external access to
- Poor documentation on the Vernon system
- Lack of staff time to work on collection
- Lack of space for them to work
- Earthquake remediation
- Inadequate environmental conditions
- Only 35% of collections on electronic database.
- Unknown valuations
- Not enough storage space, no control environment, not catalogued
- Having a permanent home
- Lack of dedicated staff or environmental control
- We have made a major commitment to start the meaningful management of our collection. We have recently opened a new exhibition building and collection store which will enable us to make progress in the area of collection management. This will be dependent upon us raising sufficient funds to enable us to contract suitably qualified museum professional/s to undertake the training of the volunteers but more importantly lead the project.
- That conservation standard on-site storage continues to be available for the collection as it grows - That we can keep up with and advance the conservation treatment of the vast range of objects in the permanent collection in the face of ever increasing other demands on the time of conservators (e.g. condition reporting) - Being able to afford insurance premiums for

the actual values of the whole collection - Keeping up with and continuing to work on thorough cataloguing, which is additional to having

- Main asset (100 year old church) is very expensive to preserve. Fire risk to other items except photographs which have been scanned and stored as digital images separately.
- Time to formally catalogue and digitise
- Risks to the collection - theft, fire, earthquake
- Lack of funding and staffing support. Concerns regarding conservation and progress made in inventory and cataloguing.
- Lack of storage space
- Lack of: Dedicated staff for collection care and conservation
- Environmental control
- Ownership status of building
- Appropriate storage
- Need more funding to pay for improved storage / displays, staff to digitise collection / registrar, and further conservation of items.
- Nil
- Local Govt support for maintaining collection
- Theft and vandalism while on display in public areas around the university.
- Unknown valuations
- No valuations
- To gain comprehensive inventory of the collection.
- Space
- We are entirely voluntary and are all getting on in years. There are very few young ones stepping up and showing an interest.
- Storage
- Lack of environmental control and dedicated collection/conservation staffing.
- Storage
- Keeping them preserved
- Need more & improved display space
- Need more time to work on the collections
- Lack of: Storage Environmental controls and staffing for collections
- Completion of the full review of the museum and its contents/collection
- Identifying the objects of historical significance and aligned to strategy
- Identifying and rationalising those that are not
- Improving the preservation quality of collection storage environments
- Expanding the provenance of collection items to ensure that their significance is documented and preserved
- Improving public access to collections by increasing the number of digital assets online, participation in public events, participation in temporary exhibitions and increasing the number of external loans
- We need to do a complete inventory, update the valuations, review our collection policies, and we are overdue to seek to build a new collection storage and research facility.

- Running out of space
- Seismic risk of building may mean some strengthening work is carried out
- Repackaging the 10% of collection that is not in museum grade boxes
- Re-shelving project underway - Better climate control needed
- Buildings are valued
- Valuation only two years old
- Time and money to maintain the equipment
- Humidity control, and running out of storage space and museum is in an 'earthquake prone building' according to Southland District Council
- No valuations
- Lack of space
- Our 4 relocated historic buildings are full
- We restrict any additions to our purpose built waka house
- It is expensive looking after 6 buildings, although one we have is a shipping container for storage of papers and newspapers
- One small historic building is used as a workspace
- Issues and sensitivities associated with disposals
- The environment and staff levels and sustainability of both to be in a position to care for the collection
- Completion of cataloguing and digitisation
- Conservation and stabilisation
- Adequate storage facilities
- Effective presentation
- More space and correct storage
- Digitising our holdings
- Getting database of items
- Our collection is not well catalogued - i.e. no photos. We are currently beginning this process
- We would struggle to know what we had on site at any one time, or if things went missing
- We have a lot of low value items which are donated
- All buildings are open to the public daily (and therefore to the elements) we are in a rural area and pests (rodents, borer, silverfish etc.) are a constant battle. This is one area we are working on, but it is a big task
- Larger work area and more storage space
- Lack of funding and awareness regarding appropriate preservation within an often damp 19th Century building
- Inadequate storage and displays
- Lack of: environment controls dedicated collection/conservation staff
- We would like more space in which to display our stored items and any additional items which we could then acquire
- Improve care of items of significance and rationalize remaining collection
- Reached storage capacity limits, need to consolidate our existing collection and identify areas of duplication for de-accessioning purposes.
- Display preparation and collection care spaces are also required.

- The amount being gifted from within our community and our ability to adequately safe guard it from deterioration and damage
- We need funds to preserve what we have
- We need a curator and receptionist
- Getting a secure income stream to cover running costs
- It's not possible to maintain a high level of physical care as one (busy) person managing a collection of 600+ works over 30+ buildings that are open to thousands of staff and visitors while also managing a program of temporary exhibitions
- Having our records organised for online browsing is a big challenge
- Only part of the collection storage and exhibition spaces are covered by HVAC. We also have a large offsite store which is secure and covered by monitored alarm but is not air conditioned
- Recent archaeological material
- Architectural plans 5000 to catalogue and store
- Unknown proportion of collections valued as heritage assets
- Putting more on public display
- Restoration of remaining 50% of the 10 trams & keeping the operational ones going
- Secure and adequate premises for documents, archives and artefacts
- Trying to get as much under cover and finding dollars to hold deterioration
- Deterioration of photographs and textiles

APPENDIX THREE – ACCESS, VISITATION AND ENGAGEMENT CONCERNS

Question: What (if any) are your most pressing concerns with regards to access, visitation and engagement? (Verbatim answers)

- Need to increase use of technology
- Getting buildings repaired and strengthened, and galleries refitted with exhibitions, to allow full public access to the Museum again
- Lack of understanding of visitors and their needs
- Finding a venue for temporary exhibition of collection during building closure
- Growing the audience IS Capability
- Offering a seamless and consistent visit - pre, during and post visit
- Sustainability in an ever-changing technology landscape
- How to build visitor numbers
- Lack of wheelchair and pushchair access
- Lack of repeat visitation by locals
- Lack of space to hold public programmes
- Lack of space and budget for better exhibitions
- Poor state of building stock and services
- A very small museum. We only open once a month and hold one big event per year
- Having sufficient trained volunteers with lesbian knowledge to assist visitors
- Access is constrained due to the physical limits of the building and location. We are endeavouring to make capital improvements by refurbishing our entry and reception, and external access routes but these are part of a long term city plan and we compete with many others for capital dollars. City Gallery is proactive in promoting accessibility through programming (e.g. deaf and sight impaired tours; website) and design (wheelchair height vitrines, high contrast and larger font signage and labels)
- Visitation and Engagement: We need more accurate visitor data and are working towards this
- Members - overall organisation, numbers unknown. Website - for overall organisation, numbers unknown
- Having staff available for one-on-one tours
- safety, collection risk, physical access
- Lack of trained staff
- No physical disability access. No street visibility, although we have street signage we get very few "walk ups"
- My position is part-time, soul charge. So the doors are open to general public while groups are visiting the meeting rooms. Security is an issue especially at night
- None
- Connecting the online and offline experience ensuring a seamless integration
- Varying public programmes to appeal to a wide catchment
- It would be great to offer visitor access to the internet - for researching: Papers past/BDM
- No pressing concerns at this stage.
- Attracting new generation visitors - Asian market

- This museum's collection is internationally significant, and servicing this wider group can best be done on line
- We need to digitize,
- Keeping our programme current and interesting, keeping it fresh and engaging with new audiences
- More visits are wanted
- Getting WiFi access to our visitors
- The storage facility is not adequate for staff nor at all suitable for the public
- Reaching an audience outside of Palmerston North
- Everything - going through redevelopment process including stakeholder engagement
- Controlling use of WIFI
- We need more volunteers to keep the museum open to enable visitors access. We also want to do more outreach with the local schools but need more volunteers for that as well. Don't know numbers of visits to website
- Shortage of committee to man museum. Can only be opened Sundays 12noon to 5pm, and by appointment during the week
- Security in a Parliamentary environment Providing for visitors with access needs
- A greater searchable web presence i.e. e-hive
- Layout of foyer and exhibition spaces Signage and labelling
- Effective professional support
- No connection telephone line for email
- Increasing our visitor numbers
- Finding the resources to run more public programmes
- We are rarely open. The building is cold and has no proper admin area in which to house a computer. A recently rejuvenated committee, along with increasing council interest could help with progress
- AMETI - a major motorway project with massive access and site matters arising
- Increasing maintaining membership of 'friends' group. Increasing and maintaining volunteer numbers Getting more visitors Don't know number of visits to website
- Relevancy
- Way-finding, WiFi access in front of house areas, air-conditioned gallery spaces
- Numbers of People
- Lack of funds prevent development
- We need to encourage more visitors. We need to keep our level of volunteers as we have 3 on duty each day we are open
- Establishing online browsing of the Art Collection
- As we are in prime central city/viaduct location the perception about lack of packing is difficult to overcome
- Not enough visitors
- Public transport access (lack of)
- Updating and changing the exhibition and displays
- Making the museum more known to the public
- Interpretation of collection
- No space to have changing exhibitions that draw in visitors.

APPENDIX FOUR – FINANCIAL CONCERNS

Question: What (if any) are your most pressing concerns with regards to finances? (Verbatim answers)

- Ongoing operating funding and revenue generation
- Obtaining funding to re-open fully operationally, i.e. fully staffed and normal hours
- We remain short of operating funding by at least $500k to be able to operate at the minimum level required
- Not enough available for enough staff to carry out the required work on the collection
- Not enough to fund a new collection store in order to improve collection storage
- Local Government cost-cutting post-earthquakes has reduced available funds
- No financial records available
- Getting sufficient money to pay staff as currently one volunteers does all the administration and fund raising so a director is sorely needed
- Level of support from local government has remained the same despite increasing costs to present programme. In real terms are expected to do more with less. Increases to costs of programme presentation such as freight, installation costs and exhibition build. Capital investment in the building and services
- Generating sufficient income through admissions and other activities to meet operating costs but more importantly finding sufficient funds to maintain six NZHPT Category 2 listed buildings that we have as part of our collection
- Continuation of Council funding at present levels.
- Lack of funds to maintain building properly. One coat of paint would drain accumulated finances completely
- Developing a viable trust board who can generate funds
- Ongoing funding from CNZ. Maintaining strong relationships with funding partners such as Embassies, despite small staff & staff turnover
- Constant pressure to increase external funds raised and reduce ratepayer funding
- Reduction in budget
- Sponsorship is sought to upgrade equipment and displays
- Ongoing viability
- No concerns
- Collections are not valued. Obtaining more grants
- Continued council support- Earthquake strengthening/storage/staff costs
- That we have sufficient to meet reasonable staffing needs within current constraints and allow current staff to take accrued annual and sick leave without having severe impact on the gallery's day-to-day or longer-term programming
- Funding is required for the large amount of Capital works needed to revitalise the site over the next 5-10 years
- There is always the risk of losing major funding sources such as LEOTC and the possibility of major cuts in local government support. Sponsorship and Grant funding is becoming increasingly hard to obtain

- Sustainability. We need to establish a base source of long term funding to secure the infrastructure of the NZFM
- Paying off our loan to PNCC
- Lack of funding
- Don't know valuation of assets
- Value of institutions assets - unknown. Small income (free entry to museum). Rely on grants and donations for any major work
- Need to upgrade and replace our Collections database
- Keep income ahead of inflation Increase funding for more research and curatorial staff Capital funding of Redevelopment project
- Off season we actually run at a loss
- Renewal of buildings all past their use by date except one barn
- Becoming less reliant on grants by better use of facility and more admissions
- Delivering on expectations from public and Council with the resources that we have. Not being successful in requesting any additional funding due to pressure on the rates spend, currently it is mostly going on a huge project to refurbish infrastructure in the District, Council has little appetite to increase rates
- Too little for our needs. A membership drive is underway
- Sustainable income against increasing costs
- Maintaining and increasing income
- Developing a strategy to add part-time paid administrative support and the means of funding this
- Audited Financial Accounts not yet returned
- Income stream
- Funding depreciation and sustainability
- More budget cuts and less funding/sponsorship
- Need to generate more income and work closely with the local authority
- Generating sufficient income to keep developing. All volunteer at present - We would like to hire two staff; also finance for major conservation work on the collection
- Don't know value of institutions assets. Could be close to $1 million.   Raising sufficient finance to allow continuing restoration projects to be completed
- No funding - we are reduced to running raffles and applying for grants
- No financial records

APPENDIX FIVE – STAFFING CONCERNS

Question: What (if any) are your most pressing concerns with regards to staffing? (Verbatim answers)

- Funding
- Funding
- Increasing leadership capability
- Women in leadership
- Talent management
- Lack of staffing to do the work required
- Poor security when there is no staff member working
- Need of more full time staff
- Money to pay a director
- Staff retention for front of house staff in particular
- Funding for new positions
- Training and development
- Workload
- Living wage and maintaining salary levels
- Generating enough income to employ a part time front of house person
- Volunteers are getting older and numbers may drop below a critical level
- Getting a trust board who can find funds to employ staff
- Managing workload between two staff members
- Both the Librarian and myself (Curator) are contractors with no official contract, meaning we can be let go at anytime
- More volunteers
- Council wide staffing realignment currently underway to achieve savings
- Training costs and retaining staff development budgets
- Committee members and volunteers who open the museum and attend the gardens are slowly ebbing away through illness and age and younger people are not interested as it is a voluntary service
- Staff must close the museum if when rostered on, are unwell/or unable to attend work
- Attracting younger persons. Training in good practice
- All getting old
- We share an intern at the Recovery Centre at Wigram Air Force Museum
- Getting the best staff. Being able to pay competitive wages
- Need more skilled volunteers. Who are completely honest & able to be trusted with the collection
- Managing consistency, communication and good relationships between myself and three part-time administrators, and having one person take major responsibility for day-to-day operation and ongoing work in admin, marketing and promotion so that as director and curator I can concentrate on developing and delivering the programme to a high standard and also have sufficient support and energy left for fundraising and working with outside agencies and partners

- Retention and facilitating team work and communication across the museum
- Attraction and relation of talent
- We could always do with more staff to carry out some of the major projects and do catch up on backlogs but more pressing is to be able to really invest in staff development
- Sustainability - the roles of 'director' curator and administrator are currently voluntary and as such individual dependent. The BOT are required to be unpaid working trustees making the survival of the NZFM precarious to say the least
- When the loan is paid off we can hire an archivist
- Need more staff
- Museum requires a manager that is suitably qualified in museums and industrial archaeology
- We need more volunteers in all aspects of museum operation
- Very difficult to get volunteers as there are many volunteer organisations in this town
- Being able to resource up at busy times with casual staff
- Professional development around Maori tikanga and visitors with access needs
- Ageing workforce
- Stability of staff
- Insufficient to carry out high quality collection management
- Improvement and training
- Would like to be able to afford to have at least one paid employee
- Growing skill levels so the team can be more self-managing, less governance/staff cross over
- Large workloads for some staff, there is always so much to do with a relatively small number of staff
- Providing relevant training in a cost effective manner
- Volunteers with too little time to devote to the museum. Some with a deeper interest have recently joined
- Employment law
- Increasing and maintaining volunteer numbers and funding a way to add and fund part-time, paid, administrative help to ease the load on the volunteer office/administrative staff
- Getting a paid curator and receptionist
- Succession planning and organisation capability. We have long serving staff and volunteers who have a lot of institutional and maritime related knowledge. In the boarder context the maritime industry has many trades and skills that are becoming lost
- Getting the right person in the right job, i.e. Good recruitment. Also, our FOH positions tend to change rapidly due to the low hours and type of people filling the role: students etc
- We are volunteer led and run. The most pressing concern is the increasing average age of the volunteers
- Need funding to hire some

APPENDIX SIX – MOST PRESSING CONCERNS FOR THE YEAR AHEAD

Question: What are the most pressing concerns for your museum in the upcoming year?

- Being under review and ensuring long term operating and management structures are put in place
- Finding temporary exhibition space during building work
- Funding of the re-development project
- Appropriate storage for collection items in store room
- Building public profiles and events.
- Funding
- Fiscal restraints on Auckland Council to increase levy %
- Collection Readiness projects underway but has revealed scope of significant backlogs. Long term options for collections storage being developed in Master Plan and align with Council's Long term Plan
- Introduction of an Admission charge has resulted in a reduction of FIT- 9% on prior year
- Maintaining and growing volunteer staff
- Relationship between the Council and Historical Society needs to be clarified
- Challenges with the size and type of building (courthouse) the museum is housed in
- Challenges with a large collection which is poorly stored and documented
- Poor state of building stock and services. Long programme of earthquake remediation to collections. Need to seismic improvements to buildings for heritage buildings, collections and public safety
- We're a very small museum with only a few steam engines
- Too much to do, not enough money, not enough staff and volunteers
- Employing a director who can manage the museum's administration and public programmes
- Maintaining and increasing funding for programmes; capital investment in the building, equipment and services
- Building on the momentum we have created by constructing a new exhibition building and collection store and lifting standards through training and to enable the huge task of cataloguing and the better management of our collection to begin. With no professionally qualified museum staff employed we rely on finding funds for contractors
- Finances
- Earthquake assessment of the building. Deterioration of the building. Lack of interest in matters historical by community. Fire risk is high for all non-scanned items.
- Finding money, attracting volunteers, the enormity of the task ahead - undergoing collection audit
- Pressure to produce high quality exhibitions on a limited budget & with limited staff time
- That the library continues to be funded by the Ernest and Marion Davis Trust and doesn't become a department of the ADHB. They own the building because it's on their land. So time in the future they could demolish it for further development
- Future development
- The successful reopening with the Len Lye Centre in 2015
- Budget cuts

- Committee members and volunteers are ebbing away through illness and/or old age. Younger people are not interested in helping out as it's a voluntary service
- Collection cataloguing and storage
- Attracting visitors off the main highway
- Finding extra space for both display and storage
- None - things are going along nicely
- We require more volunteers. Obtaining more grants to repair photographs and frames etc
- Completing all the targets. Earthquake strengthening report, investigate new storage, running the education programme, maintaining staff. Attracting visitors
- Continue improving the displays
- To manage a successful but demanding exhibition and public programme alongside a demanding fundraising programme and good communication around that with limited people resources and board engagement
- Time
- Achieving our strategic objectives and moving the museum away from its chequered past
- Strategic planning for the next 5 years
- Completing the touring exhibition "Balls, Bullets and Boots" Upgrading the website Seismic strengthening of gallery and storage areas
- Redevelopment project and combining museum and gallery operations
- Staffing levels - not enough to achieve expectations
- Surviving without any funding since South Waikato Council pulled the funding
- More volunteers would be helpful
- New committee members
- Diversifying service - offering new programmes
- Participating in national celebrations - Waitangi 175/WWI00/150 years of Wellington being a capital city
- Redevelopment, Excellence of service to our community, Care of the collection, Surveying to understand community needs / expectations, Improving collection management processes, Retention of institutional memory
- Helpful visit by museum resource person
- We need major funding for our new museum which another committee are overseeing (in conjunction with the committee). Scanning photographic collection. Finalise cataloguing
- Keeping up the volunteer hours to staff the office Saturdays and Sundays
- Attracting volunteers, financial sustainability, governance, becoming more professional, staying relevant
- Increasing the Museums connection to the Community, increasing visitor numbers. Ensuring the Council understands the importance of the Museum's collection and the services that we offer. Planning for possible new museum
- To try to progress interior improvements and establish an archive when all finance is eaten up by building and exterior maintenance
- The motorway project
- Nil
- Visitor numbers
- Funding

- Financial sustainability
- Retention of institutional knowledge
- Rejuvenation and refreshment of permanent galleries
- Budget cuts, staffing, visitor numbers
- Sustainability
- Progressing the conservation / preservation of our historic fleet of Wellington trams
- Maintaining and increasing our skilled volunteer workforce
- Finance becoming more difficult to raise mainly due to down turn in 'pokey' machine revenue
- We need to create exhibition space so we can draw in visitors