Program and Planning Committee Minutes

In attendance: Sharon Bartmann, Andrea Snyder, Ariel Edwards, Thomas Scurto Davis, Wendy Branzburg and Ayanna Kersey McMullen (by phone).

1. Community partnership updates:

School for the Deaf. Ariel and Collin have expanded our programming by doubling our class time and accommodating their complex class makeup and scheduling. They came to tour the PAM show with a high school group. They now have a new ED and head of the art department so we/they are hoping to re-establish a better, more communicative, working relationship as we move forward.

Thomas explained that in the past we have found funding and then look for partners. This approach has not been especially successful because there is never enough "buy in" from our partners. New approach is to partner 50% of our funding with our partners from the beginning to be determined by how responsive and engaged they are. We will only partner with those institutions that are totally committed.

Catharine School:

MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) was revisited and now back on track. Finished 10 sessions which will pick up again in the spring. Very successful first phase working with 80-90 fifth graders. Very engaged and excited about the project.

Overbrook School for the Blind:

Final MOU. They agreed to match Karen Lotman's \$10,000 funding. Susan Fabio is the art teacher there. She takes classes at MLAC and volunteers here. Blindness is just one of the challenges at OSB. It's a private school so functions differently than non profits. More staff than students.

Bucks County Visually Impaired and Blind:

Thomas is connected and in conversations with a possible future partnership.

The Village and Elwyn partnerships will not be pursued.

2. Enrollment Report:

Very successful overall numbers. Only decreased numbers are Adult Workshop and those numbers always vary according to a variety of reasons ie. day, time, season etc. Most workshops are ceramics, printmaking and metals. No drawing or painting. Purpose of workshops is to draw in a new and larger market but it's not a big money maker. Mostly intermediate and advanced students take workshops.

3. Net Promoter Scores:

Ariel distributed a 4 question survey after the fall semester. Received 74 responses which is considered high for us. The question in regard to the responses is how do we analyze the qualitative responses? 74 different answers. These are open ended questions which gather better information but we need to address just how to use that information. Also, this survey went to our fall students. Should a survey go to all of our constituents ie. exhibit visitors, donors etc.?

Ariel chose to not survey demographics in the fall survey so we discussed if and how we should address those questions in the next survey. Most of us thought the teachers need to be engaged and asked to promote and distribute the surveys emphasizing the importance to the students to have their voices be heard and fill out the surveys to give us an accurate result. We will include demographic questions in our next survey. It was agreed that with our commitment to transparency that the survey says what we mean ie: This is not about asking for money. "We are committed to a diverse, inclusive community. In so doing, please share with us.....
Hope to roll out a new Net Promoter survey for the Spring semester.

4. Final discussion on the way out the door was how to get feedback from our students to understand why so few students sign up online. Is the website difficult to use? Is the human contact for registration more engaging or informative? Is there something we're missing? How do we collect that information?