

Mississippi River Parkway Commission
Phase 1 – Nat'l Office Review

Summary:

In order to objectively and transparently evaluate Pilch and Barnet's services as the MRPC's national office, a committee of three was appointed by Pilot Terri McCollough. Committee chair, Karl Samp (Past Pilot), selected Anne Lewis (Pilot Pro Tem) and Derrick Biglane (Mississippi Chair) to assist him in the evaluation. A board survey constituted Phase 1 of the the evaluation and twelve board members out of a possible 18 responded.*

In general, the survey indicates MRPC Board members believe the performance of Pilch and Barnet is valued and affirmed. Valuations of the four key areas in the current scope of work – Meeting Administration; Marketing; Board/Organization Support; and Traveler Assistance – trended to the positive side with most weighting in the Good and Great valuation columns.

When asked to name one of the service areas BEST achieved by Pilch and Barnet, Meeting Administration and Marketing drew the vast majority of responses.

When asked to name one of the service areas LEAST achieved by Pilch and Barnet, Board/Organization drew the most responses. Two respondents chose deliberately not to answer this question.

It is important to remember that with only 12 responses, no one area gained a decisive majority. The results should be viewed as indicative, not conclusive.

The final section – designed to gather board members' insight into future priorities for a new scope of work – pointed to some new undertakings while maintaining some of the current service areas. "Securing Financial Support" and "Management of the Organization" both had the highest number of (1s). "Marketing" and "Collaboration with State and Federal Agencies" comprised the second area of priority. Interpretive Center Relations came in third.

Conclusion: In the minds of most MRPC Board members, Pilch and Barnet are doing the job they were hired to do and doing it well. Secondly, though, new areas of concern and priority have emerged, and those areas now need to be included in a new National Office scope of work.

*Iowa, Missouri and Tennessee are missing from the responses.

Results:

Section 1: Identify on a scale of “Poor” to “Great” how P & B has done at providing services in their current scope of work.

| Existing Service Areas | Poor | Fair | Adequate | Good | Great |
|--|------|------|----------|------|-------|
| Semi-Annual Meeting & Annual Meeting Coordination & Management | | | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| Great River Road Marketing/Promotion | | | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Board & Organization; Planning/Administration/Management | | 1 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| Traveler Assistance/Fulfillment | | | 2 | 4 | 5 |

Section 2: Reflecting on the existing services, rank what P & B carries out best.

| Existing Service Areas | Responses |
|--|-----------|
| Semi-Annual Meeting & Annual Meeting Coordination & Management | 5 |
| Great River Road Marketing/Promotion | 4 |
| Board & Organization; Planning/Administration/Management | 1 |
| Traveler Assistance/Fulfillment | 1 |

- One respondent refused to rank and stated P & B carry out the scope of work well.

Section 2 continued: Reflecting on the existing services, rank what P & B does the least well.

| Existing Service Areas | Responses | Notes |
|---|-----------|---|
| Semi-Annual Meeting & Annual Meeting Coordination & Management | | |
| Great River Road Marketing/Promotion | 2 | One person felt strongly about this. One person stated the weighting was based on not seeing anything himself. |
| Board & Organization; Planning/Administration/Management | 5 | • |
| Traveler Assistance/Fulfillment | 3 | |

- Displeasure expressed with Shack Up Inn
- No selection – states should do this
- Two respondents refused to rank this
- One respondent added his/her own category – “Growth Opportunity in fund development, grant writing, sponsorships,

Section 3: Rank the priorities you would select for future attention by a National MRPC office:

1 Priority:

Securing financial support
Management of organization

#2 Priority:

Marketing/Promotion
(Followed closely by Collaboration with state and federal agencies; Annual/Semi-annual mtg management.)

#3 Priority:

Interpretive Center relations
(Followed closely by State Commission relations; Marketing/Promotion)