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Would you be interested in attending a residency program in the Boston area that included international artists?

What other kinds of activities would you like to see TransCultural Exchange sponsor?

Do you think this conference will benefit your career?

How could this conference benefit your career?
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TransCultural Exchange's (TCE) 2007 Conference on International Opportunities in the Arts was the first ever Conference on International Opportunities in the Arts to be held in America. More than 60 representatives from around the world joined over 350 attendees and 25 moderators to converge in Boston during the weekend of April 27-29, 2007, turning Boston into the hub of the global arts community.

The Conference offered the local and national creative workforce concrete information on ways to take advantage of international opportunities and residencies, which are often the first step into the global marketplace, through panels, workshops and networking sessions. The Conference also showcased Massachusetts’ creative economy both at home and to the world to ensure the state’s long-time ability to retain and build upon its already large creative workforce.

Results show that TCE has met the Conference goals. Consulates, representatives of such programs as the State Department, the Fulbright Program, the German-American Exchange Program, CEC ArtsLink, Trust for Mutual Understanding, Res Artis and Directors of Residencies from over 30 countries—including Finland, Sweden, Romania, Taiwan, China, Hungary, Japan, Greece, Canada, Malta, Germany, Slovakia, Turkey, Estonia, Australia, Denmark, the Netherlands, South Africa, Belgium, Ireland, Brazil, Egypt, Cuba, the United Arab Emirates, India, Afghanistan and Russia—were on hand to present their artist residency, networking and exhibition programs for both emerging and established artists, critics, art teachers and students.

Other invited guests met with artists for one-on-one mentoring sessions and considered artists for their programs. Attendees also learned how to obtain funding for working abroad (the Fulbright Program, CEC Artslink, Art Corps, etc.) and attended workshops with members from Trans Artists – the world’s primary information center for artist-in-residences – who conducted workshops on finding and applying to international programs.

In addition, results of a survey administered during the conference and on-line indicate that most participants were highly satisfied with all aspects of the conference. For example, more than four-in-five respondents (82.1%) rate the conference as excellent or good. Comments provided by respondents were copious, detailed and almost entirely positive. Participants were particularly satisfied with the “number of networking opportunities,” the “quality of the mentoring sessions” and “the wealth and value of information presented during these opportunities.” Participants wrote of “attaining a higher understanding of my career,” “expanding information on residencies exponentially” and “exchanging ideas,” while commenting that the conference was “a great motivation,” “eye opening,” and “a unique opportunity for working with others.”

Of note is that more than half (54.6%) of the conference participants completed the voluntary survey. The high completion rate, coupled with the detailed open-ended (and primarily positive) comments, is another indication of the conference’s effect and success.
Moreover, more than seventy percent of the survey respondents (71.2%) indicate that they are interested in attending a similar conference in 2009 and nearly two-thirds (64.8%) indicate that they are interested in attending a residency program in the Boston area that includes international artists. Perhaps most importantly, nearly sixty percent of respondents (59.7%) believe that the conference will benefit their career. While 37.5 percent of respondents are not sure if the conference will benefit their career, many of these respondents indicate that “it is too early to tell” and that they will know better in time as they apply what they learned at the conference to achieving their career goals.

Results of the intercept and on-line surveys also indicate that conference speakers were impressed by Massachusetts’ cultural offerings. Of note, all of the mentors were highly impressed by the quality of the work they saw by the artists.

In addition, preliminary outcomes in the weeks following the conference show early success in terms of artists securing residencies. For example, over 6 different programs are planning to offer residencies to artists whom they met at the conference – even though the application process for this year is long finished. In response, TCE is offering three chosen artists $500 stipends to pursue these residencies. There were also requests for other similar conferences on international opportunities for other disciplines.

Other successful outcomes of the conference include discussions of future collaborations. For example, institutions such as the School of the Museum of Fine Arts, Salem State College, Northeastern University’s Digital Media Department and the University of Massachusetts Amherst have approached TCE to be a part of their next conference. The Kohler Arts and Industry program is also in negotiation with TCE to host and/or create a join partnership for the next conference. Massachusetts College of Art is also is hiring the Alliance of Artist Communities to do a workshop on residency programs at MCA based on seeing the workshop at the conference, while the Massachusetts College of Art’s Urban Arts program is now exploring working with the Siemens Art Program.

TCE staff has also been invited to speak to various organizations as a result of the conference. For example, TCE was invited to give a conference follow-up lecture to Philadelphia’s Center for Emerging Visual Artists, which took place at CEVA May 14, 2007 and TCE’s director Mary Sherman was invited to speak about international opportunities and collaboration to artists (including participation in TCE’s current Tile Project) in Western Massachusetts on June 2, 2007 at the home of critic Charles Guiliano.

These examples demonstrate that TCE has met its immediate program goal of organizing the conference and exposing artists to international opportunities. Furthermore, discussions of future collaborations and the fact that artists have already secured residencies confirm that the benefits of the conference will extend into the future. However, the ultimate measure of the conference’s success may be the degree to which the conference benefits artists’ careers in the long-term. Although this outcome cannot be measured so soon after the conference, TCE plans to conduct follow-up interviews with conference attendees in approximately six months to a year. These interviews will allow TCE to further measure the impacts of the conference in terms of the number of residencies attained by conference participants and the role that the conference played in assisting these artists in achieving their career goals.
Economic Impact Analysis

Another stated goal of the conference was to offer Massachusetts an influx of new business. This report contains an economic impact analysis that measures the economic activity created by the conference. Using participant expenditures data and expenditures from TransCultural Exchange, it is estimated that the conference had a total economic impact of $408,751 and created 3.0 full-time jobs. Importantly, none of this economic activity would have existed without the conference.

TransCultural Exchange had a total of $184,090 in conference-related expenditures. Thus, for every dollar spent by TCE, 2.2 dollars in economic impacts were created. In addition, a total of $30,000 of the Massachusetts Cultural Council grant was spent by TCE to plan and hold the conference. With a total economic impact of $408,751, almost fourteen dollars have been generated or leveraged for every state dollar spent in grant money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Economic and Employment</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Induced</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impact</td>
<td>$184,090</td>
<td>$189,635</td>
<td>$35,026</td>
<td>$408,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Impact</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[This page left blank intentionally]
1.00 INTRODUCTION

1.10 ARTS IN THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

The arts are one of the fastest growing occupational groups in the U.S. and global workforce and one of the major components of the Massachusetts economy (New England Council, 2002). At the same time, “International artistic exchanges are more important than ever in an age in which ideas, information, and technologies travel freely across national borders. Our commercial creative industries are increasingly global in reach” (Creative America). Yet “creative industries are facing increasing international competition” for which creative businesses and policy makers need “to appreciate the scale of these competitive challenges” (National Endowment for Science, Technology & the Arts).

In addition, it is essential that artists have direct contact with the new global marketplace; otherwise the artist is dependent on a “middleman to provide feedback – which may be more of an indication of the arbitrary taste of the tourist than the inventiveness and quality of project. [Potential] profit [thus] would be lost to the producer – further limiting his ability to identify new markets and develop alternative products” (Jackie Guille, Developing Sustainable Enterprise).

It is crucial, therefore, for members of Massachusetts’ creative economy to learn how to work within the global marketplace to be competitive. In addition, opportunities for these artists to interact with their global counterparts are seen as an important catalyst for economic and creative growth both individually and for the Massachusetts creative economy as a whole.

1.20 TRANSCULTURAL EXCHANGE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN THE ARTS

TransCultural Exchange (TCE) is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to promoting international art and the understanding of world cultures through high quality art exhibitions, cultural exchanges and educational programs at its home base in Boston and throughout the world. The organization has received awards from organizations such as the International Art Critics Association and support from respected world organizations such as UNESCO, the U.S. State Department’s Art in Embassies Program, and the Asian Cultural Council, among others.

TCE is at the center of a long-term, multi-pronged initiative, the goal of which is to help the Massachusetts creative workforce meet its full creative and economic potential in the today's increasingly global marketplace. A major initiative in meeting this goal is TransCultural Exchange’s Conference on International Opportunities in the Arts, which is the first ever Conference on International Opportunities in the Arts to be held in America. The aim of the conference is to create, sustain, enhance and maximize the economic impact of the arts in Massachusetts.

1 Sherman, Mary. TransCultural Exchange Adams Grant.
Over 350 attendees, 60 speakers and 25 moderators from around the world converged on Boston during the weekend of April 27-29, turning Boston into the hub of the global arts community. The conference offered the local creative workforce concrete information on how to take advantage of international opportunities and residencies, which are often the first step into the global marketplace. International residencies often attract today’s new wave of artists: someone for whom geographic boundaries are not fixed; someone who functions as “a curator/project manager/artist/website designer” (NETSA - referring to Gardner, Csikszentmihalyi, Stein and McRobbie). Thus, residencies not only provide new venues for creating, promoting, selling, exhibiting and engaging in the 21st century’s trans-global society, but they also put Massachusetts artists in direct contact with this new wave of artists who are also international curators, organizers and critics.

The primary focus of the Conference was the twenty-five conference panels. The aim of the panels was to assist artists to enter the global art arena, to gain greater cultural awareness and to transmit their new-found knowledge through their work. Speakers from around the world presented their artist residency, networking and exhibition programs for both emerging and established artists, critics, art teachers and students. Other invited guests met with artists for one-on-one mentoring sessions and considered artists for their programs. Attendees learned how to obtain funding for working abroad (the Fulbright Program, CEC Artslink, Art Corps, etc.) and attended workshops with members from Trans Artists – the world’s primary information center for artist-in-residences – who conducted workshops on finding and applying to international programs.

It is intended that the conference will stimulate new and, perhaps, unexpected economic activity for artists, enhance the artists’ reputations and boost international recognition of Massachusetts’ creative economy. This activity, in, turn, will bring an influx of new business to the state and provide Massachusetts’ creative sector with new venues and sources of economic and creative activity, while improving artists’ livelihoods, whose new works will contribute to the state’s civic life. Further, bringing international artists, curators and critics to Massachusetts for the conference will provide local institutions with new avenues of exchange. All of these outcomes will serve to strengthen and enhance Massachusetts’ creative economy both at home and in the eyes of the world to ensure its long-time ability to retain and build upon its already large creative workforce.
1.30 CONFERENCE SUPPORT

TransCultural Exchange received funding from several sources. These include $30,000 from the Massachusetts Cultural Council and $9,000 from the LEF Foundation, with $3,000 of this amount to be earmarked for scholarships to non-affiliated university artists who do not have access to professional development funds. In addition, TCE received $500 from an anonymous donor to be targeted for minority scholarships and the Turkish Cultural Foundation provided $550 as a scholarship for a speaker to the conference. Boston Cultural Council contributed $2,874; Res Artis, $5,000; Mondriaan Foundation, $2,000; Délégation du Québec à Boston, $1,500 and Consulat Général de France à Boston, $1,500.

Major conference sponsors also include Massachusetts College of Art, (http://www.massart.edu), Massachusetts Institute of Technology (http://web.mit.edu/) and Northeastern University (http://www.neu.edu). Funds were also raised from the conference fees and in-kind support for airfare and accommodations were provided by nearly half of the speakers.

1.40 CONFERENCE HEADQUARTERS AND FACILITIES

The majority of the Conference panels were held at Northeastern University. Other panels were held at the Massachusetts College of Art, which housed over 220 mentoring sessions. MIT’s Kresge Auditorium served as a satellite venue on April 29 for the panel on “Documenta and Biennales” and the Boston Center for the Arts’ Mills Gallery hosted the panel on “Navigating Cultural Differences,” which included a tour of their current exhibition, “Encounters,” curated by the currently Boston based free-lance curator Femke Lutgerink.

1.50 CONFERENCE STAFF

The conference consisted of an all volunteer staff: TCE’s staff and students from Boston University’s Arts Administration Program, Massachusetts College of Art, Northeastern University’s Digital Media Department, Boston College’s German Department (translators) and Art Department, and from the New England School of Art and Design.
2.00 ECONOMIC IMPACT AND SURVEY EVALUATION - METHODOLOGY

2.10 ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

The Center for Policy Analysis was retained by TransCultural Exchange to conduct an economic impact analysis of the Conference on International Opportunities in the Arts. The program’s economic impact is being measured using expenditure data obtained from participant surveys that were administered by Internet and by direct intercept at the conference and from conference-related spending by TransCultural Exchange. 2

The estimated total economic impact of the conference is calculated using the IMPlan econometrics modeling system, which has been in use since 1979 and is currently used by over 500 private consulting firms, university research centers, and government agencies.3 The Center for Policy Analysis has been a licensed IMPLAN user since 1999 and regularly employs its econometric modeling system in conducting economic and fiscal impact analyses.

2.20 PROCESS EVALUATION

The process evaluation assesses the implementation of TransCultural Exchange’s Conference in terms of the goals established in its grant application with the Massachusetts Cultural Council. TransCultural Exchange’s established goals are:

Goal 1: To act as a catalyst, offering the local creative workforce concrete information on how to take advantage of international opportunities and residencies, which are often the first step into the global marketplace.

Goal 2: To offer Massachusetts an influx of new business as well as showcase Massachusetts’ creative economy both at home and in the eyes of the world to ensure its long-time ability to retain and build upon its already large creative workforce.

2.21 Survey Evaluation

A survey was administered to conference participants, who either completed the survey at the conference or on-line at a later date. The survey asked participants to indicate the amount they spent on various items during the conference weekend and this data was partly used to determine the economic impact of the conference. The survey also solicited information about participants’ backgrounds, their satisfaction with various aspects of the conference, opinions and comments about the conference, and the benefit of the conference to their career. Results of the survey can be found in Section 5.00. A total of 191 surveys were returned for a response rate of 54.6 percent.

---

2 The survey instrument can be found in Appendix A.
3 A more detailed description of the IMPLAN system can be found in Appendix B.
ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

DIRECT, INDIRECT, INDUCED, & TOTAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS

Economic impacts consist of direct impacts, indirect impacts, and induced impacts. Direct impacts include payroll expenses and other budget expenditures made by TransCultural Exchange such as advertising, printing, office supplies, postage, and travel. Indirect impacts derive primarily from off-site economic activities and occur primarily as a result of non-payroll local expenditures by attendees to TransCultural Exchange, such as airfare, hotel and lodging, food, clothing, miscellaneous retail and admissions to museums. Indirect impacts differ from direct impacts insofar as they originate entirely off-site, although the indirect impacts would not have occurred in the absence of the conference.

Induced impacts are the multiplier effects of the direct and indirect impacts created by successive rounds of spending by employees and proprietors. For example, a restaurant owner may use money spent by TCE conference attendees at his restaurant to purchase gas or a gallon of milk at a local convenience store.

The Center for Policy Analysis built a combined regional input-output model for Suffolk County, Massachusetts using the IMPLan Professional 2.0 model building software and county-level data packages. Expenditure data was collected through intercept on Internet surveys as well as from conference-related spending by the sponsoring organizations.

Economic Impacts

TransCultural Exchange incurred $184,090 of conference-related expenses, which includes $78,609 non-personnel expenses, $55,751 in non-personnel in-kind expenses and $49,730 in personnel expenses (see Table 1). These expenses constitute the direct impacts of the conference.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Expense</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personnel</td>
<td>$78,609.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Personnel In-Kind</td>
<td>$55,751.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$49,729.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$184,089.62</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.11b Conference Attendee Expenditures

Conference attendees spent an estimated total of $157,063 on items such as hotel and lodging, airfare, food and drink, miscellaneous retail, transportation, clothing, admissions to museums and car rentals (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Who Spent Money</th>
<th>Average Amount Spent</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>465.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfare</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>436.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Drink</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>101.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous retail</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transportation (gas/tolls/parking)</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>45.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>133.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>21.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions to museums/historical sites</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>29.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other items</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>102.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car rental</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>156.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.11c Total Economic Impacts

The total economic impact of the TCE International Opportunities in the Arts Conference is $408,751. These impacts include $184,090 in direct impacts, $189,635 in indirect impacts, and $35,026 in induced impacts (see Table 3). The conference also created an additional 3.0 full-time equivalent positions. These jobs are annualized FTEs (Full-Time Equivalent), that is, they represent year long employment and not simply jobs for the weekend that the conference was held.

TransCultural Exchange spent a total of $184,090 on conference-related activities. Thus, for every dollar spent by TCE, 2.2 dollars in economic impacts were created. In addition, a total of $30,000 of the Massachusetts Cultural Council grant was spent by TCE to plan and hold the conference. With a total economic impact of $408,751, almost fourteen dollars have been generated for every state dollar spent in grant money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Impact</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Induced</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impact</td>
<td>$184,090</td>
<td>$189,635</td>
<td>$35,026</td>
<td>$408,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Impact</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 The economic impact model does not include in-kind expenses.
4.00 PROCESS EVALUATION AND PRELIMINARY OUTCOMES

The process evaluation assesses the implementation of TransCultural Exchange’s Conference in terms of the goals established in its grant application with the Massachusetts Cultural Council. TransCultural Exchange’s established the goals are:

**Goal 1:** To act as a catalyst, offering the local creative workforce concrete information on how to take advantage of international opportunities and residencies, which are often the first step into the global marketplace.

**Goal 2:** To offer Massachusetts an influx of new business as well as showcase Massachusetts’ creative economy both at home and in the eyes of the world to ensure its long-time ability to retain and build upon its already large creative workforce.

4.10 GOAL 1

To act as a catalyst, offering the local creative workforce concrete information on how to take advantage of international opportunities and residencies, which are often the first step into the global marketplace.

As the following narrative demonstrates, TransCultural Exchange was highly successful in meeting Goal 1. Activities conducted in meeting this goal include:

4.11 Dates and Attendance

The Conference on International Opportunities in the Arts was held between April 27 and April 29, 2007. The Conference included over 350 attendees, 60 speakers from around the world, 25 moderators and over 30 volunteers.

4.12 Examples of Events

The primary focus of the Conference was the twenty-five conference panels. Speakers representing more than forty countries presented their artist residency, networking and exhibition programs for both emerging and established artists, critics, art teachers and students at these panels. Sample panels included a presentation on teaching and exhibition possibilities at Turkish Universities by Dr. Ilgim Veryeri-Alaca, Visiting Lecturer at the Modlin Center for the Arts, University of Richmond, as well as a talk on international programs sponsored by the Massachusetts College of Art that are open to artists not affiliated with the MCA. A full list of speakers and their affiliations can be found in appendix F.

Other panel offerings focused on short-term residencies, specifically those targeted at emerging artists, professional arts, artists dealing specifically with industry and technology and multi-disciplinary artists. The panels were staggered so that, for instance, all the panels for professional artists met one after another so that most attendees could chose and attend the panelist most relevant to them without missing others. For these talks, the Turkish Cultural
Foundation, French Consulate, Mondriaan Foundation, Danish Embassy and Quebec Delegation came to Boston and sponsored speakers.

Panels such as the Fulbright Program, CEC Artslink and Art Corps focused on ways to obtain funding for working abroad. Other talks were targeted to Massachusetts businesses to encourage greater support and interaction with the arts. For example, Dr. Annika Schoemann spoke about the Siemens Arts Program and the ways in which it complements the charged fields between culture, business and science. Etiquette specialist Jacquie Baetschi’s talk “Navigating Cultural Differences” addressed different cultures’ local customs and protocols to ensure successful inter-personal and international business transactions – crucial knowledge for anyone working abroad; and the Danish Cultural Attache Irene Krarup spoke on how European countries are currently dealing with and supporting the phenomena of artists collaborating with their peers in other countries. These 3 talks were also offered as single ticket items to attract people in business, government and/or industry for which the bulk of the conference was of less relevance.

Further, speakers and other invited guests met with over 220 artists for 20-minute, one-on-one mentoring sessions and to consider artists for their programs, at which time the artists presented their work for feedback and advice. These reviews provided attendees invaluable advice, direction and concrete information on how to take advantage of international opportunities and residencies. In addition, a member from Res Artis – the world’s main information center for artist-in-residences – and the Alliance of Artist Communities conducted a workshop on finding and applying to international programs.

Comments provided by respondents indicate that these sessions were a success. For example, when asked the program session and/or conference activity respondents thought were most valuable, the highest number of respondents indicated that the mentoring sessions in general (N=28 or 16.4%), all programs/sessions (N=20 or 11.7%) and information on residencies (N=18 or 10.5%) were most valuable.

Also of note is that the conference allowed panel moderators, who typically are local curators or others in the field, a chance to network and hear from their peers. These moderators included Michael Rose, the director of the Rose Art Museum; Bill Arning, Curator of the List Visual Arts Center; Anja Chavez, Curator of the Davis Museum; Anthony De Ritis, Director of Northeastern University’s Digital Media Program; and Carole Anne Meehan, Curator at the Institute of Contemporary Art.

In addition to the 25 panels and one workshop, the conference included:

• Tours of the Institute of Contemporary Art, MIT’s Art and Architecture Program and Massachusetts College of Arts’ facilities, promoting all these venues to the attendees and international speakers.

• A reception at Massachusetts College of Arts’ galleries, showcasing the MCA students’ work.

• A gala dinner for the attendees, speakers and sponsors on Saturday night at the Massachusetts College of Art that included a promotional video on the MCA’s international programs, a performance by the legendary Massachusetts-based jazz
drummer Bob Moses and his New England Conservatory students, and music dj’ed by John Barber, a MCA student.

• A dinner for the speakers and sponsors on Friday night at Northeastern University that included a promotional video on Northeastern and a preview of (NEU Digital media department) Dennis Miller’s Music Marathon, one of the major Boston Cyberarts events. The Music Marathon and the Conference shared a hospitality suite at Northeastern University, which also was a central meeting place and place to pick up conference handouts.

• The Boston Art Dealers Association hosted an open-house for all the Conference attendees and guests on Friday night from 1- 5 pm at 38 Newbury Street. The open-house showcased area artists’ work in exhibitions at Acme Fine Art, Alpha Gallery, Robert Klein Gallery, Pepper Gallery and Richardson Clarke Gallery.

4.13 Benefits to Artists’ Careers

More than 220 artists had their work viewed and commented on by the Conference speakers, who are residency directors, museum curators, critics, and other invited guests from around the world. These reviews provided attendees invaluable advice, direction and concrete information on how to take advantage of international opportunities and residencies.

In less than a month following the conference:

• Over 6 different residency programs, including CAMAC in France, the Debrecen International Colony of Artists in Hungry, the Dorothea Fleiss East-West Artist Symposia in Romania, Talal Moualla in the United Arab Emirates, Gozo Contemporary in Malta, Chaled Res in Egypt and the Akiyoshidai International Art Village in Japan, are planning to offer residencies to artists whom they met at the conference.

• In response to the above interest abroad in the attendee artists’ works, TCE is offering 3 stipends of $500 to 3 Massachusetts artists (Elizabeth Geissler, Guillermo Hart and Edith Wright) to attend these programs.

• Marja de Jong of the Finnish artist residency program Saksala ArtRadius selected Mary Bucci McCoy’s work to feature on their website.

• The Dubai curator Talal Moualla is introducing Naveed Nour’s work to a gallery in the United Arab Emirates.

• The Dutch curator Maijke Jansen has offered to show Debra Weisberg’s work in the Netherlands.
In addition, comments from the intercept and on-line surveys indicate that attendees feel that the Conference was one of the few, if only sources of information on international opportunities and that the conference was invaluable to their careers.\textsuperscript{5} For example:

- “It provided concrete leads for opportunities in international artist residencies, lifted the veil of mystery behind the application process, and provided a mentoring interview that just might lead to a residency.”
- “Between the presentations, panelists and networking, I am sure with a little organization I can create and attain the goals I have set for myself.”
- “[The conference] expanded information on residencies exponentially.”
- “Great motivation helped me to focus better on my future projects; very inspiring.”
- “It gave me ideas for a new direction in this juncture of my career and how to enhance what I am doing.”
- “It provided insight into the layers of functionality and interaction that take place in the art community.”
- “The mentoring session was especially valuable in suggestions for getting exposure for my work.”

Many respondents also cited the Conference’s importance for networking, sharing their work with the presenters and others and making contacts that they would not otherwise have the opportunity to make. Similar sentiments were expressed that was similar to this one attendee’s,

- “I met many interesting people including artists and panelists from other countries. It made me feel ambitious about reaching outside my culture, not as a tourist but as a working artist; it made me want to attempt creative projects in countries I had visited before and also places I had never been.”

TCE plans to conduct follow-up interviews with conference attendees in approximately six months to a year. These interviews will allow TCE to further measure the benefits of the Conference on attendees’ careers as these individuals explore residencies and other opportunities that were presented at the conference.

\textsuperscript{5} See Appendix C for specific comments.
4.14 Benefits to Massachusetts Institutions and Conference Partners

Preliminary outcomes in the weeks following the conference show early success in terms of partnerships and future collaborations. For example,

- The School of the Museum of Fine Arts, Salem State College, Northeastern University’s Digital Media Department and the University of Massachusetts Amherst have approached TCE to be a part of their next conference.
- The Kohler Arts and Industry program is in negotiation with TCE to host and/or create a join partnership for the next conference.
- Massachusetts College of Art and Catherine Merrill of the Art of Fire began talks on a partnership and exhibition for 2009.
- Massachusetts College of Art is also hiring the Alliance of Artist Communities to do a workshop on residency programs at MCA, based on seeing the workshop at the conference.
- Massachusetts College of Art’s Urban Arts program is now exploring working with the Siemens Art Program.
- TCE is working with the Apothiki Art Center to establish an international residency program for Northeastern University students and artists.
- TCE was invited to give a conference follow-up lecture to Philadelphia’s Center for Emerging Visual Artists, which took place at CEVA May 14, 2007.
- TCE’s director Mary Sherman was invited to speak about international opportunities and collaboration to artists (including participation in TCE’s current Tile Project) in Western Massachusetts June 2, 2007 at the home of critic Charles Guiliano.
- TCE is working with UMass Amherst’s Hampden, Herter and University galleries to create a residency program in conjunction with the conference in 2009.
- During the conference 4 people offered to volunteer at the next conference and 3 offered to be considered as TCE board members.

These are just an example of the new markets for artists and organizations opened by TCE’s conference. Additionally, the intercept and on-line surveys indicate that a majority of the artists attending the conference feel that the conference provided them with new networking opportunities and contacts as well as exposure to opportunities, encouragement and inspiration. For example, 30.5 percent of respondents indicated that the conference provided them with new contacts and networking opportunities, while 22.9 percent of respondents commented that they received valuable information to attend a residency or other international opportunity (N=27 or 22.9%).
4.15 Measures of Customer Satisfaction

Results of the intercept and on-line surveys show that respondents have high levels of satisfaction with the conference. For example, more than four in five respondents (82.1%) rate the conference as excellent or good and more than sixty percent of respondents rate each of eighteen conference aspects (e.g. facilities, location, registration, panel topics, mentoring sessions) as excellent or good. Detailed results can be found in Section 5.21.

Of note is the high level of attendee satisfaction with the conference panels and speakers, which were the primary focus of the conference. For example, 82.0 percent of respondents rate the selection of panels and speakers as excellent or good and 84.9 percent of respondents rate the selection of panel topics as excellent or good.

In addition, more than seventy percent of respondents (71.2%) indicate that they are interested in attending a similar conference in 2009 and 64.8 percent indicate that they are interested in attending a residency program in the Boston area that includes international artists. Perhaps most importantly, nearly sixty percent of respondents (59.7%) believe that the conference will benefit their career. While 37.5 percent of respondents are not sure if the conference will benefit their career, many of these respondents indicate that “it is too early to tell” and that they will know better as they apply what they learned at the conference to achieving their career goals.

Importantly, more than half (54.6%) of the conference participants completed the voluntary survey. The high completion rate, coupled with the detailed open-ended (and primarily positive) comments, is one indication of the conference’s effect and success. Participants were particularly satisfied with the “number of networking opportunities,” the “quality of the mentoring sessions,” and “the wealth and value of information presented during these opportunities.” Participants wrote of “attaining a higher understanding of my career,” “expanding information on residencies exponentially” and “exchanging ideas” and commented that the conference was “a great motivation,” “eye opening,” and “a unique opportunity for working with others.”

Other examples of comments praising the conference include:

• “A big huge thank you to all of the TransCultural Crew and all the volunteers, funders, etc. I am grateful to all of you! Also I am VERY impressed with what a WONDERFUL JOB everyone did!!!! I am thrilled to have attended . . .”

• “Extraordinary achievement! So much planning. Thank you Mary Sherman.”

• “I really would like to thank Mary Sherman and the Team from the TransCultural Exchange for organizing this inspiring Conference!”

• “Incredibly well organized and orchestrated. Mary Sherman combined absolute efficiency with charm, ease and great attention to each individual.”

• “Mary Sherman did a phenomenal job pulling together such a variety of international speakers and workshops.”

• “Thank you very much for this great experience!”
4.16 Website

Results of the intercept and on-line surveys show that respondents have high levels of satisfaction with the website. For example, more than eighty percent (81.3%) of respondents rated the website as either excellent or good.

TransCultural Exchange’s goal included updating its website to offer more information and to create an interactive web portal for artist studio, information and cultural exchange. Thus, TCE made audio and video tapes of all the conference sessions. These recordings will be available on the website once the tapes are digitalized. Lack of adequate funding and the loss of its volunteer webperson, however, have not allowed TCE to create an interactive webportal as an ongoing resource for artists. To compensate, at the moment, TCE has included a link to TransArtists website, the world’s largest clearing house of artist residency programs.

4.17 Press Coverage

The TCE conference received more 40 press citations from a wide geographic spectrum including New York Foundation for the Arts, Art New England, Chicago Artist Resource, College Art Association and New York Arts Magazine. A press bibliography is included in Appendix E. Of note is the number of press citations and the wide geographic distribution, many of which are international.
4.20 GOAL 2

To offer Massachusetts an influx of new business as well as showcase Massachusetts’ creative economy both at home and in the eyes of the world to ensure its long-time ability to retain and build upon its already large creative workforce.

Activities in meeting this goal include:

4.21 Showcasing Massachusetts’ Creative Economy

Over 350 participants from the U.S. and abroad attended the TCE conference. Results of the intercept and on-line surveys indicate that most conference attendees and speakers were impressed by Massachusetts’ cultural offerings. Of note, all of the mentors were highly impressed by the quality of the work they saw by the artists. As a consequence, many are inviting artists to their programs this year – even though the application process for this year is long finished. In addition, there were requests for other similar conferences on international opportunities for other disciplines.

Echoing the sentiments of a number of the international presenters, the Director of Academie Schloss Solitude in Germany wrote,

“Thank you for the three unforgettable days I spent in Boston. A wonderful opportunity to discover another side of the US reality, involved in culture and education, friendly, peaceful, open to otherness and generous. Indeed another American voice than the usual one you hear, read or see in medias.”

Other comments that highlight participants’ perception of the Boston area include:

“I thought that this was an excellent start to a much needed conference in Boston. Boston is lame because there is no international attention or an arts presence like cities such as NY, Chicago and LA. We need to increase the knowledge of our artists and art professionals and create a better community then the one we have. TCE is a resource that is greatly underused and that a lot more people in Boston could utilize with more exposure and another conference date.”

“I’ve been to a few other conferences analogous to this one and feel that Mary and staff have done a fantastic job with a complex roster of components: good locations (and parking was convenient, which is an achievement in itself), good speakers and good topics, all organized well. What more could anyone need I hope the overseas presenters enjoyed their stay in Boston. Thank you enormously for all of your effort in putting this on. It serves everyone’s careers, but also brings diverse points of view.”

“I want to thank Mary Sherman and everyone involved in this conference. I know it was an enormous undertaking. I think the experience will not only benefit me (with an informal invitation to attend a residency and exhibit), but will also create a positive buzz about our fair city, Boston. I am grateful for the opportunity to participate. Thank you again.”

Additional comments can be found in Appendix D7.
“The organization was perfect and I would like to thank Mary Sherman and her team for the fantastic job done. A lot of projects were born during this conference and I’d like to thank them for this event, which was the missing link in the art world.”

It is expected that the quality and success of the TCE conference will have positive future impacts for local artists and the region’s creative economy by assisting local artists to meet their full creative and economic potential. Immediate impacts, such as the conference itself, its economic impact on the local economy and discussions of future collaborations are substantial.

In addition, it is anticipated that the qualitative and quantitative impacts of the conference will create a ripple effect that over time will increase, broaden and expand Massachusetts’ creative economy to ensure its long-time ability to retain and build upon its already large creative workforce. This will likely occur by creating a larger, more diverse and more knowledgeable creative cultural force in Massachusetts where artists are more effectively able to compete in the global economy and who contribute to a world-class local arts community.

7 Mary Sherman. TCE Grant Application.
5.00 SURVEY EVALUATION

An intercept survey was administered to conference participants during the conference. Participants also filled out the survey on-line. A total of 191 surveys were returned for a response rate of 54.6 percent, most of which were completed on-line. The percentage of respondents who completed the survey, coupled with the detailed open-ended (and primarily positive) comments, is one indication of the conference’s effect and success.

5.10 GENERAL INFORMATION

5.11 Place of Residence

A total of 350 attendees participated in the conference. Respondents reside in twenty different states, the District of Columbia, and fourteen countries. The largest percentage of respondents resides in Massachusetts (59.8%), New York (4.8%), Pennsylvania (3.2%) and California (2.6%). A more detailed list of respondents by city or town can be found in Appendix D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Country</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>State/Country</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.12 How did you participate in the conference?

Respondents were asked how they participated in the conference. More than three-quarters of respondents (75.9%) participated as conference attendees, while 18.9 percent participated as speakers, 6.8 percent participated as mentors, 5.8 percent participated as moderators, 3.1 percent participated as volunteers, and 2.6 percent participated in other ways.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendee</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Participants were allowed to check more than one category, thus the percentages do not add to 100).

Other ways in which respondents participated in the conference include:

- Co-sponsor
- College Gallery Director
- Event staff
- Scholarship awardee
- Sponsor
- Translator

5.13 What is your annual income level?

Nearly a third of respondents (32.1%) have incomes between $20,000 and $39,999, while 21.9 percent have incomes between $40,000 and $59,999, 17.1 percent have incomes of $80,000 and over, 12.3 percent have incomes between $60,000 and $79,999, and 16.6 percent have incomes below $20,000.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below $20,000</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$39,999</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$59,999</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-$79,999</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 and over</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.14 What is your age?

More than a third of respondents (34.2%) are age 51 to 60, while 31.1 percent are age 41 to 50, 18.9 percent are 31 to 40, 11.1 percent are under 30 and 4.7 percent are over 60.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.15 How did you find out about the conference?

The highest percentages of respondents found out about the conference from TransCultural Exchange (31.4%), a colleague (26.2%), “other” sources” (18.8%) and from the Artists Foundation (15.7%). Less than ten percent of respondents learned of the conference from direct mail (9.9%), Massachusetts College of Art (9.4%), Museum of Fine Arts (4.7%), advertising (3.7%), Massachusetts Cultural Council (2.6%) and the College Art Association (1.0%).

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransCultural Exchange</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Colleague</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists Foundation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mail</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts College of Art</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Museum of Fine Arts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Cultural Council</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Art Association</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Participants were allowed to check more than one category, thus the percentages do not add to 100).
“Other” sources include:

- Alliance Web Site
- Art Papers
- Asked to moderate panel
- Boston Center for the Arts
- BRA
- Dance-Action-Network (Yahoo group)
- Email (N=8)
- IMMA
- Googled artist residency
- Invitation to moderate
- Janna
- Listserve at Lynn Arts
- Local newsletter: Boston Redevelopment Authority
- Mary Sherman at South Boston Open Studios
- Met Mary Sherman through a friend
- Northeastern University
- Professor at UMass
- Dartmouth (N=2)
- Received an email
- Residential Artist
- Rhode Island School of Design
- Roxbury Open Studios
- Turkish Cultural Foundation
- VLA (N=2)
- Was asked to present
- Website

Advertising sources include:

- art magazine
- brochure (N=2)
- email (N=2)
- Harvard
- NYFA
5.16 The program session and/or conference activity respondents thought was most valuable

Respondents were asked what programs or sessions they thought were most valuable. The highest number of respondents indicate that the mentoring sessions in general (N=28 or 16.4%), all programs/sessions (N=20 or 11.7%), information on residencies (N=18 or 10.5%), “Studying Abroad” (N=13 or 7.6%), “Finding the Best Fit” (N=12 or 7.0%) and networking events (N=12 or 7.0%) were the specific sessions and/or conference activities that were most valuable. Responses include:

Sessions/Programs Overall

- Mentoring sessions (N=28, 16.4%)
- All programs/sessions (N=20, 11.7%)
- Information on residencies (N=18, 10.5%)
- Networking events (N=12, 7.0%)
- Friday night networking (N=9, 5.3%)
- Short-term residencies (non-specific as to which session) (N=6, 3.5%)
- International Residencies- Professional Artists Panels/non-specific (N= 6, 3.5%)
- Meeting the people (N=5, 2.9%)
- Gala dinner (N=4, 2.3%)
- Emerging Artists Panels (N=3, 1.8%)
- Websites given at speeches (N=1, 0.6%)

Specific Panels

- Studying Abroad (N=13, 7.6%)
- Finding the Best Fit (N=12, 7.0%)
- Art Fairs (N=7, 4.1%)
- Biennale & Documenta (N=6, 3.5%)
- Working with Science and Technology, Session A, (N=5, 2.9%)
- Small Scale Programs (Greece, Malta, Ireland) (N=5, 2.9%)
- Art, Social and Economic Transformation (N=4, 2.3%)
- Creativity, Culture, Education and the Workforce (N=4, 2.3%)
- Multi-Disciplinary (Estonia, Japan, Canada) (N=4, 2.3%)
- Professional Artists, Session C (China, Brazil, Turkey) (N=4, 2.3%)
- Professional Session B (Australia, Sweden, Ireland) (N=3, 1.8%)
- Grant Giving/Global Mission (N=3, 1.8%)
- A new collaborative atmosphere presented by Irene Krarup (N=2, 1.2%)
- Not Your Average Residency (N=2, 1.2%)
- Emerging Artists (Finland, Germany, Turkey) (N=2, 1.2%)
- International Residencies – Short Term Session B (Romania, Hungry, Cuba) (N=2, 1.2%)
- International Residencies – Prof. Artists, Session A (Taiwan, Japan, Canada) (N=1, 0.6%)
- Working with Science and Technology, Session B (N=1, 0.6%)
- Navigating Cultural Differences (N=1, 0.6%)
5.17 Which one of the following best describes you?

More than forty percent of respondents (41.6%) identify themselves as an artist not affiliated with a college or university, while more than a quarter of respondents (26.8%) identify themselves as an artist affiliated with a college or university. Smaller percentages of respondents identify themselves as an arts professional (15.3%), “other” (6.8%), a gallerist or museum curator or administrator (3.7%), a student (3.2%), an advising administrator (1.6%), or an academic advisor (1.1%).

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artist not affiliated with a college or university</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist affiliated with a college or university</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Professional (non-artist)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallerist/Museum Curator or Administrator</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Administrator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Other” responses include:

- Architect (N=3)
- Artist affiliated with regional Arts Center
- Artist and teacher
- Artist/ arts administrator
- Artist, artistic director
- Engineer with senses for art
- Independent artist and organizer
- Professor a Massachusetts College of Art
- Residence founder and artist
5.18 How long have you held your current position?

Twenty-nine percent of respondents (28.8%) have held their current position for 5-10 years, while 26.6 percent have held their position for 11-20 years, 23.9 percent have held their position for more than 20 years, and 20.7 percent have held their position for less than five years.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.19 If you are an artist, how would you describe your work?

The highest percentages of respondents describe themselves as drawing/mixed media artists (38.2%), painters (35.6%), “other” (27.2%), and installation artists (24.6%). Less than twenty percent of respondents describe themselves as sculptors (19.4%), public artists (10.5%), activists (8.4%), performance artists (5.2%), sound artists (5.2%), and writers/critics (5.2%).

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drawing/Mixed Media</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painter</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation Artist</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculptor</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Artist</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Artist</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Artist</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer/Critic</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: artists were allowed to check more than one category thus the percentages do not add to 100).
Other types of artists include:

- 19th century photography/collage
- animator
- ceramicist (N=2)
- ceramics
- textiles
- community-based artist
- craftsman/picture framer
- curator
- dance/theatre
- digital (N=2)
- film
- fine artist
- graphic designer/photographer/mixed media
- independent curator
- jewelry designer
- new medias artist (N=2)
- painter/printmaker
- photographer (N=9)
- filmmaker
- photographer/video artist
- photographer/mixed media
- photographer/videographer
- photographer/visual
- printmaker (N=12)
- recycled glass
- teacher (N=2)
- technologist
- video (N=4)
- visual artist/photographer
5.20 What other activities did you attend during the conference?

Other activities that respondents attended during the conference include a mentoring session (70.7%), the opening reception (60.7%), the Saturday cocktail event (53.9%), the Saturday conference dinner (34.6%), “other activities” (16.2%), Boston Center for the Arts event (13.6%), Massachusetts Institute of Technology tour (10.5%), Visual Music Marathon (10.5%), Massachusetts College of Art tour (7.9%), and the Boston Institute of Contemporary Art tour (6.3%).

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Session</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening reception</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday cocktail event</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday conference dinner</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (see bullets following table)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Center for the Arts Event</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology Tour</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Music Marathon, part of the Boston Cyberarts Festival</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts College of Art Tour</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Institute of Contemporary Art Tour</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Participants were allowed to check more than one category, thus the percentages do not add to 100).

“Other” activities include:

- Boston Museum of Fine Arts (N=5)
- CyberFestival events
- Exhibition at MassArt (N=2)
- Fogg Art Museum
- Gallery visit
- Gardner Museum
- Independent visits to museums & galleries
- Isabella Steward Gardner Museum
- Lectured at Mass Art
- Lunch appointment with attendees
- Lunch with others
- Mills Gallery
- MIT conference Sunday
- MIT tour
- Newbury St. Open Studio
- Open meeting with residential artist
- Other art museums
- Other Cyberarts sites
- Siemens Art Program
- Visited Gardner Museum
- ICA
- Visiting gallery and artists studio
5.20 Satisfaction with the Conference

5.21 Overall, how would you rate the quality and efficiency of the following aspects of the conference?

More than sixty percent of respondents rate each of the conference aspects as excellent or good. Respondents are most satisfied with the hotel accommodations (94.8% excellent/good), Northeastern’s conference facilities (90.1% excellent/good), and the Saturday evening gallery reception (90.0% excellent good). Respondents are least satisfied with the mentoring sessions (21.6% poor/very poor), although 60.8 percent of respondents rate the mentoring sessions as excellent or good (see Table 13 and Figure 1).

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The conference overall</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance mailings, publicity, etc</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>17.21%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference location</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference facilities: Northeastern</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference facilities: Mass Art</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference facilities: MIT</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information materials provided</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference brochure</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel accommodations</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of conference facility</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration process</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransCultural Exchange Website</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday evening reception</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday evening gallery reception</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday night gala dinner</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Panel Topics</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Panel Speakers</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Session</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1

Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Conference

Note: Chart is sorted by percentage of “excellent” responses.
5.30 Spending Data

5.31 Approximately how much in total will you spend during your stay in Boston on the following items?

Nearly three-quarters of respondents (73.3%) spent money on food and drinks, while more than forty percent of respondents spent money on public transportation (47.1%) and other transportation (43.5%). Respondents also spent money on miscellaneous retail (27.2%), admissions to museums and historical sites (25.7%), hotel and lodging (20.4%), airfare (19.4%), clothing (9.9%), other items (4.9%), and car rental (1.6%). The largest average amount of money was spent on hotel/lodging ($465.45) and airfare ($436.81).

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Spending</th>
<th>Average Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food/Drink</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transportation (gas/tolls/parking)</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous retail</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions to museums, historical sites, etc.</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfare</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other items</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car rental</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.40 Interest in Future Conferences and Contact Information

5.41 Would you be interested in attending a similar conference in 2009?

More than seventy percent of respondents (71.2%) indicate that they are interested in attending a similar conference in 2009, while 3.5 percent are not interested and 25.6 percent are not sure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.50 Open-Ended Questions

5.51 In what ways was the conference valuable to you?

Respondents were asked to list ways in which the conference was most valuable. The most salient themes include the international information presented at the conference (N=105 or 61.0%), accessibility to panelists (N=42 or 24.4%), making friends (N=17 or 9.9%) and mentoring sessions (N=11 or 6.4%). The full list of open ended responses can be found in Appendix C1. Examples of responses include:

International Information

- “I was impressed by the various offers and the quality of the residences and the enthusiasm of the artists I saw in the mentoring sessions.”
- “Great opportunity to spread the word about my residency program; good opportunity to meet other directors; discuss possible exchanges, and collaborations.”
- “I have wanted to do artists' residency for 20 years. Now I am finally able to. I needed information like this.”
- “It provided concrete leads for opportunities in international artist residencies, lifted the veil of mystery behind the application process, and provided a mentoring interview that just might lead to a residency.”

Accessibility to Panelists

- “The access to many different people was greatly appreciated. “
- “Bravo, a great concept and a great conference overall. It provided a unique opportunity for networking with others who share a drive for artistic and intellectual community experience.”
- “The contacts I made were amazing.”

Mentoring Session

- “My mentoring session was a very gratifyingly positive and potentially productive experience.”
- “The opportunity to meet a lot of artists and present our activities is something very important.”
- “The highlight was my session with my mentor, Suzanne Jenkins. She was very understanding and appreciative of my work and has encouraged me to apply to her organization for a residency in Guatemala.”
5.52 Is there anything you wish you had known before attending the conference?

Respondents were asked to list things they wish they had known before the conference. The primary themes include additional information/background on mentors (N=12 or 11.0%), panelists/moderators (N=6 or 5.5%), and residencies (N=4 3.7%); site information (parking, maps) (N=6 or 5.5%); and more information about different panels (N=5 or 4.6%). The complete list of comments can be found in Appendix C2. Examples of comments include:

• “Would there have been any way to request a mentor that was affiliated with a residency I wanted to go to? That would have been much more useful all around. I enjoyed my session, but I was disappointed that the nature of my work did not relate at all to the program she heads up.”

• “All I wanted to know was explained during the period before the conference.”

• “That many of the top caliber residencies are extremely competitive and there are few places for artists from another locale, i.e., the one in India takes mostly artists from India. The one in Northern Japan has a very short season and takes few artists.”

• “Parking, registration, maps could have been clearer.”

• “Specific information on each program (i.e. age limits on programs, number of residents at any given time, how many programs annually).”

• “The categories of residency were a bit unclear. From the artists' point of view, it would be helpful to know what disciplines they favor, which offer financial assistance to US artists and which do not, which are looking for a proposed community project from the artist.”
5.53 What would you suggest to improve the conference experience?

Respondents were asked to suggest ways to improve the conference. The most frequent suggestions include holding the conference in one location (N=38 or 22.8%), less overlap in sessions/panels (N=28 or 16.8%), more informal meeting areas and opportunities (N= 16 or 9.6%), better mentoring sessions (N=15 or 9.0%), a central information location (N=13 or 7.8), a better schedule and conference brochure (N=12 or 7.2%) and better presentations (N= 11 or 6.6%). The complete list of suggestions can be found in Appendix C3. Examples of comments include:

- “A common meeting-relax area for the panelists. This would have been a good way to schmooze, relax and network in a low-key way. It is hard to do that at a noisy (but very fun and wonderful gallery opening.”

- “A more cohesive conference site where the locations were not so spread out. Also staggered sessions that enable more artists to attend more of them.”

- “Additional mentoring sessions, ones to sign up for, where you could present work for a number of different opportunities.”

- “Combine the venues – have all sessions in one or neighboring buildings.”
5.54 What additional information would you like to see on the TransCultural Exchange website?

Respondents were asked to provide additional information that they would like to see on the TransCultural Exchange website. The most frequent suggestions include more information about opportunities in general (N=7 or 7.1%) and residency programs specifically (N=22 or 22.4%), including the website addresses and contact information of conference presenters. Respondents would also like to see a conference archive as well as documentation and access to the Conference’s content. The complete list of suggestions can be found in Appendix C4. Examples of comments include:

- “Perhaps a link, artist to artist, of individuals wishing to work collaboratively with others in different disciplines to propose and develop a project together.”
- “Good site; pre-conference support for me was absolutely stellar.”
- “Information from artists who have participated; what their experiences were with residencies, nuts and bolts of it, like arranging supplies, transportation, etc.”
- “Exhibition possibilities abroad or opportunities to work on a volunteer basis in other countries.”
- “I would love to have an online network/email addresses of other attendees. And a listing of all links and websites of programs presented. More than once I wanted to be in two (or three) places at once . . . so it would be great to check out the places I wasn’t able to hear about.”
- “Links to all the residency organization websites, talks by artists who attended residencies and the work they did.”

5.55 Would you be interested in attending a residency program in the Boston area that included international artists?

Nearly two-thirds of respondents (64.8%) indicate that they are interested in attending a residency program in the Boston area that includes international artists, while 10.1 percent of respondents indicate that they are not interested and 25.1 percent are not sure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.56 What other kinds of activities would you like to see TransCultural Exchange sponsor?

Respondents were asked to list the types of activities that they would like to see TCE sponsor. The activity most listed by respondents includes additional exhibitions, both in the United States (with international artists), abroad and at the conference (N=16 or 16.2%). Respondents also would like to see TCE sponsor workshops (N=9 or 9.1%), residency programs (N=9 or 9.1%) and other networking activities (N=7 or 7.1%). Additionally, there was an interest in TransCultural Exchange organizing similar conferences for other artistic disciplines (N=8 or 8.1%). The complete list of suggestions can be found in Appendix C. Examples of comments include:

- “Have several early and mid-career, successful, international and National artists talk about the TRAJECTORIES of their careers, and how the different career and life decisions they made, or connections, made a particular effect. Let us ask them questions.”

- “Would like to see literary arts a bit better represented. Doesn't have to overlap with what existing literary orgs already do. More and more of us are interested in literary residencies outside the US box.”

- “To expand the conference itself. More lectures, more panelists.”

- “Portfolio Reviews. It is difficult for us to get away like this, and expensive. We need to get something specific out of it.”

- “Perhaps the website could be used for further exchange - people could write in a blog about their ideas and can connect with each other.”

- “More panels with art professionals in Boston and networking sessions with international artists.”

- “More local events, maybe focusing on application preparation, Fulbright preparation, local reviews of portfolios before they get sent out to residencies, monthly reminders of what deadlines are coming up.”

- “More international Filmmakers exchanges; more participation from Latin American Universities and L.A. Art Schools.”

- “In between the conference events, program a couple of residency presentations per year in the community. Better yet, keep those mentoring sessions ongoing in-between the conferences. They're invaluable to an artist with limited funds to travel and interview in person for opportunities.”
5.57 Do you think this conference will benefit your career?

Nearly sixty percent of respondents (59.7%) think that the conference will benefit their career, while 2.8 percent indicate that the conference will not benefit their career and 37.5 percent are not sure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.58 How could this conference benefit your career?

Respondents were asked how the conference could benefit their career. Many respondents answered this question in terms of how to improve the conference (such as provide contact information for the presenters), while others noted that the conference will benefit their career if some tangible outcome results (an exhibition/residency). Other respondents noted that the conference provided them with new contacts and networking opportunities (N=36 or 30.5%) and information to attend a residency or other international opportunity (N=27 or 22.9%). The complete list of suggestions can be found in Appendix C6. Examples of comments include:

- “Connections, possible residency, etc. As someone who follows up on leads, I know that following up on ONE good contact can open up a whole world of possibilities.”
- “It will help me understand which residencies are likely to be a good match for me, so I can focus well and get into some. This would give me time to make art and move forward. Excellent.”
- “Meet other connections, enrich my own work, looks good on a resume.”
- “Obviously if I get a residency or exhibition from a contact I made through the conference I would be delighted.”
- “Getting a residency would greatly improve my CV as a new artist. Having time to focus on my art would be great. And learning about another culture can only help enrich my experience and work.”
- “It's a little too soon to tell what and how benefits will emerge. I do intend to apply and contact at least two of the presenters.”
5.59 Additional Comments

Respondents were asked to provide additional comments, most of which are positive. Major themes include general thanks/congratulations; more background information on presenters; holding the conference in one venue; matching mentors with attendees more successfully; providing contact information for all attendees and presenters; avoiding overlapping panels; including more presentations that are relevant to the theme of the attendees; including more information on nametags; sponsoring other types of artistic exchange beyond residencies; and providing a clearer brochure and clearer directions. The complete list of suggestions can be found in Appendix C7. Examples of comments include:

- “A really great lineup of visiting presenters from around the world, very much appreciated.”
- “Awesome job of organization.”
- “The price was reasonable. Appreciated extra events that were optional and which broadened exposure to Boston area.”
- “I appreciate all of the work involved and the bringing together of people from around the world.”
- “I thought that this was an excellent start to a much needed conference in Boston. We need to increase the knowledge of our artists and art professionals and create a better community than the one we have. TCE is a resource that is greatly underused and that a lot more people in Boston could utilize with more exposure and another conference date.”
- “I want to thank Mary Sherman and everyone involved in this conference. I know it was an enormous undertaking. I think the experience will not only benefit me (with an informal invitation to attend a residency and exhibit), but will also create a positive buzz about our fair city, Boston. I am grateful for the opportunity to participate. Thank you again.”
- “The organization was perfect and I would like to thank Mary Sherman and her team for the fantastic job done. A lot of projects were born during this conference and I’d to thank for this event which was the missing link in the art world.”
- “I was impressed about the various offers and the quality of the residences and the enthusiasm of the artists I saw in the mentoring sessions.
- “Thanks! Thought this was a great idea and a great start.”
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APPENDIX A – SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Please take a moment to answer the following questions about your experience at the 2007 Conference on International Opportunities in the Arts. Your responses, comments, and suggestions will help TransCultural Exchange with funding and the planning of future conferences and programs.

A. General Information

1) How did you participate in the conference? (Please check all that apply)
   ○ Attendee
   ○ Mentor
   ○ Moderator
   ○ Speaker
   ○ Volunteer
   ○ Other ______________________

2) What is your zip code, or if you live outside the U.S., in what country do you live? ________

3) What is your annual income level?
   ○ below $20,000
   ○ $20,000 - $39,999
   ○ $40,000 - $59,999
   ○ $60,000 - $79,999
   ○ $80,000 and over

4) What is your age?
   ○ under 30
   ○ 31 - 40
   ○ 41 - 50
   ○ 51 - 60
   ○ over 60

5) How did you find out about the conference?
   ○ A Colleague
   ○ Artists Foundation
   ○ College Art Association
   ○ Direct Mail
   ○ Massachusetts College of Art
   ○ Massachusetts Cultural Council
   ○ School of Museum of Fine Arts
   ○ TransCultural Exchange
   ○ Advertising: (Where?) ______________
   ○ Other: ___________________________

6) The program session and/or conference activity you thought most valuable was:

   ____________________________________

7) Which one of the following best describes you?
   ○ Arts Professional (non-artist)
   ○ Academic Advisor
   ○ Advising Administrator
   ○ Gallerist/Museum Curator or Administrator
   ○ Student
   ○ Artist affiliated with a college or university
   ○ Artist not affiliated with a college or university
   ○ Other: __________________________

8) How long have you held your current position?
   ○ less than 5 years
   ○ 5 – 10 years
   ○ 11 – 20 years
   ○ more than 20 years

9) If you are an artist, how would you describe your work? (Please check all that apply).
   ○ Activist
   ○ Drawing/Mixed Media
   ○ Installation Artist
   ○ Painter
   ○ Performance Artist
   ○ Public Artist
   ○ Sculptor
   ○ Sound Artist
   ○ Writer/Critic
   ○ Other _____________________
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10) What other activities did you attend during the conference? (Please check all that apply).
   - Boston Center for the Arts Event
   - Boston Institute of Contemporary Art Tour
   - Massachusetts College of Art Tour
   - Massachusetts Institute of Technology Tour
   - Mentoring Session
   - Opening reception
   - Saturday cocktail event
   - Saturday conference dinner
   - Visual Music Marathon, part of the Boston Cyberarts Festival
   - Other: ________________________________________

B. Satisfaction with the Conference

11) Overall, how would you rate the quality and efficiency of the following aspects of the conference? Please use the scale below to indicate your responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The conference overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance mailings, publicity, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General conference location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference facilities: Northeastern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference facilities: Mass Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference facilities: MIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information materials provided (maps, guides, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference brochure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel accommodations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of conference facility (e.g. parking, public transportation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransCultural Exchange website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday evening reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday evening gallery reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday night gala dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Panel Topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Panel Speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Spending Information

12) Approximately how much in total will you spend during your stay in Boston on the following items?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food/Drinks</td>
<td>$ _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>$ _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfare</td>
<td>$ _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions to museums, historical sites, etc.</td>
<td>$ _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>$ _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous retail (e.g. souvenirs, books, etc.)</td>
<td>$ _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>$ _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transportation (gas/tolls/parking)</td>
<td>$ _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car rental</td>
<td>$ _______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other items (please list)</td>
<td>$ _______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Interest in Future Conferences and Contact Information

13) Would you be interested in attending a similar conference in 2009?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe
- Don’t Know

14) Would you be willing to be contacted in the future for follow-up questions? (TransCultural Exchange is interested in determining how our efforts can best suit artists’ needs.)

- Yes
- No

If yes, please provide us with your address and/or email contact (please print clearly):

Name _______________________________________________________________
Address ____________________________________________________________
Address ____________________________________________________________
City ______________   State/Province _______________________
Country ______________   Zip/Postal Code ______________
Email _____________________________________________________________

E. Open-Ended Questions
15) In what ways was this conference valuable to you?

16) Is there anything you wish you had known before attending the conference?

17) What would you suggest to improve the conference experience?

18) What additional information would you like to see on the TransCultural Exchange website?

19) Would you be interested in attending a residency program in the Boston area that included international artists?
   
   o Yes
   o No
   o Maybe
   o Don’t Know

20) What other kinds of activities would you like to see TransCultural Exchange sponsor?

21) Do you think this Conference will benefit your career?

22) How could this Conference better benefit your career?

23) Any additional comments are greatly appreciated.

Thank you very much for your participation. TransCultural Exchange hopes that you had a truly enjoyable and enlightening experience.
Appendix B – IMPLAN & Economic Impact Methodology

B1. IMPLAN

The direct, indirect and induced economic impacts of the TransCultural Exchange conference project are specified using IMPLAN (IMpact Analysis for PLANing), which is an econometric modeling system developed by applied economists at the University of Minnesota and the U.S. Forest Service. The IMPLAN modeling system has been in use since 1979 and is currently used by over 500 private consulting firms, university research centers, and government agencies. The Center for Policy Analysis has been a licensed IMPLAN user since 1999 and regularly employs its econometric modeling system in conducting economic and fiscal impact analyses.

The IMPLAN modeling system combines the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis’ Input-Output Benchmarks with other data to construct quantitative models of trade flow relationships between businesses and between businesses and final consumers. From this data, one can examine the effects of a change in one or several economic activities to predict its effect on a specific state, regional, or local economy (impact analysis). The IMPLAN input-output accounts capture all monetary market transactions for consumption in a given time period. The IMPLAN input-output accounts are based on industry survey data collected periodically by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis and follow a balanced account format recommended by the United Nations.

IMPLAN also includes social accounting data (e.g., personal income and gross state product) that makes it possible to measure non-industrial transactions such as the payment of indirect taxes by businesses and households. The IMPLAN data base provides data coverage for the entire United States by county and has the ability to incorporate user-supplied data at each stage of the model building process to insure that estimates of economic impacts are both up-to-date and specific to an economic target area. IMPLAN can construct local input-output models in units as small as five-zip code clusters.

IMPLAN’s Regional Economic Accounts and the Social Accounting Matrices are used to construct local, county, or state-level multipliers specific to a target economic area. Multipliers describe the response of an economy to a change in demand or production. The multipliers allow economic impact analysis to move from a descriptive input-outputs model to a predictive model. Each industry that produces goods or services generates demand for other goods and services and this demand is multiplied through a particular economy until it dissipates through “leakage” to economies outside the specified area. Thus, multipliers calculate the response of the targeted economic area to a change in demand or production.

8 The IMPLAN modeling system draws on a variety of statistical sources, including the Bureau of Labor Statistics Growth Model, Bureau of the Census, ES-202 employment and earnings data, the Regional Economic Information System (REIS), and the Bureau of Economic Analysis Gross State Product data.
IMPLAN models discern and calculate leakage from local, regional, and state economic areas based on workforce configuration, the inputs required by specific types of businesses, and the availability of both inputs in the economic area. Consequently, economic impacts that accrue to other regions or states as a consequence of a change in demand are not counted as impacts within the economic area. The model accounts for substitution and displacement effects by deflating industry-specific multipliers to levels well below those recommended by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. In addition, multipliers are applied only to personal disposable income to obtain a more realistic estimate of the multiplier effects from increased demand. The reliability of these estimates has been proven through empirical testing (Department of Commerce 1981; Brucker et al 1990).

A predictive model is constructed by specifying a series of new expenditures in a specific economic area (e.g., new employment or construction) which is then applied to the industry multipliers for that particular region. Based on these calculations, the model estimates final demand, which includes employment, employee compensation (excluding benefits), and point-of-work personal income (including benefits). The initial IMPLAN data details all purchases in a given area, including imported goods and services. Importantly, IMPLAN’s Regional Economic Accounts exclude imports to an economic area so the calculation of economic impacts identifies only those impacts specific to the targeted economic area. IMPLAN calculates this distinction by applying Regional Purchase Coefficients (RPC) to predict regional purchases based on an economic area’s particular characteristics. The Regional Purchase Coefficient represents the proportion of goods and services that will be purchased regionally under normal circumstances, based on the area’s economic characteristics described in terms of actual trade flows within the area.

B2. DIRECT, INDIRECT, INDUCED, & TOTAL ECONOMIC IMPACTS: METHODOLOGY

Economic impacts consist of direct impacts, indirect impacts, and induced impacts. Direct impacts include payroll expenses and TCE budget expenditures such as advertising, printing, office supplies, postage, and travel. Indirect impacts derive primarily from off-site economic activities and occur primarily as a result of non-payroll local expenditures by attendees to TransCultural Exchange, such as airfare, hotel and lodging, food, clothing, miscellaneous retail and admissions to museums. Indirect impacts differ from direct impacts insofar as they originate entirely off-site, although the indirect impacts would not have occurred in the absence of the conference.

Induced impacts are the multiplier effects of the direct and indirect impacts created by successive rounds of spending by employees and proprietors. For example, a restaurant owner may use money spent by TCE conference attendees at his restaurant to purchase gas or a gallon of milk at a local convenience store.

The Center for Policy Analysis built a combined regional input-output model for Suffolk County, Massachusetts using the IMPLAN Professional 2.0 model building software and county-level data packages. Expenditure data was collected through intercept on Internet surveys as well as from conference-related spending by the sponsoring organizations.
APPENDIX C - OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

C1. The program session and/or conference activity you thought most valuable was (Question 4.16):

- 1-2 week programs
- 1-2 week residencies
- A new collaborative atmosphere presented by Irene Krarup
- All programs/sessions (N=11)
- Art, Social and Economic Transformation (N=3)
- Art Fairs (N=5)
- Artists’ Residencies
- Artists working with technology
- Biennale & Documenta (N=6)
- Colleges with residencies
- Creativity, Culture, Education and the Workforce (N=4)
- Denmark program
- Emerging Artists
- Finding the Best Fit (N=4)
- Friday night networking
- Fulbright/Aomori Japan
- Fulbright-info/overview
- Gala dinner
- Global
- Informal time (dinner, networking)
- Information on residencies (N=4)
- International residencies
- International residencies - emerging artists
- International residencies (Asia and CIES)
- International residencies --CAMAC, Bridge Guard, Kohler
- International residencies conferences and mentoring session (N=5)
- International Residencies- Professional Artists
- International Residencies, Professional artists, session B
- International Residencies, Session B: NEU: Snell 108
- International residency professional sessions
- Introduction to panelists and networking event NEU
- Ireland/Germany/Sweden/Australia
- Janna-Study abroad
- Learning about others in art/technologies
- Meeting other artists, and information for emerging artists
- Meeting the people (N=2)
- Mentor session (N=19)
- Mentoring session with Yaohua Su and International residencies for: Professional artists, 1-2 weeks
- Multi-Disciplinary
- Multi-Disciplinary, especially Aomori, Dorothea Fleiss, Greece, Malta, Northe
- National and international lists/overview
- Navigating Cultural Differences
- Networking events (N=10)
• Northern Ireland, Estonia, Malta, Greece, Romania
• Not Your Average Residency (N=2)
• One on one
• Opening reception (N=4)
• Opening reception was a good networking time
• Organizations with a Global Mission (N=2)
• Organizations with a Global Mission; Residencies for emerging and professional artists
• panel discussions - meet and greet
• Panel on Art Fairs (N=2)
• Panel on residencies through universities and panel on Eastonia, Banff, Japan
• Personal meeting
• Portfolio review with mentor
• Presentations on different residency programs
• Professional Artist Sessions
• Researching & Applying for Residencies
• Researching and applying for residencies
• Researching and applying for residencies (N=2)
• Researching residencies
• Residencies Affiliated with Schools (N=3)
• Residencies for professional artists
• residency information(N=3)
• Residency sessions (general) (N=5)
• Residency speakers
• Saturday gala
• School residencies/Burren College of Art
• Seminars on various residencies
• Session A Snell 108/networking
• Sessions on shorter residency programs (N=2)
• Small Groups residencies
• small-scale retreats
• Solitude presentation
• Sunday pm session on Economics and Art
• Sunday session on opportunities in Brazil...and the mentoring session
• Sweden/Australia
• Symposium - programs in the U.S.
• The panel that included the Greek island information
• The panels talked about artist, skills and how to find.
• The session on how to apply
• Time to mingle and chat
• University residencies
• University Residency Program
• Websites given at speeches
• Working with science and or technology

C2. In what ways was the conference most valuable (Question 4.51)?

• Accessibility to panelists; great networking; information.
• All international information in more detail and connecting directly with some of the curators and art people from those countries and institutions.
• All the contacts with other artist-in-residences and the different artists to see what they expect from a period in a residence. I was impressed about the various offers and the quality of the residences and the enthusiasm of the
• Artists I saw in the mentoring sessions.
  - Always good to hear what interests people about artists’ communities.
  - Amazing contacts.
  - American hospitality; another America involved in art, culture and education.
  - Approachability of panelists.
  - As a speaker I was able to network with my other network residency colleagues.
  - Bravo, a great concept and a great conference overall. It provided a unique opportunity for networking with others who share a drive for artistic and intellectual community experience.
  - Broadening my knowledge of artists’ residences and exhibition opportunities.
  - Brought together information and presenters that I wouldn’t have found on my own.
  - Catching up with artists I have not seen in a while and talking/networking with them/sharing resources with each other.
  - Connecting with other artists here and abroad, information on residencies, meeting directors of residencies.
  - Connections.
  - Contact many people in the field of residencies and artists- building a network.
  - Contact with personnel.
  - Contacts.
  - Contacts and ideas for next year’s conference.
  - Contacts with other artists.
  - Encouraged and directed me to where to look for residencies internationally.
  - Encouragement and artistic bonding.
  - Expanded my knowledge of international art communities.
  - Exposed me to a variety of opportunities that I didn’t know about.
  - Exposure to new ideas.
  - Exposure to numerous residencies.
  - Face-to-face contact with presenters and artists from other countries.
  - Fairs or residencies.
  - Finding out about specific residencies I was unaware of.
  - Found out about some residency programs I didn’t formerly know about.
  - Found out about various programs.
  - Found out more about future options.
  - Found wonderful sites to apply to; met wonderful artists.
  - Gaining visibility.
  - General networking.
  - General overview of residencies; gallery contacts for my gallery.
  - Getting to meet people who run/administer residencies, etc. and making contacts with my artist peers (in other disciplines).
  - Good information and connections.
  - Good source of current information, web addresses etc.
  - Great information; very interesting people.
  - Great motivation helped me to focus better on my future projects; very inspiring.
  - Great networking and meeting artists, curators, residency people; answers to many questions - - even questions I didn’t know I had; excellent sense of the lay of the land with residencies; wonderful range of possible programs.
  - Great opportunity to spread the word about my residency program; good opportunity to meet other directors; discuss possible exchanges, and collaborations.
  - Helped me understand the kinds of residencies out there; clarify more why an artist would go away for a residency.
  - Helpful in compiling a list of websites to search for specific opportunities with venues.
  - Helpful to be introduced to organizations that do not appear on internet searches.
  - I came “shopping” for a residency. While I found great ones, I realized my view was too narrow that I could consider finding funding to bring groups to the US.
  - I found lots of networking opportunities, and several residencies of great interest to me.
  - I got a better sense of what the residency world is about.
  - I got to meet a lot of people handling residencies all around the world, got to learn about their different programs, the way they function and the difficulties they face. It was a good event for networking and I made some very good friends.
I had a chance to meet professionals; I learned about opportunities; I introduced Turkey, which so many people were interested in.

I had a few good conversations with speakers at the college residencies workshop and the small residencies (not your average) with the speakers from Malta, Northern Ireland, and Greece.

I have wanted to do an artists’ residency for 20 years. Now I am finally able to. I needed information like this.

I learned a lot about residencies and how to research and apply for them.

I loved the mentoring session; I got valuable feedback and information.

I met a lot of people who shared similar interests.

I met many interesting people including artists and panelists from other countries. It made me feel ambitious about reaching outside my culture, not as a tourist but as a working artist; it made me want to attempt creative projects in countries I had visited before and also places I had never been.

I was able to find out about a lot of possibilities at one time and made some great connections.

I was able to learn about available residency opportunities that I would otherwise not have heard about.

I will be able to send information to the Ministry of Culture in Brazil; to other Brazilian Cultural Organizations in MA, and CT, as well as to other Brazilian artists in the U.S. and in Brazil.

Imagination.

In depth residency information; mentoring session; some connections.

Information for grad students and opportunities for faculty.

Information on subjects and networking.

Information.

Information; global activity.

Informed me of all kind of international opportunities; good networking opportunities as an emerging artist.

Inspiration.

Interaction with other artists; better understanding of specific residencies; general information; meeting the directors of the residencies.

Interesting residency opportunities were presented; it was good to meet people from abroad who are affiliated with arts organizations; I have lists of contacts to follow up later.

International focus and networking opportunity.

International networking.

Introduced me to more possibilities; chance to get a more personal and in-depth view.

It demystified the residency process for me; I met some very nice people.

It gave me a better understanding of the various programs presented.

It gave me a chance to meet artists and arts professionals who are interested in the work of the Trust for Mutual Understanding and to present the Trust’s work in a broad context.

It gave me a sense of where my work does and does not perhaps ‘fit in’ to a larger context; the opportunity to see examples of work being made worldwide which is interesting and perhaps inspiring.

It gave me ideas for a new direction in this juncture of my career and how to enhance what I am doing.

It provided a wealth of information.

It provided concrete leads for opportunities in international artist residencies, lifted the veil of mystery behind the application process, and provided a mentoring interview that just might lead to a residency.

It provided insight into the layers of functionality and interaction that take place in the art community.

It was eye opening as to the number of artist residency programs available to the pursuing artist.

It was great to hear about residencies that I had not heard about previously; it was really great to have the mentoring session and to meet other artists.

It was interesting to see the audience that was interested in this themed conference.

It was interesting to see the range of funding opportunities.

It was valuable to learn what different types of residencies are out there, learn the specifics about some, and learn how you might fund them.

It was very helpful to have the information compiled and presented in such a way.

It was very valuable in that I learned a great deal about both the process of evaluating residencies and details about residencies of interest to me; my mentoring session was a very gratifyingly positive and potentially productive experience as well.

It wasn’t.

Learned about many opportunities; was inspired.

Learned more about art schools and their interest in internationalization.

Learned new information.
• Learned of new residencies.
• Learning about diverse artist opportunities worldwide.
• Learning about the different programs and countries and organizations.
• Learning about wide range of opportunities; networking.
• Legal and funding opportunities.
• Lots of information.
• Made connections and learned about opportunities.
• Making new contacts, renewing old contacts; mentoring session.
• Meet and hear all these people with all their experience; contact information.
• Meeting my peers from foreign and other US residency programs.
• Meeting new people, making new contacts, having a knowledge about other residencies.
• Meeting people connected to other art residencies; meeting artists; getting to know buildings in Boston.
• Meeting people face to face; exchange of information.
• Meeting people, sharing experience and networking for the future.
• Meeting people/artists (N=6).
• Mentor session; contacts; very good general overview of residencies & art fairs, with new insight on both topics.
• Mentoring session was useful; the breadth of opportunities available was impressive.
• Mentoring session.
• Met people- other artists and presenters.
• Met some new peopleorealized there were residencies that could be useful.
• Network.
• Network; meet friends; learn about residencies
• Networking & exposure to new opportunities, new people.
• Networking (N=7).
• Networking and an opportunity to present IMMA's great residency; finding out more about how things work in USA.
• Networking and business exchanges; meeting of very interesting people from all over the world; get together from artists, curators, arts professionals, art advisors and people who were interested in art.
• Networking and finding out what the rest of the world is doing.
• Networking and Fulbright/VLA info.
• Networking and learning about other residency programs.
• Networking and making contacts; meeting new and so far unknown initiatives from all over the world; viewing MassArt and MIT.
• Networking with other artists was great; information given with brochure; names of residencies and directors is valuable.
• Networking with the industry and other artists.
• Networking; gaining an overview of the arts in other countries, both the art scene and funding situation.
• Networking; overviews of various other residencies became more specific.
• New information about residencies.
• Nice to see the numbers of people involved
• Opened me to things I had never heard of.
• Opened my eyes to more residencies.
• Opening doors.
• Opening up possibilities; making connections
• Openness, intelligent discussions, explanations of opportunities, sharing, networking.
• Opportunities and options, as both an artist and an arts professional/picture framer.
• Opportunity to speak to the panelists.
• Outreach; networking.
• Overview of options
• Overview of residencies.
• Provided nice opportunity for exchange with colleagues, and to share information with artists.
• Putting a face to the colonies was good; listening to the more practical details, ones you don't get from the brochures and web sites was very helpful; also realized the limitations with shipping materials and completed artwork.
• Resources for residencies.
• Seeing what's available; meeting curators and admin.; meeting other artists.
• Sharing of contact info and general networking.
• Sharing real resources for artists.
• Specific information about a wide range of options for working abroad; direct input during the mentoring session.
• Stimulating to hear colleagues from all over the world and listen to what artists are thinking through the kinds of questions that were being asked.
• Thanks for pricing the conference for early-birds at $150 - it was very affordable.
• That conference gave me the fantastic opportunity to meet others institutions from all over the world and talk about further projects; the opportunity to meet a lot of artists and present our activities is something very important.
• The access to many different people was greatly appreciated.
• The accessibility to programs all over the world.
• The contacts I made were amazing.
• The highlight was my session with my mentor, Suzanne Jenkins. She was very understanding and appreciative of my work and has encouraged me to apply to her organization for a residency in Guatemala.
• The information from the panels; the networking; and the wonderful part about being with fellow artists.
• The interaction with other artists from around the World.
• The mentoring session was especially valuable in suggestions for getting exposure for my work.
• The mentoring was valuable and could be improved; it is too short and my mentor did not have expertise aligned with my medium, so if we could better align the mediums and allow for more time - would be good.
• The panels and discussions brought ideas and information that I otherwise would not be exposed to.
• The panels covered a very good section of the residencies and programs available to artists.
• There were programs that I didn't know that existed (like Gozo) that I was able to hear great info about.
• To be a part of this conference was very valuable for me because first of all I had a chance to meet with many people who are interested and has taken position in the same field as I do; it was very important to exchange ideas and find out that we all shared the same intention concerning the responsibilities in taking position of today’s art field to change the world for good.
• To meet other artists and exchange different ideas about art.
• To personally see/hear many representatives of international residency-and exchange programs, art organizations and -institutes etc. from all over the world to have the opportunity to meet and interact with many through Q & A to network to have the opportunity of a mentor-session with a mentor from a foreign country to meet other attendees from all over the world.
• Visual presentations to enhance understanding
• Wealth of information presented
• Websites for quality programs.
• Websites, overview.
C3: **Is there anything you wish you had known before attending the conference (Question 4.52)?**

- A better understanding of traveling to other countries, what it really entails.
- A little more background on each residency.
- Advertise what the emphasis of the conference is.
- All I wanted to know was explained during the period before the conference.
- Better mentor information. My session was useless. I felt it was a waste of time.
- Biographies of panelists and mentors; being able to better target mentors. When I emailed this request, I was recommended to Google the name and or organization. I had already done this and found very little about the organization-and nothing about my mentor. I had no idea what to expect or how to tailor my questions for maximum benefit of time.
- Breakdown of other attendees’ backgrounds.
- Did not realize this was just about residencies; thought it would be about showing, too.
- Everything was very clear.
- A better description of the purpose of the mentoring session.
- More information about the different sessions so that it would be easier for me to choose which ones I wanted to attend.
- How bad my portfolio review would be...would not have signed up for it.
- How exhausting it would be
- How it relates to dancers/performers.
- Map of local restaurants - difficult to find food not knowing the area.
- How to get to Friday night opening.
- How to make four days last a week
- I liked the surprise.
- I needed more info as a moderator. My panelists were confused about the tech part and their hard copy material they sent ahead of the conference never made it to our panel room.
- I think on the schedule you should list a website for each speaker/organization if applicable, so that we could do a little more research regarding which speakers we wanted to see.
- I think that this conference was important in the art world and very specific.
- I think that this conference was important in the art world and very specific.
- I wish I’d had web addresses to check out the presenters and decide which ones I wanted to see.
- I wish I had attended more of the panels and had a better idea of the location.
- I wish I had known about the price increase sooner.
- I wish I had known the conference wouldn’t touch on exhibition opportunities.
- I wish I had known that the mentor I met with had chosen to do a mentoring session to tell others about the one residency program that she knew about and wanted to promote, but had been declined the opportunity to do a panel discussion because the residency she attends costs money.
- I wish I had received a mailing. I signed up a month in advance but never received a mailing.
- It would be good to get the maps in advance and parking info in advance.
- I wish I had researched the websites of presenters- would have helped me choose.
- I wish I would have known that we did not get to choose who our mentorship meeting was with.
- I would have wanted to know that it was mostly geared towards residencies; I thought opportunities were going to be broader.
- I would like to have had contact information and websites listed to check out before and after coming.
- If the website had posted the schedule updates in the mornings before the sessions began, I might have adjusted my workshop choices in time.
- A bit more detail about the presenters as well as the lay out of the venues.
- It is amazing that there is absolutely nothing to say here. I have never seen such organization before. BRAVO to you, you covered all of the bases. It was amazing to me that in the midst of all of this organizing, you answered personal e-mails promptly and with a personal touch which made me feel special
- It was a little confusing in terms of how this was to unfold. But, in hindsight it seemed to work out remarkably.
- Lengths of residencies listed in brochures, number of people they take, media used would help in deciding which sessions to attend.
• More about free parking.
• More about the mentoring sessions.
• More about the types of residencies and programs to make comparisons easier.
• More about the weather.
• More background on mentors and presenters.
• More descriptive listings about the residencies so people could better choose what panels to attend.
• More detailed information on event.
• More information on the places. Also, that some conferences overlapped.
• More specifics on what each presenter would discuss so that the difficult decisions about what to attend would be easier.
• More websites for presenting residencies.
• Most information could have been gleaned from visits to the web sites of the AIR programs. The conference promotional info stated “learn how to break into the international art world”, which feels misleading. As someone actively pursuing international residency opportunities, I’d hoped there would be more insight into the specifics, rather than general info on the AIRs.
• Would have been helpful to know why I was paired with my mentor so that I could maximize that interaction which felt random and not prod
• Better maps ahead of time. Intro bag seemed a bit of a waste- info I didn't need
• Only that when I signed up for the mentoring session that we weren't going to pick the mentor.
• Parking, registration, maps could have been clearer.
• Preview of website, please, so info here could go beyond that.
• Specific information on each program (ie Age limits on programs, number of residents at any given time, how many programs annually).
• That basically everything I learned was available on websites.
• That I didn't need to bring my laptop and that a technology assistant was available.
• That many of the top caliber residencies are extremely competitive and there are few places for artists from another locale, i.e., the one in India takes mostly artists from India. The one in Northern Japan has a very short season and takes few artists.
• That not all the sessions would have the speakers listed.
• That residencies are mostly geared toward 35 and under.
• That the sessions would have as little to offer me as they did. I felt I wasted much of my time. Much of the information given by panelists was available on the web. I had hoped instead to be given more general, and also insider, information about attending residencies over the lifetime of one’s artistic career: how it affects your career overall, whether it effects what gallery directors and museum curators think of you.... or feedback from artists who have attended each of the residencies.
• That there would be so few handouts and limited information.
• The categories of residency were a bit unclear. From the artists’ point of view, it would be helpful to know what disciplines they favor, which offer financial assistance to US artists and which do not, which are looking for a proposed community project from the artist.
• The emphasis was on new media and cutting edge work. It was as if there is not a place to advance if one does more traditional art forms. Is this true Might you be clearer about the bias in the future
• The information that had been sent so far was clear and detailed.
• The names of the artists I was mentoring and a delegates list with web info.
• The organization and preparation were amazing
• Websites on panelists.
• Where to park.
• More about each session.
• Wish for a package in hand with subway ticket on arrival.
• Would there have been any way to request a mentor that was affiliated with a residency I wanted to go to That would have been much more useful all around. I enjoyed my session, but I was disappointed that the nature of my work did not relate at all to the program she heads up.
• I wish I had known that it would concentrate mostly on residency programs. I thought it would be more general, to include other international opportunities, such as exhibitions without residencies.
• Who to get to know Biographical information on the panelists, sponsoring organization, major presenters, along with photos may have helped in the meeting and greeting of the foreigners.
C4. What would you suggest to improve the conference experience (Question 4.53)?

- A better designed website & listing of events: I was unable to print out the schedule so had to paste it into another document & then edit it - very confusing layout. (I heard this from other attendees, so it wasn't some glitch with my computer, which is what I thought at first) 2) Perhaps not 'double scheduling' mentoring with sessions, so as not to miss events (Timing is a problem, I know.)
- A central location for info. I wish there were tables of info for different programs- domestic & international. It seems a shame that people from major US programs were in attendance and there wasn’t any place to find information.
- A common meeting/relax area for panelists. This would be a good way to shmooze, relax and network in a low-key way. It is hard to do that at a noisy (but very fun and wonderful) gallery opening.
- A different format for the schedule, less overlap for the sessions.
- A final get-together at the end, like the opening reception, to network, a chance to make some art together.
- A list of all websites from every panel to be provided to attendees. Also: mentoring session more like "job fair": many mentors at long tables, you can talk to several. The pairing was not always a match; some of the mentors did not have advice for attendees about residencies.
- A more cohesive conference site where the locations were not so spread out. Also, staggered sessions that enable artists to attend more of them.
- A more concentrated venue with a home base to which conferees could return.
- A number of the speakers were impossible to understand I got nothing from their talks as they had heavy accents and did not use translators. They were under the misconception that they were articulate and that their English was adequate. One speaker had handouts in Japanese only. Other speakers had no handouts or only a few so they ran out immediately. In some cases there were technical difficulties and very poor visuals. Some speakers not that well prepared.
- A shared art-making event at the conference. Less travel to locations.
- Abstract booklet
- Accuracy of speakers (listing of who would be speaking), more info from people who had attended residencies, and brochure information on more residencies in a central location instead of at the end of each talk. Maybe even a session where people who have attended residencies can exchange info and network amongst themselves.
- Add titles/organizations to presenters' nametags, more relaxed, quieter music for gala.
- Additional mentoring sessions, ones to sign up for, where you could present work for a number of different opportunities.
- Advising residency directors to be explicit in what they expect from applicants to have clear information on costs involved. (None of the directors of the small residencies could give any idea of expenses)
- Affiliation on name tag
- Be clearer about what the goals of the conference are. What will we get as artists from these sessions For example, the session with the volunteer lawyers for the arts was mainly a history of the company Boring and not more useful than their web site. Next time, please have water and coffee available at each location, for each session. The weather was tough.
- Be very clear to the mentors what is expected, and have a guide by which they can model their sessions with artists on.
- Better clarification of what conference is about. Nametags that clarify presenters from artists, and where people are from.
- Better directions, information about public transportation and campus.
- Better if the talks were in one campus. I don't think it helped to have such big breaks in between talks. Speakers should have been prepared with handouts or applications more often. The mentor piece didn't really seem clear as to her role and what I expected from her. I think it would have been helpful to have an artist on each panel too- one who has done a residency that is talked about. Maybe a panel of artists that have connected to the international world and how they did it.
- Better layout of conference brochure, use a show and tell approach.
- Better mentoring sessions- don't use Judy (for France). Better pairing of mentors with artists.
- Better presentations, more advice, more specific.
- Better registration process on site.
- Better signage to events.
- Better ventilator Air quality was so poor that it was difficult to breathe.
- Brochure/booklet can be greatly improved.
Centralize the activities - improve the weather.
Circulate print-outs that list all the names and contact information of presenters, residencies, sources of residencies in advance at the registration desk, so that attendees can have the benefit of that info even if they don’t attend a particular session. 2) Devote presentation time to contextual discussions of important things that you can’t glean from a website, such as the politics of getting into competitive programs, useful tips, etc. 3) Run technical checks in advance of sessions.
Closers locations
Cluster events (daily) in one location if possible.
Coffee and fruit in mornings at a central location.
Coffee in the mornings. Perhaps sessions on how to create residency opportunities here in the US for international artists.
Combine venues - have all sessions in 1 or neighboring buildings.
Concurrency of mentoring sessions and panels and even panel end cocktail party.
Conference be held in one location 2) badges identify who/what/where people are from/representing, etc. 3) booklet identifying participants with emails, websites, etc. available at registration 4) not so many “GALA” events, but events geared towards artists participants, be it openings at box lunches/refreshments, drinks at a funky bar where we can have fun and mingle, etc.
Conference venues in same location - central. Better brochure, signage, directions, better place to park.
Could be great to have institution name and country on the nametags. Would have made it easier to find the person and institution that you are looking for.
Create a way to enable attendees to hear as many panels as possible. Match mentors to attendees or forget it.
Differentiate between cultural exchange and cultural residency.
Do not have presenters simply read their power point or walk us through their website, I can do that on my own time. Inform presenters that their sole mission is NOT to market their program, but rather to provide information useful to folks selecting an appropriate match.
Do not schedule all the panels at the same time It was not possible to get back and forth between Northeastern and MA to attend the panels that were happening during the same time slots. I missed 3/4ths of the sessions that I wanted to attend.
Don’t have two mentoring sessions in the same room - it’s distracting. The sound was difficult (surprisingly) at the Kresge, so I could understand only about two thirds of what was said. Also, the glitches with presenting digital material (who would think that at these fine colleges this would be an issue) I am not complaining because overall everything was excellent. But you asked...
Double the sessions - even if they were shorter - but I feel I missed some that I would have liked to attend when I was at my mentor session - also if the sessions were all in closer proximity it would have been easier to sample them.
Events & seminars that attract a wider range of people. It seemed like it was mostly white, middle-aged women.
Fewer venues (challenging to work out timing and transport). Speakers who could address more general topics. An overview of residencies rather than a great deal of specific detail about their own particular affiliations.
For some panelists the jet lag was palatable, making their presentations lax, even though the programs they represented weren’t I’d suggest a week-long conference (so that the presenters can acclimate to the time zone....)
From my point of view - giving a mentoring session the same day that I gave my presentation was not that good. I would have like to see more peer presentations. Also it would have been interesting to have other new media artists and art centre to create link and collaboration with them.
Giving a listing of all attendees and websites to preview presenters.
Have it in one location or closer together (N=4).
Have less parallel sections, so that one can attend to more events.
Have presenters stick to listed order so if you want to hear a particular person you can estimate when to leave other workshops.
Have the sessions at one site - so more artists can network and meet each other.
Have venues closer together (on one campus) and have more intimate and formal networking possibilities.
Having panels of interest occurring at same time on different campuses was difficult to navigate, thus missing opportunities.
Hire a graphic designer to make brochure.
How to start a new international residency program.
I am very familiar w/ conference site but more signage for out of towners. If concurrent panels were held in closer proximity to allow "panel hopping" to topics of particular interest.
• I believe we should have been able to select our individual meetings.
• I had a hard time finding my way around. That made me very nervous. Because I felt I could get lost, be late, etc, etc, I wish everything was in OMNI HOTEL. So I could focus on the conference rather than getting nervous for how to go and come back. I like simplicity. I want to think about one thing which is the CONFERENCE; though seeing schools was good.
• I had to make choices between difference sessions. I feel I missed a lot because the sessions were not repeated at a different time slot.
• I think all speakers should be digital, better situation with microphones, more websites and contacts.
• I think that we should have more opportunity for the participants (speakers) to meet each other or have a meeting point for everybody in-between each conference. The distance between the conferences was maybe too important and we couldn't see as we would like (because everything was interesting).
• I think the auditorium at MCA was not a great space - dark and old. I would try to find a better space.
• I think there should be more about long-term residencies, i.e. 1 year or longer. It's good to know about them, but personally, I think a 2 week residency where you have to travel half the world to get there, is a waste of time in terms of art production.
• I think there should have been a conference room where each residency program had a table with information where we could periodically stop by.
• I wish there had been more opportunities to meet other artists once the conference had begun.
• I wish there was a way that all the mentors/residency representatives could have had a chance to see the work of everyone who attended if they so chose; maybe a list of everyone's websites (whoever has websites) divided into categories.
• I would also like to learn more about Symposia- my mentor and others mentioned these short opportunities for a show and other activities are great for emerging artists.
• I would centralize the location(s), maybe limit it to one or two universities...not so spread out.
• I would like to note that since this was about Transcultural exchange, I would have liked to see more people of color, African, Asian, Latin, etc on the panels giving us an insight on how we as artists impact their communities.
• I would possibly like to see the panels moderated more for content and discussion of global issues.
• Identify presenters on nametags and make sure ALL presenters have handouts.
• If future panels are going to be at different locations provide shuttle service.
• If the conference is in a single venue, then it would be possible to move between the panels that were scheduled at the same time. As it was, I felt that I had no choice but to miss a lot because of logistics. Also, try to avoid giving too much time to panelists who do not have open applications. I would rather hear in-depth information about residencies I can actually apply to, rather than those that are by nomination only. Try to set up panelist guidelines regarding content and form.
• Improve the mentoring sessions and align mediums, teams and groups and allow for more time. Enhance the networking time and venue for more networking and less moving from building to building.
• In general, I thought the conference was great.
• It was fine - but a little tough to find the building from Huntington Avenue.
• It was great as it was.
• It would be nice to bring panel speakers together in advance, perhaps seat them together at the opening reception.
• It would be very nice and extremely helpful to have a coordinated contact list for the panelists/moderators (made available only to the panelists/moderators).
• Keep it in one place, more intimate for networking and not as hectic. Provide time after panels for folks to talk to the individual panelists that they are interested in. Panelists should bring more visuals (most were great, there were a couple of really weak presentations) and information hand outs.
• Less moving around to different venues and rooms on the Northeastern (very confusing) campus.
• Less overlapping sessions and have it in 1 location.
• Less time-overlap of the various activities, more specific time-frames for the various panels etc. (vs. 2hr window).
• Let's hold some of the panels and events at the School of The Museum of Fine Arts. We are right next Mass Art and the walking up and down from Northeastern to Mass Art was a killer. Many were tired out by it.
• List of mentors provided to artists so that artists can choose 3-5 and rate them in priority order to be matched up with mentor who is most applicable to their interests/needs.
• List of speakers and attendees included in brochure.
• Local arts administrators to mentor out of towners.
Local maps, more central location, clearer brochure, less scheduling overlap.

Longer mentoring session; more handouts from residency organizations.

Make the conference longer and more affordable for students and repeat some presentations.

Make the conference sessions in one location. Registration table (I came towards the end) needed better signage and organization.

Making it easier to move from session to session. Having sessions in different colleges made that difficult.

Many of the panelists were simply presenting info that could be learned from a website. The best panels provided unique insight.

Many of the residencies of interest to me were all scheduled at the same time. Most of them did not use the full time allowed and I tried to jump back and forth between rooms. If the times were staggered a little more, maybe it would have been possible to attend more sessions.

Map and directions that included driving directions and parking for local participants not staying at the hotel.

Maps, parking information, coffee.

May be good to have an "expo" type area where the residencies can set up and talk to smaller groups.

Maybe it would be good to give more information about the different speakers and their relation to the organization they present and also give a photo so it is easier to connect names and faces.

Mentoring sessions for EMERGING artists...otherwise be more structured with what is expected by artist and mentor.

Mentoring should be better coordinated for matching artist/mentors and clarity of expectations.

More artist representation-for example, a presentation by an artist who has attended one of these residencies showing initial idea/proposal with discussion of experience and outcome.

More clear explanation of agenda. The explanations of the sessions should be more inclusive, and we should be able to get to more, rather than a group of which one may sound great, but the others not so much, and then we miss others we might have benefited from.

More curators and gallery owners that are looking for artists.

More exchange (extended contract) with moderators.

More free networking opportunities w/ residency guests and fellow attending artists.

More information about exhibiting opportunities for emerging artists, not just residencies.

More interaction on a personal level with resident providers.

More interactive talking sessions.

More panels about exhibiting abroad (without a residency) involving information about finding venues, travel, and shipping work for shows.

More representatives from European residencies.

More structured networking and open discussion sessions. Clearer maps and topics.

More student participation from MassArt, NE, MIT (as the goal of these universities speak to intl. education/experience).

More time to network (or dance) after Saturday dinner; music not conducive to conversation.

More time to travel between events. Start Friday with an early session, fewer sessions at once.

More variety in types of activities (workshops etc) in addition to panels.

Networking event in daytime.

Never allow only a foreigner to represent a residency program abroad...as was the case with Brazil (Mr. Van Horne)...a "hotel" residency.

Not have a lot of overlapping programs; also have artists from all over the world and just not the US.

Not so spread out (venues).

One location. (N=2)

One of the merits of a conference is the informal personal contact. Therefore a conference needs a harbor - a place, where people can meet between the sessions, can post a message for whom they are looking, or simply sit down and have a chat. With the geographical distribution of the sessions this was not possible. A small relief was the hotel - where we run in each other sometimes in the lobby.

One site so that it is easier to go back and forth between sessions and sometimes attend sessions going on at the same time; initial reception with hand out material for all attendees; three days so that there is less overlap and more time to see more

One venue - not so much distance between sites.

Opening session didn't work very well. Couldn't see the presenters or remember who was who. Presenters could have name tags of different color, with their venue or specialty written on it, and they could perhaps be ready to come to the mic and introduce themselves. Slightly more mentoring time; mentors better informed about what
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• Organize all in one building, schedules not overlapping.
• Organize the conference in one place.
• Panels and information on residencies for curators and other arts professionals.
• Perhaps color code the presenters' IDs, and indicate their organization & country.
• Perhaps hold it on one campus.
• Perhaps it would be helpful to have a kind of a schedule overview over all talks and events...not to miss a talk while you are in a complete different building.
• Perhaps the sessions can be divided into "tracks" and popular sessions offered twice.
• Perhaps, have panelists bring more written material to pass out especially if English is shaky.
• Pick good speakers for every panel.
• Place all presentations in the same building.
• Portfolio critiques w/ residency guests more meaningful mentoring sessions or none at all coaching of guest presenters to devote less time regurgitating web site info - a 5 minute talk followed by Q and A and one-on-one conversations
• Provide address, e-mails of presenters.
• Provide much clearer maps of campuses. Mentor was disappointing. Possibly differentiate between opportunities for more traditional and more cutting edge work.
• Provide websites and list of residencies on line more discussion/debate forum rather than presentations that repeat material available on the web opportunity to meet and discuss in small groups with the presenters.
• Put out a bid with graphic artists at MASSART to design a conference brochure for you. Make it part of their final project.
• Quality of the topics (more theory) of the speakers (not too many anecdotal lectures).
• Readress the graphics on the print materials. Badges should have name, location, role, panelist, attendee or volunteer, as well as organization.
• Really enjoyed the music at dinner, but it was too loud and many people felt they couldn't talk while it was playing.
• Schedule that would allow attendees to participate in all sessions of interest to them.
• Schedule the workshops that are overviews of the programs with suggestions as to how to apply at the beginning of the conference. Then, break up the conference into more specific topics. Give presenters a format/guidelines within which to present their topics. There was a great range in the quality of the presentations.
• Scheduling the panels: A number of the panels I attended were not presented in the order listed - making it difficult to move between panels and see various speakers/presentations I hoped to. Also, maybe a pause of a few minutes between each panelist would've facilitated exiting/moving between/among the venues.
• Sessions might be spaced in more convenient locations in relation to each other, facilitating getting to check out more of them. For the dinner, it would have been nice to have had name tags, intermingling artists with presenters for more networking possibilities.
• Shuttles from hotel to events, especially Friday night. Shuttles to galleries.
• Signage, general information, presenters' format, more time for discussions and questions; less parallel panels.
• Smooth technical issues.
• Some people might have appreciated a shuttle between Mass Art and Northeastern.
• Target the dance community better. Gala dinner too expensive for me to go to. Would have been nice to know up front (when registering) that gala dinner and receptions would be separately-priced - I was under the mistaken impression that it was included and did not budget for that. However, I think it's a good idea to price separately because it gives more choice and it reduces waste.
• Tell the presenters to relate their presentation more to the attendees and give the attendees more information things they could be involved in.
• The ability to team up with other artists in order to get the full experience of every panel discussion. To exchange notes on each others findings - to share all panels attended to those who were participating at other panels.
• The brochure needs more work as well as the site.
• The brochure was very difficult to read- bad design format.
• The conference program was hard to read as well as understand. The demarcations for sessions was the same as time slots. Groupings were not well established. In addition, I have seen conferences print a list of people in attendance and a single piece of contact information.
• The loud music was not conducive to conversation.
The mentoring session was disappointing. The luck of the draw approach was not beneficial and was a waste of time. I was hoping my mentor would suggest options rather than to tell me that my work is accomplished.

The opening reception got off to a slow start. Introductions or some impetus for mingling would have been good at the beginning as most people stayed in small groups that knew each other. Fortunately I am outgoing.

The packet should include websites/info for all the panelists, since no one could attend all of them as they go on at the same time, it was hard to pick which to attend, and then not to have any information regarding the ones you did not attend.

The panelists' contact info printed onto the conference brochure by their corresponding org info.

The printed schedule was visually unwieldy - too much of the same font/type size, etc. - like a long run-on sentence. The more I referred to it - the more lost & confused I'd get.

This conference I have attended has been very successful and I would love to take part in the next one, not only as a participant but I also may take part in preparation too, if there may be any help I can.

This was a great idea, but there should be more to the conference than information that can be attained on websites. More detailed information from speakers, solid sources of information - so many workshops I attended the speakers brought 5 catalogs for 100 people- not okay We're at a conference because we are interested in finding out as much as we can. Handouts, materials, and business cards are a must.

To establish all art-modulations in pre-determined areas...where everyone can find each section and what is happening there, why and how...in time or before...

to have the sessions happening in one location, the hotel where we stayed, for example.

To have to spend more time between conference speakers. Even some small thing like good bye dinner on the last day would have been good to share experiences and say good bye to each other. Also it was very difficult to share oneself between different locations and panel discussions. If it would be possible to host conference panels at the same building or at least in the same campus. Also to have one stable conference information stand, during the whole conference.

To make the conference in one building.

To not schedule so many lectures at the same time. Wanted to attend all of them.

Too many panels overlapping (creating constant flow of people in and out of the panels, which was disruptive). Maybe conference is more spread out over several days so that artists can attend more panels.

Transportation between NEU, MCA. Table for artists to drop off business cards on, easier to read brochures

Try not to arrange meetings/seminars simultaneously. Decisions of missing any session have been extremely painful to make.

Try not to schedule mentoring sessions during panel presentations.

Try to have the sessions at the same institution. It would make it possible to go between sessions if there were parts that were more interesting to the participant. Also, if the speakers are listed in a particular order, it is helpful if the speaker in that order. At registration, make sure the people handing out the information know directions and logistics for the incoming participants.

Venues closer together, less spread out, a central locale/venue.

Wanting to either follow up on presentations attended, or contact presenters of sessions I was not able to attend, it would be helpful to have a list of conference moderators, speakers/panelists with their name, affiliation and contact address ( due to the many presentations held at the same time, and the fact that various speakers were not present and replaced by others who were not listed anywhere) it just was not possible to attend all I would have liked to attend.

What about a means of the artist attendees submitting imagery in advance based on which the curators/professionals could select people to meet with while at the conference I think it would be helpful to have a panel that talks about the layers of people and how it all interconnects: artists/curators/dealers/museums and how to make those connections. sessions closer together hotel closer sessions a little better organized/focused for the artist attendee.

What are international curators looking for.

Would extend it by 1 day so speakers can get to more presentations. Open Studios could have been interesting.

Would have liked a breakfast center to interact with other attendees for a few minutes...name tags with place ...slightly more consolidated experience if at all possible as far as presentation sites. The conference might also be marketed at universities and colleges.

You might provide busing between some of the venues or allow more time between talks or it would be better to concentrate sessions in the same place at the same time. Students and artists should pay much less to participate. $10 per day perhaps. I know several artists who did not come up from NYC when they heard how expensive the conference was going to be.
C5. What additional information would you like to see on the TransCultural Exchange website (Question 4.54)?

- A column to further address the international residency programs' call for artists in the future year.
- A link to contact information for these individuals.
- A list of program websites.
- A list of websites of available residencies.
- A listing of the participant's websites would be great.
- A roster of attendees at the conference w/web addresses and emails.
- After the conference may be the list of all participants with their email-address in a protected area.
- Any relevant information, handouts, etc., provided by the panelists.
- Applications and other materials and opportunities to begin the process of applying for residencies.
- Background on the mentors.
- Better maps.
- Biographies of presenters. Not full resumes-just an understanding of the person.
- Breakdown of residencies by length of time (I can only do short residencies).
- Conference information was difficult to read. needs design.
- Contact info for all presenters and websites.
- Contact information for presenters/attendees
- Contact information for speakers, podcasts.
- Contact information for the presenters - maybe available with a password or PIN for attendees - unless presenters specifically decline. At least links to their venues.
- Directions to locations, time of travel, how to purchase tickets for train.
- Document this years event.....more detail about the presenters (and the events, for instance if the seminar is about Art Basel link to it or preview it in a simple manner)
- Documentation from this year's festival.
- Even at this point, to have website/contact info about all the speakers/residencies. No one could attend all of them, but it would be great to have this info.
- Exhibition possibilities abroad or opportunities to work on a volunteer basis in other countries.
- Future collaborative projects and opportunities for artists abroad
- Good site; pre-conference support for me was absolutely stellar
- Grant info, gallery info, a panel of artists to offer stories about their artistic paths and how they became involved in residencies/what kind of experiences they had.
- How does one get a link from your site
- How to match outside funding with residency programs that offer little or no financial assistance.
- I think a link to the websites to the artist residency programs which have attended to the TCE conferences would be helpful.
- I would love to have an online network/email addresses of other attendees. And a listing of all links and websites of programs presented. More than once I wanted to be in two (or three) places at once...so it would be great to check out the places I wasn't able to hear about.
- Include web addresses of presenters.
- Information from artists who have participated; what their experiences were with residencies, nuts and bolts of it, like arranging supplies, transportation, et.
- Invited panelists' websites.
- It seems like so many residencies are really for new media people. It is discouraging to find that the traditional art materials are underrepresented. I'd like to know in advance who has received the residencies in terms of their media. You spend 2 hours listening to these residency directors only to find they only accept, say one artist from the US in new media. Why bother to apply
- Links and art jobs.
- Links to featured residency sites and participants information with links.
- Links to all residency organization websites, talks by artists who attended residencies and the work they did.
- Links to all the sites mentioned in the speakers presentations.
- Links to all the websites for the residencies and contact information for presenters.
- Links to artist residencies who were presented at the conference.
- Links to presenter websites.
• Links to residency programs.
• Links to residency websites.
• Links to the participants websites.
• More clarification of what the organization (TCE) does.
• More information on presenters and mentors.
• Perhaps a link, artist to artist, of individuals wishing to work collaboratively with others in different disciplines to propose and develop a project together.
• Perhaps a list of the speakers and participants and their profession
• Pertinent information about the presenters; links to their websites.
• Podcasts, websites, contacts, possibly online mentoring.
• Posted changes in schedules and portfolio review schedules....
• Presenters’ speeches and address info.
• Summary of the current conference.
• The list of contacts, residency addresses, etc. that were covered in all the sessions, and the schedule updates during the conference.
• The presenters were very varied. It seemed a few gave out information that was relevant to the artists. But often, they gave irrelevant information. It seemed perhaps some did not know why we were there.
• The web-site is perfect.
• The website has all of the necessary information.
• URLs for residency programs.
• USA opportunities as well. More literature summarizing all the emerging artist opportunities websites in one place.
• Website addresses for all residencies with links.
• Websites for residencies by country.
• Websites of all presenters.
C6. What other kinds of activities would you like to see TransCultural Exchange sponsor (Question 4.56)?

- A place to read on your website about other artists' experiences at some of the residencies.
- A post conference brochure for participants with names of participants, panelists, affiliations, and contact info.
- A presentation of artists describing their residency experiences pros, cons, learning experiences.
- A roster of attendees might be useful.
- Activities were great, the quality of information could be better.
- An exhibition of attendees' work curated by a guest curator of the conference.
- Anything with face to face opportunities and exposures.
- ART Fair
- Art work exhibition exchanges, technological information exchanges.
- Better media presentations and actual media events, bring in some established artists to present from their perspective.
- Can't even imagine - but am interested in anything international: curating, exhibitions, artists' talks, etc. I am all eyes & ears
- Conference or opportunities for studio exchange between international artists.
- Could be publications like a small newspaper publishing twice a year about different residencies, artists' experiences etc.
- Exhibition opportunity centered conference
- Exhibitions, travel.
- Exhibitions.
- For residencies that don't provide much help financially, provide information on grants that might contribute.
- Funding work shops for artists
- Galleries showing their new artists and have artists talk about their work and experiences. Art shows at the museums.
- Gallery and international collectors' exhibits.
- Get involved in promoting US artists nationally and internationally.
- Grant writing.
- Have several early and mid-career, successful, international and National artists talk about the TRAJECTORIES of their careers, and how the different career and life decisions they made, or connections, made a particular effect. Let us ask them questions. That would be GREAT.
- Help artists connect to commissioning curators/international institutions. There is no support to make jump into global arena.
- How-to workshops.
- I think its wonderful to be exposed to what is going on in the international art world- possibly speakers and artists who show there work.
- I would like the Trans Cultural exchange to be involved in helping Boston artists show their work abroad even if the artists aren't able to be placed in a residency in a country of their choice. I would appreciate meeting more foreign curators and have the opportunity to show them my work.
- I would like to see TransCultural Exchange keep organizing similar meetings to make it possible to discuss and evaluate the developments in contemporary art world.
- I'd like discussions on "professional artist" vs. emerging artist No one I spoke to seemed to have a iron clad definition. Is it about age, time working on art, exclusivity or pursuit or what
- In between the conference events, program a couple of residency presentations per year in the community. Better yet, keep those mentoring sessions ongoing in-between the conferences. They're invaluable to an artist with limited funds to travel and interview in person for opportunities.
- Include contact info on all the presenters in the packet, so there isn't time wasted writing in the dark from fuzzy projected info. This time it was possible to talk to the presenters, next time I predict there will be double the attendance and it will be harder. Keep presenter to attendee ratio generally workable.
- International artist collaborative; working session.
- International conferences/theory/art practice.
- International exhibition opportunities.
- International Global Shows.
- International group exhibitions and/or collaborations based on themes.
- International visits to artists' studios.
• Invite artists who have participated in some of these residencies to speak about their experiences.
• It might be interesting to suggest grouping like minded attendees (similar interests) with panelists or at the beginning.
• Maybe a symposium on setting up and/or facilitating residencies & retreats for artists.
• Maybe exhibitions. I would like to host a show in the gallery I direct at the Community College of RI. No funds though.
• Mentoring sessions, access to people who could provide connections and more direct networking opportunities.
• More Asian info, maybe some people from museums, maybe a TransCultural Exchange art festival.
• More breakout sessions that focus on particular issues; I think a lot of people formed their own but there were lots of questions about the logistics of traveling, you may have offered this and I just missed it.
• More dance-related topics.
• More fun activities. Massages afterwards.
• More gallery and performance events in conjunction with the conference.
• More info on funding possibilities, the how-to, why-to apply to a particular residency. VAL overview was great, perhaps they could do break out sessions of more specific info/areas.
• More international artist-to-artist connection possibilities.
• More international Filmmakers exchanges; More participation from Latin American Universities and L.A. Art Schools (there are many).
• More international residencies.
• More local events, maybe focusing on application preparation, Fulbright preparation, local reviews of portfolios before they get sent out to residencies, monthly reminders of what deadlines are coming up.
• More networking activities.
• More panels with art professionals in Boston and networking sessions with international artists.
• More similar events in Boston area.
• National residencies.
• Networking opportunities.
• Peer review workshops, experiences of artists in residencies.
• Perhaps the website could be used for further exchange - people could write in a blog about their ideas and can connect with each other.
• Portfolio review by critics, gallerists, non-profit people.
• Portfolio Reviews. It is difficult for us to get away like this, and expensive. We need to get something specific out of it. It is too much for just meeting interesting people. Especially for the artist. Perhaps for the presenters it would be great.
• Post funding opportunities.
• Promoting any and all sorts of foreign exchanges is invaluable.
• Provide grant information.
• Residency program.
• Sort out residencies in terms of media and style. Give updated listings of that information.
• Specific techniques. e.g. how to curate self, how to make a website, how to do promotions.
• This conference seemed to focus on visual artists. How about a conference on writers, filmmakers, puppeteers, theatre, photographers, etc... The whole artistic family.
• This is also a time consuming idea, but if artists could submit 3-10 digital slides or a 3-5 minute audio/video and then the work was constantly on display in a couple of different places, that could be very cool. We could see each other's work and refer the presenters to our work.
• Time allotted to talk to interesting people in small groups. Maybe add a day or so where things aren't quite so jam-packed with events.
• To expand the conference itself. More lectures, more panelists but please not at the same time.
• To really make the resource available in terms of contact information.
• Trade fair of residencies, more networking opportunities.
• Traveling group exhibition of TCE artists.
• Venture into other areas of art like decorative arts etc.
• Why not an installation.
• Workshops and something directly to the interested people...
• Workshops, residencies, more info on website.
• Would like to see literary arts a bit better represented. Doesn't have to overlap with what existing literary orgs already do. More and more of us are interested in literary residencies outside the US box.
• Would love to participate in something like the tile or coaster project.
C7. How could this conference benefit your career (Question 4.58)?

- A few connections were made. I have a better sense of how to present myself to residencies and programs.
- A little eager with more social events for networking.
- A one on one with the Transcultural exchange to evaluate Salem State College as a site for international residencies.
- Attending a residency.
- Between the presentations, panelists and networking, I am sure with a little organization I can create and attain the goals I have set for myself.
- Broad my knowledge of residence program in the globe, especially some programs form Middle Asia.
- Broaden my understanding of how to NAVIGATE the processes of becoming successful in different ways. What does it really take. There seems to be a lot of insider information and connections. How does one break into that. What are my odds, for example, if I am a shy person with no time to schmooze people up every Thursday evening at openings. How has the internet affected the dominance of certain metropolitan art centers, such as New York?
- By creating good international network
- By exposing me to opportunities that will allow me to show and create my artwork abroad and establish contacts while there.
- By researching and attending a residency.
- Conference presented lots of information I didn't have, regarding potential residency opportunities.
- Connections for residencies and exhibition opportunities.
- Connections to curators and other artists.
- Connections, networking.
- Connections, possible residency, etc. As someone who follows up on leads, I know that following up on ONE good contact can open up a whole world of possibilities
- Easier ways to network, panels specific to type of work people are involved in and are categorized as such.
- Exhibition opportunities, exposure to curators/writers.
- Exhibition opportunities.
- Expanded information on residencies exponentially.
- Expands my network of professional artists and enlarges my creative options.
- Follow-up on connections made, explore info funding possibilities
- Found many residencies I would like to apply for; made many contacts with other artists.
- From contacts made with other artists and curators; from residencies that I intend to apply to.
- Getting a residency would greatly improve my CV as a new artist. Having time to focus on my art would be great. And learning about another culture can only help enrich my experience and work.
- Got to know a lot of people
- Hopefully, some contacts I made will continue on to friendships, mentors, etc.
- I am interested in traveling without staying at a residency, but with some kind of financial support. A discussion about that (if it exists) would have been greatly appreciated.
- I could be showing work internationally.
- I made a lot of contacts and I will see people again, which I met on the Conference and this will help me to go further in my career.
- If I got an international residency.
- If I actually do a residency, maybe hearing from people who had already participated in these residencies would help.
- If I could land a residency or a find situation that would put me in contact with curators in other countries.
- If the conference kept in touch and co-integrated with companies, museums, galleries of art and so on...and make the dreams come true, so the Conference could be Alliance between artist and the public out side of the Conference...
- If there were contact lists, I could network.
- I'm not sure. I am hopeful that as a result of learning at the conference I'll be able to put in motion with positive outcome...the residency in Brazil
- Indirectly, providing insight into packaging oneself as an artist, what today's residency programs are looking for, and what they do and do not have to offer.
- Information -local and national. I think that trying out a residency which is local or national before going abroad would be a good idea.
• It connected me with people of similar interests.
• It has helped me think of traveling more and applying for grants.
• It has made me aware of a number of residencies where I can lend of myself and share.
• It will help me understand which residencies are likely to be a good match for me, so I can focus well and get into some. This would give me time to make art and move forward. Excellent
• It would be helpful to have experts who have selected artists for years at a residency program and who have a broad overview of and are familiar with various residency programs do the mentoring sessions.
• It’s a little too soon to tell what and how benefits will emerge. I do intend to apply and contact at least two of the presenters.
• Just being aware of the possibilities and having the access to artists and arts administrators from around the globe is an amazing opportunity and resource.
• Knowing about different residencies, then attending. Having spoken to people, advertising our department and people coming to South Africa.
• Knowledge, communication.
• Legality and presenting self and work.
• List of emails and addresses of attendees.
• Making contacts and residency possibilities.
• Making new contacts. Over the world. Exchange experiences and meet new people in your fields.
• Meet other connections, enrich my own work, looks good on a resume.
• Meeting with more people who are supporting themselves with their art.
• Met people in more intimate context.
• More critical examination of my work, suggestion for contact galleries; collaborations with other artists.
• Networking is the primary driver of these events. Any opportunity to meet and exchange with attendees adds opportunity to the event itself.
• Networking opportunities
• Networking.
• Networking. Perhaps a residency that would lead to further exposure.
• Networking; met potential future collaborators; information of possible opportunities for me as a curator.
• New contacts made between artists and organizations, help to make new steps in ones work.
• Obviously if I get a residency or exhibition from a contact I made through the conference I would be delighted.
• Perhaps if I can travel abroad and connect again to continue established relationships.
• Personal contact is the most direct contact there is and in my opinion it works the most efficient. I hope the contacts will be effective in time.
• Possibility of applying to some of the residencies I heard about.
• Preparation gave me a chance to research and re-assess my work and the residency.
• Provide a comprehensive list of presenter contact info and websites for more information
• Put artists in direct contact with these curators, festival and other international opportunities.
• Recognition/development of work.
• Simply showing all the opportunities available.
• The connections from the conference will lead to many things- new discussions, new collaborations, and possible residencies.
• There was an emphasis on getting to meet people, encouragement to be more aggressive.
• There was very little in international art competitions- only Fulbright Documentation provided a general session up front with info on how to apply, what people are looking for, etc.
• Through contacts, the residency and myself are better known and there is more personal contact.
• To show my work to an international level.
• What is most important is meeting each other face-to-face, resulting in what I hope will be a long and lasting friendships.
• Wider interaction with world culture.
• Will better understand future opportunities and how to go about assessing them.
C8. Additional Comments (Question 4.59)?

- Better information on presenters (e.g. length of residency, what kind of art do they do etc).
- A big huge thank you to all of TransCultural Crew & all the volunteers, funders, etc. I am grateful to all of you
- Also I am VERY impressed with what a WONDERFUL JOB everyone did. I am thrilled to have attended, plus
- saw colleagues, current grad students, former students etc. A wonderful event.
- A lot of the presenters just rambled on and didn’t talk about ways they could help us, they just talked about
- themselves.
- A really great lineup of visiting presenters from around the world, very much appreciated.
- A total aside, 20 years ago I founded a company called Cultural Exchange here in Massachusetts, and published
- a monthly calendar of cultural events statewide. I am delighted to be reacquainted with the words, adding the
- world to the mix I wished there were one opening plenary session where the majority of residency programs
- were given in overview... then breakouts of the specific programs so as not to waste time in panels not as
- targeted to your interests.
- Again, Mary did a fantastic job. Though opinions differ, in hindsight, the attendees now have to follow through.
- Transcultural Exchange could maybe keep everyone up to date with other peoples experiences and questions,
- etc.
- Allow input into mentors and contact them early with background information.
- Awesome job of organization
- Being spread out had its pros and cons. I did like the fact that I was able to see a number of places and venues in
- Boston by the fact the events were so spread-out however I missed a lot as well trying to get around. Maybe
- having the events spread across a tighter placement of venues would work better.
- Can envision a more efficient way than panel presentations to bring residency candidates in contact with
- residency representatives that would be structured more like a job fair-tables of info that attendees could move
- around.
- Change venue all to 1 place.
- Cheaper Saturday dinner option.
- Clarity of goals and what will be presented.
- Clearer signage, more water stations, brochure table, shuttle between spots, translators
- Conferences brochures should include websites and emails for presenters.
- Congratulations on this enormous undertaking
- Did a great job creating and executing event. The price was reasonable. Appreciated extra events that were
- optional and which broadened exposure to Boston area.
- Easily available good coffee and a lunch cart at events.
- Extraordinary achievement So much planning. Thank you Mary Sherman.
- For a first time event of this type, overall it was a great effort and I am glad I attended. I am not based in Boston,
- so it was not easy to do and was very expensive the conference fee, travel and hotel. I was given money from my
- school to come. It is the only way I could have afforded it. The $75 dinner was unreasonably high.
- Free coffee
- Great conference, with exciting contacts. Thanks for all the hard work
- Great idea...should be done again. I would include the Gardner Museum on your tour list as well as the ICA
- MFA and MIT. You might also consider Brandeis - their contemporary program is excellent.
- Great job Congrats
- Great start, much needed event.
- Great Thanks so much.
- Handouts of websites of all participants.
- Have a central area where a schedule with changes is posted.
- Have a closing session where all the groups have a rep out to talk to.
- Have a list of residencies and where to apply.
- Have all locations be in the same general area. Hard to get back and forth in a timely manner.
- Have more variety of artists.
- Have speakers take more questions from the audience or even break into smaller groups for more intimate
- discussion time.
- How to contact panelists- make their websites available to attendees.
- I am glad to help in organizing future conferences.
- I am telling all of my artists friends about this. Good luck with your future endeavors
I am very grateful to be a part of this organization as the founder and director of K2 Contemporary Art Center from Turkey, and I would be looking forward for the next meeting.

I appreciate all of the work involved and the bringing together of people from around the world.

I believe the conference was very helpful for the proximity from Ct. and the assistants were fabulous- always very attentive to your needs.

I look very much forward to seeing you again in the future and many thanks for everything.

I loved my mentoring session with Jean Coffrey from France. He was very bright and showed intense interest when viewing the work.

I really would like to thank Mary Sherman and the Team from the TransCultural Exchange for organizing this inspiring Conference .

I think a conference for older artists would be helpful.

I think it was general rather than specific information that was not clearly usable.

I think this was an amazing undertaking, and I congratulate you for the effort to create this conference. I'd be interested in volunteering for the next one.

I think you all should be congratulated. This is a ton of work and everything seemed to go well. Even the small media problems were not that troublesome. In fact, because of a tech delay with the presenter for the Akiyoshidai International Art Village I was able to see another panel first and make her presentation after that.

I thought that this was an excellent start to a much needed conference in Boston. Boston is lame because there is no international attention or an arts presence like cities such as NY, Chicago and LA. We need to increase the knowledge of our artists and art professionals and create a better community then the one we have. TCE is a resource that is greatly underused and that a lot more people in Boston could utilize with more exposure and another conference date.

I want to thank Mary Sherman and everyone involved in this conference. I know it was an enormous undertaking. I think the experience will not only benefit me (with an informal invitation to attend a residency and exhibit), but will also create a positive buzz about our fair city, Boston. I am grateful for the opportunity to participate. Thank you again.

I wasn't specifically looking for an international experience in signing up for this conference. I did it to learn (which I did) but found it hard to connect with others.

I wish to thank Mary Sherman, her staff, the presenters, and funders for working so hard to address this important need. I hope that funding will increase to improve upon this very strong start. You are all terrific

I would really like a list of programs contact info.

Incredibly well organized and orchestrated. Mary Sherman combined absolute efficiency with charm, ease and great attention to each individual.

Intimate venues would be nicer.

Introductory talk for all on the theme of the conference would have been great.

Is it possible to have the email addresses from the different speakers in the program?

It could be interesting to have presenters, artists and attendees link their sites prior to the conference, perhaps by category, so those attending might have some idea ahead of time of who might be there. I saw a lot of postcard and business card passing around and it could just be interesting for attendees to have this available. Just a suggestion. I realize it might be a bit of work to do.

It was a great experience to see the other side of the artist and residency world.

It was a tremendous effort for all presenters from out of the country and really appreciated. Presentations could have been a little livelier but I understand that the presenters were not "speakers" perhaps they needed additional guide lines in presentation style. The Biennial presenters especially suffered from this seemingly inability to relate to the audience of random art makers. The content was good for the conference over all and very worthwhile to attend.

It was a very well organized event. The organizer was very kind in recognizing her volunteers...that says a great deal about her leadership. The only President who spoke was Kay Sloan from Mass ART...what about the others from NE and MIT.

It was disappointing that all the panels I attended were missing panelists listed on the brochure.

It would be good for the focus on the next conference not just on visual artists- but also theater and literary artists as well. The scholarship program needs to be in place and grown for the next conference- many artists could not afford the $150 rate who could have benefited from attending. Perhaps the MCC and other funders next time could also take part in providing scholarships and even offer - even partial scholarships to artists.

It would have been nice to have at least 1 event at the hotel. Also, April is a very difficult time for people affiliated with colleges.
• It would help to know the number of applications per available slots.
• Its impressive to think that this conference was a maiden voyage. I want to cheer more development on the subject and was grateful for all those that came, shared, gave invitations, and wanted to mentor. I hope we all can continue this style of ambassadorship. Thanks Mary.
• I've been to a few other conferences analogous to this one and feel that Mary and staff have done a fantastic job with a complex roster of components: good locations (and parking was convenient, which is an achievement in itself), good speakers and good topics, all organized well. What more could anyone need I hope the oversees presenters enjoyed their stay in Boston. Thank you enormously for all of your effort in putting this on. It serves everyone's careers, but also brings diverse points of view.
• Less expensive gala.
• Less panels at same time with similar topics made for hard time to pick panels.
• List all international presenters/mentors emails.
• Locations are too far apart.
• Make conference cheaper for everyone.
• Make venues closer together.
• Many of the panelists were great, but the acoustics of the room made it hard to assimilate the presentations.
• Many people had trouble reading the schedule of events.
• Mary and all of the staff were wonderful to work with. Very relaxed and welcoming.
• Mary Sherman did a phenomenal job pulling together such a variety of international speakers and workshops.
• Mary should be very proud of her work. This opportunity has been fantastic for all.
• Mary, Caroline and Jana: YOU ARE THE BEST I think that the standing ovation said it all
• Mary, Caroline, and Jana- thank you so much- this was so hopeful and energizing.
• Maybe find collectors to open up and talk and show about collecting.
• Maybe more presenters could offer information that is relevant to audience. Several presenters talked about programs not available to American artists or artists of a certain age.
• Mentor meeting was useless; poor matching job.
• More clear info related to artist. Many presenters used it as a benefit for advertising, but gave us much less info than needed...too general.
• More conversation between the panelists.
• More hospitality tables
• More Los Angeles representation.
• More time for social situations (schmoozing).
• My head is buzzing. It was very rich in stimulation and too early to know how I will fit in or use the information. What about addressing issues of economics For instance, much of what was valued by the residencies and curators is less saleable in some communities. How does an artist manage to afford to make less saleable work which, in turn, can end up more valued
• Nametags should have home town and medium. Presenter's name tags should have their affiliations indicated. Should sell t-shirts and paraphernalia.
• Nametags should have more information.
• Nice effort.
• Other types of artistic exchange beyond residencies, more networking opportunities beyond the first event and expensive dinner.
• Overall, I think this was extremely valuable to me. I am very pleased. Thank you.
• Overall, the conference was wonderful and informative and exciting. At times, it was frustrating as sessions which were of interest to me were held simultaneously, and in addition there was no possibility to find information on how to meet those presenters that weekend nor how to get in touch via e-mail. I personally attended the conference to get as much information as possible about the various residency programs etc. and found some of the sessions disappointing as they were more a read out loud presentation
• Partnerships with private US foundations
• Party atmosphere is not the best place to interact for many people. More informal gatherings.
• Perhaps you could create an exhibition in conjunction with the conference in which a highly influential international curator was invited to select emerging artists who live and work in the US, who address cultural issues.
• Please more opportunities for dancers and dance-friendly opportunities to network. I can be a resource for you - used to be on the board of the Boston Dance Alliance.
• Provide a reliable map/schedule for the "T".
• Provide printed versions of PowerPoints on line or at the front desk to make note-taking easier.
• Put more information on the nametags.
• Put the information about the survey online at the beginning of the survey.
• Quality of presentations really varied. Helped a lot to have brochures from each place and also to see a picture slide show.
• Repeat some of the presenters so you don't have to miss events you wanted to see.
• Repeat some presenters.
• Saturday sessions I attended were mostly excellent, Sunday poor. The Sunday Science and Technology people were irrelevant because they don’t invite us there, and the Bienniale people told nothing from the artists point of view.
• Schedule 1 day more to fit all sessions.
• Seemed like there was a disconnect between many of the attendees and the caliber of residencies there. It seemed like many attendees had never been on a residency, even domestically. Many of the residencies represented were nomination only, which seems pretty inaccessible. While it is interesting to hear about these, I think it might be irrelevant to an artist looking to apply on their own.
• Should address opportunities in the marketplace.
• Should be longer.
• Should get a bag or t-shirt at the event.
• Should post a list of attendees (who and from where) on websites. Links to the websites of the speakers.
• Some of the panelists addressed greater issues, but many were just a basic intro to their programs and not very suitable to the idea of conversation.
• Some of the presenters went on WAY too long about themselves and almost nothing about opportunities for artists.
• Some of the speakers were not very good, and did not really gear their talk towards what might benefit the people in attendance.
• Some presenters (DAAD) did not seem to address the participants well enough, i.e. no visual arts applicants accepted to residency in Berlin and most of presentation focused on highly competitive undergrad programs.
• Some presenters spent too much time showing off their programs and spent too little time discussing how/what kind of artists they wish to work with.
• Some presenters were much more experienced that others (as one would expect). Perhaps guidelines for presenters as to the format to focus on for an overview of a program (for example, the presenter from Banff was excellent but the one from Estonia was very monotone and without specific focus) Create groups based on region/media to maximize attendees exposure to residencies. There could be an Asian session or Eastern European session or interest groups that focus on these areas.
• Speaker from residencies should have been better evaluated and better prepared possibly with translators so they could be understood. Tell us something beyond what we can get on a website.
• Subway/hauling luggage to our last events-ouch. Provide shuttle bus transportation.
• Thank you
• Thank you for all the work it took to put this event together, it was a good first effort.
• Thank you for organizing such kind of conference and inviting our organization to speak. Good job Mary
• Thank you for organizing this fabulous conference
• Thank you for putting this conference together Overall, I enjoyed it very much. Great to meet international artists and reconnect with local ones.
• Thank you for the great organization.
• Thank you to whomever paired me up with my Mentor. It was a perfect match. It would have been nice to have a little more time. Or also have the opportunity to meet with another Mentor as well. On the whole a very inspiring weekend. Thank you.
• Thank you very much for inviting Platford Ganada. Everything is very well organized, and worked really well. Would like to hear about future events.
• Thank you very much for this great experience
• Thank you.
• Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. It was a wonderfully enjoyable, inspiring and informative conference. Weather withstanding, I really had a good time and want to thank you again for offering me a scholarship to attend. I would also like to thank your wonderful staff and especially Thomas who was very instrumental in helping me acquire a carousel for my presentation.
• Thanks a lot.
Thanks for a lot of work- lets do it again
• Thanks for doing this. I know it is a huge and important endeavor. Sign me on as a board member and I will work for you to address the issues above, and others Catlin Rockman -Boston- catlinrock@gmail.com
• Thanks for everything. Much appreciated. Good luck in future efforts.
• Thanks Thought this was a great idea and a great start.
• The conference brochure had a poor design and was confusing at times.
• The conference in general felt de-centralized.
• The conference was a tremendous undertaking and quite successful. Excellent selection of presenters.
• The conference was a very interesting event. Congratulations for putting it together.
• The conference was definitely worthwhile and I greatly appreciate the organizational effort that brought it about (Thank you Mary). Although the value to my career remains to be seen, I enjoyed the experience and am glad I attended.
• The conference was exceptionally well organized and professionally presented.
• The conference was very biased toward new media. Could be broader.
• The cultural sensitivity workshop at BCA was very helpful. The mentor I had was a waste of time and did not want to mentor but to promote her residency in France.
• The effort made to organize such a conference is really amazing. I commend all who made it happen.
• The hotel was wonderful. The written directions and maps were great. The location of the conference was great. The social gatherings were wonderful. Perhaps email/website info for all the panelists/organizations can be added to the website.
• The mentor session could definitely be better.
• The mentoring sessions were for some of NOT helpful. Meanwhile, I missed a panel I would have liked to hear.
• The organization was perfect and I would like to thank Mary Sherman and her team for the fantastic job done. A lot of projects were born during this conference and I’d to thank for this event which was the missing link in the art world.
• The technological problems experienced in the International Res.-Multi Disciplinary, with the woman from Japan, could have been worked out the day before. That was at least 20 minute delay. Also the speakers were not seated at the front table when they started so I wasn’t sure if they were even there...whether I should leave after the first speaker or not.
• There was a hierarchical component to the conference speakers vs. attendees and very little chance to interact other than this mad rush at the end of each session which was not productive. The opening reception wasn’t helpful because no one knew who anyone was and nametags were inconsequential. Gala event excluded a lot of people and wasn’t suitable for “networking” as it was a sit-down affair. Also very little opportunity for inter-institutional networking.
• There were a lot of workshops that I wanted to attend, but it was running concurrently with the one I picked to attend. Is there any way to get a compilation of materials for all conference attendees
• This was a great event - first time wrinkles & glitches notwithstanding Thanks
• Too expensive for information that could be gotten on the web.
• Too expensive.
• Try to have one location for lectures.
• Volunteer staff was wonderful
• Very good organization. well hosted.
• We enjoyed exploring Boston as far as time permitted, and were impressed by the architectural heritage and the amount of classical music - particularly the Bach cantata at Emmanuel Church which was a real treat.
• Well run and great first year. Hope more debate and hands on will follow
• What is with the ageism of residencies
• Wonderful opportunity- so glad I came
• Would be happy to help in 2009.
• Would have been nice to know that scholarships were available. I had a lot of fun, met some nice fellow artists, met some very nice presenters, got discouraged at how many people would now be applying to places I am already applying to. Got ideas about new places to apply. Generally I think you did a great job and I am sure that the conference will get better and better. It's a very good idea, and I appreciate all the work that you did.
• Would have liked to know that you could register during the opening.
# APPENDIX D - PLACE OF RESIDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chatsworth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inglewood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amesbury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andover</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brimfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookline</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairhaven</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framingham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverett</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maynard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrimac</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natick</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Adams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerville</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watertown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Boylston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthrop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardsley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peck Slip</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX F - LIST OF SPEAKERS AND MODERATORS AND THEIR AFFILIATIONS

Stuart Kestenbaum, Executive Director, Haystack Mountain School of Crafts
C. David Thomas, Director, Blue Space Contemporary Art Center
Pirjo Heino, Curator of the Hovinkartano Cultural Centre
Adelina Jedrzejczak, Curatorial Fellow, The Rose Art Museum, Brandeis University: Chun-Hao Chen, Assistant Curator of the Kuandu Museum of Fine Arts
Raphaella Platow, Curator, The Rose Art Museum
Yaohua Su, Director, The Taipei Artist Village
Yuki Kondo, Curator, Aomori Contemporary Art Center
Caroline Andrieux, Founder, Quartier Éphémère
Michael Rush, Director, The Rose Art Museum
Marja de Jong, Founder and Director, Saksala ArtRadius
Jean-Baptiste Joly, Founding Director, Artistic Director and Chairman of the Board of the Foundation Akademie Schloss Solitude.
Aysegul Kurtel, Founder and Director of K2
Bill Arning, Curator, MIT List Visual Arts Center
Rosie Branson Gill, Curator, The Berwick Artist-in-Residency Program
Femke Lutgerink, independent curator
Marie-Christian Mathieu, Director of Studio XX
Robin Melavalin, Director of Global Education Opportunities, Colleges of the Fenway
Jacquie Baertschi, Director Etiquette Professionnelle, New York
Hunter O’Hanian, Director, Fine Arts Work Center
Richard Perram, Director, Bathurst Regional Art Gallery
Bettina Pehrsson, Director of Iaspis
Janice Hough, Coordinator, Artist Residency Programme
Durt Valkema, Vrij Glas Foundation
Johanna Branson, Vice-President of Academic Affairs, Massachusetts College of Art
Juliet Armstrong, Professor University of KwaZulu-Natal
Puja Shah, Coordinator, Kanoria Center for the Arts
Mary Hawkes-Greene, President and Co-founder, Burren College of Art
Dr. Veryeri-Alaca’s presentation is sponsored by the Turkish Cultural Foundation
Deborah Obalil, Director of the Alliance of Artists Communities
Maria Tuerlings, Director of Trans Artists.
Dorothea Fleiss, Director, Dorothea Fleiss East-West Artist Symposia
Szabolcs Süli-Zakar, Director, Debrecen International Colony of Artists
Catherine Merrill, Co-organizer, The Art of Fire
Ann McDonald, Assistant Professor, Department of Visual Arts, Northeastern University
Irene Krarup, Cultural Attaché, Royal Danish Consulate General
Doris Sommer, Harvard University, Director of Cultural Agents
Brid Schenkel, DAAD
David Adams, Senior Program Manager, Asia/Middle East
Janna Longacre, Professor, Massachusetts College of Art
M. Isabel Meirelles, Assistant Professor, Northeastern University
Fritzie Brown, Senior Program Director, CEC ArtsLink
Elizabeth Ash, Program Manager of the U.S. State Department’s ART in Embassies Program
Brigitte Bouvier, Cultural Attaché, Consulate of France
Wendy Newton, Senior Program Associate, Trust for Mutual Understanding
Caroline Anderson, Webmaster/Assistant Director, TransCultural Exchange
Dirk Drijbooms, Director, Apothiki Foundation
Norbert Attard, Director, Gozo Contemporary
Marcus Patton, Director, The Curfew Tower, Northern Ireland
Anja Chávez, Curator of Contemporary Art/Curator of Exhibitions, Davis Museum and Cultural Center, Wellesley College
Jean-Yves Coffre, Director, CAMAC
Karol Frühauf, Director, Bridge Guard Beth Lipman, Arts/Industry Coordinator, John Michael Kohler Arts Center
Dr. Annika Schoemann, Siemens Arts Program, Director of Press and Public Relations
Carole Anne Meehan, Curator, the Institute of Contemporary Art, Boston
Evelyn Müürsepp, Visual Artists Coordinator, MoKS
Machiko Harada, Curator, Akiyoshidai International Art Village
Sarah Iley, Vice-President of Programs, The Banff Centre
Ann Galligan, Professor, Department of Cooperative Education and Visual Arts, Northeastern University
Robin Chandler, Northeastern University Professor, Former Chair of the African American Studies and Women’s Studies Program, Artist and Sociologist

Erik Bright, Artist and Founder of Monnahasset Mills Artist Complex and Director for the Partnership for Creative Industrial Space

Brenda Ulrich, Assistant Director, Volunteer Lawyers for the Arts

Anthony De Ritis, Director of Digital Media and Multimedia Studies Program, Northeastern University

Xaviere Masson, Manager, International Laboratoire Programs

Natalie Angles, Director, International Residency Program

Cynthia Baron, Associate Director of Digital Media and Multimedia Studies, Northeastern University

Biljana Ciric, Independent Curator based in Shanghai

Taylor Van Horne, Director, Instituto Sacatar

Oyku Ozsoy, Program Director

Lisa Tung, Interim Director, Massachusetts College of Art’s Galleries

Randi Hopkins, Co-owner, Allston Skirt Gallery

Pieranna Cavalchini, Curator of Contemporary Art and Director of the Artists in Residence Program, Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum

Alain Mongeau, Director, MUTEK

Philip Khoury, Associate Provost, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Francine Miller, Art Critic, ArtForum; Head of the Northeast Chapter of the National Branch of the International Art Critics Association

Linda Norden, American Commissioner, 2005 Venice Biennale

Ute Meta Bauer, Co-Curator, Documenta 11; Artistic Director of the 3rd Berlin Biennial for Contemporary Art (2004).

Yung Ho Chang, Venice Biennale Participant (Architecture)

Talal Moualla, Coordinator of the International Symposium in association with the Sharjah Biennial (Visual Poetics, 1997) and organizational member of the Sixth Sharjah International Art Biennial, 2003, United Arab Emirates

Sophie Parker, TransCultural Exchange Board Member, Organizational Development Consultant

Pamela Allara, Professor Emerita of Brandeis University, curator of “Coexistence: Contemporary Cultural Production in South Africa.”

Jackie Guille, UNESCO

Suzanne Jenkins, Artist Recruiter, ArtCorps