2012 STUDENT LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE

Synopsis of Results based on Satisfaction Data

Results based on the Conference Evaluation from 2012 indicated the following:

* 385 participants completed the survey, that is, 48.3% of total participants.

SurveyMonkey Evaluation results:

* 57% of participants reported they agreed that the Student Leadership Conference helped them establish contacts and 27.5% reported they disagreed.
* 87.4% of participants reported they agreed that the Student Leadership Conference will make them stronger leaders and 7.8% reported they disagreed.
* 83.9% of participants reported that the Student Leadership Conference will help their student organization and 6.6% reported they disagreed.
* 89.8% of participants reported they would recommend the Student Leadership Conference to others and 10.2% reported they would not.
* 92.3% of participants reported that they learned something as a result of participating in the Student Leadership Conference and 4.7% reported they disagreed.
* 87% of participants reported that they engaged in reflective conversations with fellow students as a result of participating in the Student Leadership Conference and 10.3% reported they disagreed.
* 78.2% of participants reported that they were satisfied with their overall experience in the Student Leadership Conference (\*) 9 and 6.4% reported they disagreed.

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS & LUNCH SATISFACTION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Satisfied / Very Satisfied** | **% Dissatisfied /**  **Very Dissatisfied** |
| *Online Registration Process* | 93.8 | 2.4 |
| *Conference Materials* | 95.0 | 3.9 |
| *Check-in Process* | 96.4 | 1.9 |
| *Lunch* | 64.4 | 33.2 |

**SPEAKERS & SESSIONS QUALITY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Good / Very Good**  **/ Excellent** | **% Fair / Poor** |
| *Opening Speaker* | 93.7 | 6.7 |
| *Breakout Session Speakers* | 92.1 | 8.1 |
| *Closing Session* | 91.1 | 8.9 |

Results based on Qualitative Data indicated the following:

Many participants reported that the Conference was excellent, better than previous conferences, and they were glad they attended. However, there were participants who reported dissatisfaction with certain aspects of the Conference; some thought it started too early, it was too long, and should either be shorter or divided into two days.

Some participants enjoyed the Breakout Sessions, while others felt that fewer sessions with capacity for more participants would be more beneficial; some felt they had no choice but to go to sessions they did not want because the room of their first choice was full. Many participants were very touched and inspired by the speakers while others were not. It was also reported that some speakers needed to be more energetic and that the quality of some sessions was not rich and needed more interaction; it was suggested to have a five-minute break between Breakout Sessions.

It was requested to have better lunch quality as well as hot food and vegetarian options; water and coffee were also requested; it was stated that the rooms were too cold and that the check-in process location was too small.

Also, it was suggested that club officers should only be required to attend one Conference; participants stated that there should be a sign-up sheet for the Breakout Sessions before the Conference. Printing information on both sides of sheets was also recommended, as well as more advertising prior to the day of the Conference.

*Conclusion:*

The results indicated that 78.2% of participants were satisfied with their overall experience in the Student Leadership Conference (\*). Most participants indicated that the Conference allowed them to engage in reflective conversations with fellow students; they also reported that participation in the Conference will help them become stronger leaders, it will help their student organization, and it also provided learning opportunities. However, only 57% of participants reported that the Conference helped them establish contacts.

The majority of participants indicated that the quality of the Opening Speaker, Breakout Session Speakers, and Closing Session were good or better. However, based on the qualitative data, allowing more participants in the most popular sessions and maybe offering fewer sessions would increase satisfaction.

Also, the results of the Post-Survey indicated that most participants were satisfied with the Online Registration and Check-in Process as well as with the Conference Materials. Almost one-third of them, however, reported dissatisfaction with lunch; perhaps water and coffee should be made available during the Conference.

Considering that 89.8% of the participants who completed the survey would recommend this Leadership Conference to others, it can be stated that these participants were pleased with its outcome.

According to SurveyMonkey, a response rate of 80-85% for a Face-to-Face Survey Administration is considered “good”. Compared to the 2011 Student Leadership Conference’s response rate, there was a 17.4% decrease response rate in 2012 (48.3% response rate, as previously stated). More effective methods should be used in order to insure that more surveys get completed in future conferences.

In conclusion, participants were satisfied with the outcome of the Conference, most of them would recommend it to others, and they were very pleased with the quality of the Speakers. Therefore, based on the post-surveys completed, it can be concluded that when it comes to participants’ satisfaction, the 2012 Student Leadership Conference was a success.

*(\*)Note: Accuracy of overall experience depends upon Rating Scale clarification of Question 15 of the Conference Evaluation & Post-Survey. Please refer to the “Recommendations” document (Page 3).*

**Recommendations**

1. Rating Scales: According to SurveyMonkey, when an Unbalanced-Rating Scale is used, “the more positive statements tend to be selected”; therefore, in order to “avoid potential bias it is good to balance the scale.”

*“Quality” Questions:* In order to avoid introducing bias into the data, perhaps a “Balanced Rating Scale” should be used. Instead of having 2 negative statements and 3 positive statements, maybe the scale could have an equal number of positive and negative labels.

1. *Question 7*: Questions 5 and 6 ask about rating the Speakers. Does it matter if question 7 asks about rating the Session as opposed to the Speaker?
2. *Question 13*: Maybe this question should be reworded and the phrase: “learned something” could be replaced to make the question sound less general.
3. *Question 15*: As the response to this question is very significant, maybe a Likert Scale should be used instead of a Semantic Differential Scale. What each number (1-5) represents should be specified in order to be able to provide a more accurate report of this question. It is hard to determine how participants interpreted “#3”; did it represent “ambivalent”, “neutral”, “somewhat satisfied”, or maybe even, “no opinion” (as participants were exposed to previously on survey)?

**If #3 represented “somewhat satisfied”, the percentage of overall satisfaction would be 93.6% instead of 78.2%**, but this cannot be determined at this point.

1. *“Learning Outcome” Questions*: Maybe *applied scenarios* of the main points/practices discussed at the Conference should be included to better reflect students’ understanding and retention of the information.
2. *Response Rate*: Perhaps different methods and/or incentives should be considered in order to increase response rate.

Incentives after completion of surveys:

1. Thank you gift: Add a certain amount of money to participants’ Owl Cards.
2. Hand out raffle tickets at the beginning of the Conference to be drawn after return of surveys: Prizes could be small FAU logo items and build up to bigger FAU logo items and eventually to Visa/MasterCard gift cards.
3. Maybe hand out:
   * + Coupons: e.g. Whole Foods Market / Publix
     + Gift cards: e.g. Gas stations