

# ***Evaluation 2004***

# **Overall Conference Survey**

**Report Presented to the American Evaluation Association**

**Gillian Mason, Shanika Blanton, Katherine McDonald, Jennifer Neal,  
Manolya Tanyu, Tina Taylor-Ritzler, & Erin Reeves**

**Robin Miller, Sharon Telleen, Kendon Conrad**

**University of Illinois at Chicago**

**January 2005**

The evaluation measure is available upon request. Please contact:  
Jennifer Neal  
University of Illinois at Chicago  
Department of Psychology (MC 285)  
1007 W. Harrison St.  
Chicago, IL 60607  
Email: [jwatli1@uic.edu](mailto:jwatli1@uic.edu)

# Table of Contents

Table of Contents .....	2
Acknowledgments .....	3
Executive Summary .....	4
Evaluation Overview .....	5
Results and Recommendations	
<i>Who Attended Evaluation 2004</i> .....	6
Reasons for Attending.....	8
Conference Satisfaction Levels .....	9
Conference Highlights and Lowlights .....	11
Satisfaction Levels across the Years .....	13
Conclusions .....	14
Appendix A Survey Methods .....	15
Appendix B Descriptive Results for Survey .....	17
Appendix C Descriptive Results across the Years .....	22

## Acknowledgements

The success of this evaluation is due to the hard work, dedication, passion, and generosity of many individuals.

We thank the **American Evaluation Association** for providing this training opportunity to young evaluators. Their vision of contributing to the development of new evaluators provided us with the opportunity to further develop our evaluation skills and experiences while also allowing us to learn about the workings of a professional organization.

We express gratitude to the AEA Stakeholders, **Nancy Kingsbury, Susan Kistler, Sandra Mathison, Stephanie Shipman, and Nick Smith**, whose interest in ensuring that AEA members have an outstanding annual conference supplied us with material to shape a special focus for the evaluation. In particular, we thank **Susan Kistler** who continuously provided guidance and support to our team.

We deeply value the efforts of many other individuals affiliated with the AEA in helping our team to strengthen this evaluation. Specifically, we thank **Hallie Preskill and John Seeley** for serving as liaisons between our team and the AEA. We also thank **Jean King and Sharon Rallis** for adding additional insights that helped us shape the focus of our evaluation. We express gratitude to **Ross Conner, Lucia Fort, Muhammed Liman, Andy Rowe, and Lyudmila Vladiko** for their helpful feedback on our data collection instruments.

We greatly appreciate the help of the AEA staff members, **Nita Howland, Heidi McNeil, Heidi Nye, and Connie Pierce** in executing the logistics of the evaluation.

We extend great appreciation to the twenty **international attendees** who shared their experiences and ideas with us while at *Evaluation 2004*. Their generosity of time and keen insights strengthened this evaluation enormously. We also thank **all attendees who completed the web-based conference survey**. The data they provided yielded important information that was key to the results of this evaluation.

We thank **Principia Products Division of Gravic, Inc.**, in particular **Nora Petchkofski and Steve Joslin**, for their generous support in developing and securing data from our web-based survey.

We thank our faculty advisors, **Kendon Conrad, Robin Miller, and Sharon Telleen**, whose invaluable mentoring contributed immensely to the development and final products of the evaluation.

We also appreciate the generous support of the **Department of Psychology** at the **University of Illinois at Chicago** whose financial contribution to the evaluation was invaluable.

Finally, we are grateful for having had the opportunity to collaborate as a student team. In every way, this evaluation was a team effort; the consistent work of each team member was critical to the overall success of our endeavor.

# Executive Summary

## Evaluation Overview

The UIC conference evaluation team assessed the experience of attendees at *Evaluation 2004* through a web-based survey. The primary questions addressed by the assessment were who are attendees and why did they attend the conference; how satisfied were they with the conference; and do they have suggestions for improving future conferences.

## Methods

Data were collected via a web-based survey. Registrants received an email invitation to participate in completing the on-line survey about a week following the conference. Two reminder emails were sent, the first 1 week after the initial invitation to participate was issued and the second 2 weeks after the initial invitation. Each email contained a link to the survey's web page. The survey was also accessible through the AEA website. Survey items included demographic questions and satisfaction with various elements of the conference.

## Results

In general, attendees were enthusiastic about *Evaluation 2004*. The conference met many attendees' expectations. A majority of the attendees plan to attend another AEA conference in the future.

Although satisfaction with the conference is high, we note three areas in which the conference might improve. In particular, 31% of respondents to our survey rated the quality of the sessions as acceptable or less than acceptable. The quality of session moderation was also an area in which a sizeable minority (30%) of attendees reported the conference is at best acceptable. Finally, nearly a third of respondents perceive the website as at best acceptable.

## Recommendations

We present a number of recommendations emanating from attendees' comments.

- **Maintain success.** Attendees view the AEA conference as a place where they can improve their evaluation skills and network with other evaluators. AEA should continue efforts to ensure these qualities are maintained,
- **Guidelines to presenters.** Currently, AEA has several ways of encouraging presenters to provide high-quality presentations. These include helpful tips in the letter of acceptance, such as how many copies of handouts to bring to presentations, and a peer-reviewed proposal submission process. The AEA has also offered professional development sessions on presentation skills. These efforts have not yet resulted in higher satisfaction ratings with session quality. Recognizing the range of experience among presenters, AEA should continue to identify ways to provide presenters and moderators with helpful guidelines and to improve session quality.
- **Information on the website.** The AEA website has a lot of conference information including an online searchable program. AEA should continue to improve the site content and searchable features of the program.

## Evaluation Overview

Included in this report are the results of the 18-question survey that assessed the experience of all attendees at *Evaluation 2004*. The results and recommendations emanating from this years' evaluation data and the comparison to prior conferences can assist the AEA Board, Annual Conference Committee and the AEA Manager to make decisions about future AEA conferences.

Most of the questions in the survey were used in previous conference evaluations, allowing us to compare attendees' satisfaction ratings over the last few conferences. The UIC team worked closely with the AEA Executive Director, Susan Kistler, to maximize the potential usefulness of the questions included in the questionnaire. This process resulted in several revisions to the questionnaire.

For the first time, this years' evaluation was available only via the internet. This allowed us to include additional questions without making the survey appear extraordinarily long. All of the additional questions addressed our special focus for this evaluation, international attendees.

We decided to use web-based administration of our survey for a number of reasons. In the past, web-based administration of the survey has yielded higher response rates than paper versions. Web-based administration also allowed us to focus on other methods of data collection at the conference, reduced data entry time, and decreased data entry errors.

The response rate was good and compared favorably with prior evaluations. Of the 1,832 registered attendees who received the survey, 48% (n=883) completed it. This rate is much higher than past rates for online surveys (36% in 2002; 14% in 2001), and is also higher than the 36% response rate in 2003. In addition, a few respondents mentioned preferring a web-based survey.

The results in this report are organized by four main questions about *Evaluation2004*:

1. Who attended?
2. Why did people attend?
3. How satisfied were attendees with the conference?
4. What are their suggestions for improving future conferences?

## Results: Who Attended *Evaluation 2004*

Demographic information about survey respondents is presented in the table below.

Characteristic	Category	Responding n	(%)
U.S. National or International Attendee	U.S. National	767	86.9
	International Attendee	114	12.9
	<i>Missing</i>	2	0.2
Attendance at AEA Conferences	First time Attendee	382	43.3
	Intermittent Attendee	168	19.0
	Regular Attendee	331	37.5
	<i>Missing</i>	2	0.2
Current AEA Membership Status	Professional Member	692	78.4
	Student Member	95	10.8
	Non-member	93	10.5
	<i>Missing</i>	3	0.3
Relationship to an AEA Local Affiliate	Active in Local Affiliate	212	24.0
	Not active in Local Affiliate	173	19.6
	No Local Affiliate in Area	176	19.9
	Don't know if Local Affiliate in Area	294	33.3
	<i>Missing</i>	28	3.2
Level of Evaluation Knowledge and Skill	Expert	102	11.6
	Advanced	305	34.5
	Intermediate	372	42.1
	Novice	103	11.7
	<i>Missing</i>	1	0.1
Primary Source of Funding	Employer	569	64.4
	Self	156	17.7
	Grant/Sponsorship	131	14.8
	Other	24	2.7
	<i>Missing</i>	3	0.3

Demographic information table (cont'd)

Characteristic	Category	Responding n	(%)
Primary Place of Employment	College/University	339	38.4
	Government Agency	163	18.5
	Independent Consulting Practice	129	14.6
	Community Agency/Non-Profit	118	13.4
	Foundation	33	3.7
	Schools	32	3.6
	Other	61	6.9
	<i>Missing</i>	8	0.9
Primary Field of Interest	Education	352	39.9
	Health	157	17.8
	Social Services	156	17.7
	Business and Industry	28	3.2
	Environment/Agriculture	26	2.9
	Criminal Justice	13	1.5
	Other	124	14.0
	<i>Missing</i>	27	3.1
Presented at <i>Evaluation 2004</i>	Yes	459	52.0
	No	421	47.7
	<i>Missing</i>	3	0.3
Attended a PDW during <i>Evaluation 2004</i>	Yes	390	44.2
	No	487	55.2
	<i>Missing</i>	6	0.7

Attendees were asked if they were members of any other evaluation associations. 162 (18.2%) respondents indicated they were. Below is a list of associations that at least 2 respondents are members of.

Name of Association	Number of Respondents
American Educational Research Association	37
Canadian Evaluation Society	32
European Evaluation Society	8
Southeast Evaluation Association (affiliate of AEA)	7
Australasian Evaluation Society	5
International Professional Evaluation Network	5
Eastern Evaluation Research Society	3
German Evaluation Society	2
Israeli Association for Program Evaluation	2
Latin American Monitoring & Evaluation Network	2
National Council on Measurement in Education	2
Oregon Program Evaluators Network	2
Southern California Evaluation Association	2
Washington Evaluators	2

## Results: Reasons for Attending

Attendees were asked to give their three (3) most important reasons for attending Evaluation 2004. All 891 (100%) respondents answered this question.

*“Exposure to evaluation practices in diverse settings – what does it look like in other fields.”*

*“Setting up a similar association” [in another continent].*

*“I do not see the conference as a place for skill building in the narrow sense but as an opportunity for the enrichment and widening my horizons.”*

*“Opportunity to learn about current trends in the field.”*

Reason for Attending	Respondents %
Opportunity to improve my skills	80.9
Opportunity to network with evaluators in my field	64.6
Opportunity to be a part of a professional community	63.0
Topics offered at professional development workshops	26.7
Desirability of conference location	13.5
Affordability of registration fees	10.6
Opportunity to explore employment opportunities	8.5
Opportunity to network with evaluators from other countries	5.7
Opportunity to network with evaluators from my home country	4.6
Other	10

For the 94 respondents who selected “other”, reasons for attending included:

Reason for Attending	Percentage of “Other” Respondents
Participating in an official role (e.g., presenter, exhibitor)	34.0
To learn	33.0
Opportunity to network	8.5
Professional development requirement/suggestion	7.4
Curiosity about AEA/Evaluation	5.3

# Results: Conference Satisfaction Levels

## How Satisfied were Attendees with Evaluation 2004?

Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed with statements about *Evaluation 2004*. Participant satisfaction is measured on a 5 point scale, where 1 represents “strongly disagree” and 5 represents “strongly agree”. The percentages presented here are for persons who either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

### Overall Satisfaction and Satisfaction with Conference Components

A majority of the attendees agreed that they felt welcomed at *Evaluation 2004* (**84%**), and the conference met their expectations (**83%**).

Attendees also agreed that they had adequate opportunity for networking (**81%**), and that they learned things that will inform their practice (**86%**).

When asked whether the conference was worth the money **81%** agreed. A large number of participants agreed with the statement that the program content was relevant (**88%**).

Most attendees agreed that overall, they enjoyed the conference (**89%**) and **84%** plan to attend a conference in the future.

Participants were also asked to rate additional conference components. Participant satisfaction is measured on a 5 point scale, where 1 represents “needs improvement”, 3 represents “acceptable” and 5 represents “excellent”.

**Satisfaction with Support Staff and AEA Website.** Most attendees gave both the conference support staff (**70%**) and conference information on the AEA website (**74%**) an above acceptable rating.

**Satisfaction with Quality of Presentations and Moderation of Sessions.** Quality of Presentations was reported to be more than acceptable by **67%** of attendees while an additional **25%** rated them as acceptable.

Moderation of sessions by chairs was rated as more than acceptable by **62%** attendees and an additional **25%** rated them as acceptable.

See Appendix B for more detailed statistics.

### Recommendations

AEA is doing a great job! Conference satisfaction ratings were positive for all conference components

Although ratings were positive, areas that received the lowest level of satisfaction, *quality of presentation, moderation of sessions, and the AEA website* merit attention.

We recommend that AEA

- Explore what conference attendees mean by “quality”, and get attendee suggestions for improving the quality of presentations.
- Continue to provide guidelines to session moderators.
- Continue to improve the AEA website content.

## Results: Conference Satisfaction Levels

### Does Satisfaction with Evaluation 2004 Differ by Type of Attendee?

**Satisfaction by AEA Membership Status.** Attendee satisfaction was analyzed based on whether respondents identified themselves as a professional member, student member, or non-member of the AEA. Among the different types of members, satisfaction differed in regard to:

- Conference support staff
- Information on AEA website
- Quality of presentations
- Whether *Evaluation 2004* met one's expectations
- Whether *Evaluation 2004* was worth the money
- Relevance of program content
- Whether attendees plan to attend future AEA conferences

Means revealed that both professional and student members rated *Evaluation 2004* more satisfactorily than non-members for all of the above-mentioned conference components.

### **Satisfaction by Presenter.**

Analysis of attendees' satisfaction based on whether one presented or not at *Evaluation 2004* revealed differences between the two groups in regard to:

- Conference support staff
- Information on AEA website
- Quality of presentations
- How welcomed one felt
- Whether *Evaluation 2004* met one's expectations
- Relevance of program content
- Whether attendees plan to attend future AEA conferences

Means revealed that presenters rated *Evaluation 2004* more satisfactorily than respondents who did not present for all of the above-mentioned conference components.

**Satisfaction by Attendance Patterns.** Attendee satisfaction was also examined in relationship to conference attendance patterns (first-time attendee, intermittent attendee and regular attendee satisfaction). The groups differed in regard to satisfaction with:

- Conference support staff
- Information on AEA website
- How welcomed one felt
- Whether *Evaluation 2004* met one's expectations
- Whether *Evaluation 2004* was worth the money
- Relevance of program content
- Networking opportunities
- Overall enjoyment
- Whether attendees plan to attend future AEA conferences

Means revealed that in general regular attendees tended to rate *Evaluation 2004* more satisfactorily than those who attend intermittently, who in turn rated it more satisfactorily than first-time attendees for all of the above-mentioned conference components.

**See Appendix B for detailed statistics.**

## Results: Conference Highlights and Lowlights

### The Best Aspects of *Evaluation 2004*

Two questions provided information on positive aspects of *Evaluation 2004* – “What was the single best part of attending *Evaluation 2004*?”, and “What else would you like us to know about your experiences at *Evaluation 2004* or with this survey?” Between the two questions, we received  $n = 984$  comments, which we have organized into nine major categories. The nine categories are outlined below.

*“I always enjoy the Conference. The overall experience is always wonderful!”*

*“I was inspired to come back to my office and introduce new processes and tools for evaluating our programs.”*

*“The pre-conference workshops, great content for the price.”*

*“The diversity of attendees was very impressive. As an ethnic minority, I did not feel isolated.”*

#### **Conference Sessions (n=294).**

Conference attendees expressed satisfaction regarding the program (e.g., sessions, roundtables, plenary sessions, poster sessions). Many attendees liked the variety in content, as well as in presentation format. Respondents reported it was often hard to choose which session to attend. Respondents also positively referred to the quality of the presenters and the sessions. In addition, conference participants sometimes noted favorably specific sessions such as those that were more “hands-on” or sponsored by a particular TIG.

#### **Networking/Socializing (n=271).**

Respondents were positive about the opportunity to network and socialize with colleagues at *Evaluation 2004*. Many also stated that they were able to meet new people and that mixing social events with sessions helped them to network.

**Learning (n=126).** Respondents characterized *Evaluation 2004* as a place where they felt they could expand their knowledge about evaluation or update themselves on current trends. They liked finding out what others think about a particular issue within evaluation.

#### **Professional Development Workshops (n=122).**

Another popular aspect of the conference is the professional development workshops. Many attendees noted how pleased they were with the particular professional development workshop that they attended. Specific comments noted how much the respondent learned or noted the session variety. Some respondents also noted that it was worth the price and time.

**The Whole Conference (n=70).** Some of the conference participants were hard pressed to find just one single aspect of the conference that they liked. They described the conference as a whole to be pleasing. Attendees complimented the organization of the conference.

#### **Location and Affordability (n=29).**

Respondents commented on liking the fact that the conference was in Atlanta. Others liked the location of the hotel. Some stated that the conference was pleasing because it was affordable.

#### **Conference Atmosphere (n=28).**

A small number of respondents commented on aspects of the conference atmosphere. Respondents referred to how welcoming AEA members and staff were. Others mentioned that interactions between attendees were pleasant and that the atmosphere was very collegial.

**The AEA Staff (n=17)** Respondents praised the AEA staff both for treating conference attendees well and for responding to their needs quickly.

**Presenting (n=15).** Presenting was a highlight for some people. They reported that they felt rewarded by being able to share their work and receive feedback.

#### **Diverse Mix of Attendees (n=12).**

Respondents were impressed with the cultural diversity and the diversity of views and fields represented at the conference.

### Areas for Improvement

Two questions requested respondents identify areas for improvement – “What aspect of *Evaluation 2004* most needs improving”, and “What else would you like us to know about your experiences at *Evaluation 2004* or with this survey?” Between the two questions, we received 776 comments concerning improvements. We organized all comments into categories. The eight categories with the most comments in each are outlined below. No other category had more than ten comments in it.

**Conference Presentations:** Three areas specific to low quality of presentations were repeatedly mentioned. Together they accounted for 146 comments.

**Availability of Papers (n=22):** Oftentimes, presenters did not have enough copies of their paper or handouts to give attendees. In some cases there were no papers. AEA does suggest a minimum number of copies presenters should prepare.

**Presentation Skills (n=55):** Respondents mentioned that presenters’ were often either inaudible or read directly from their papers, and that their overhead presentation materials were of poor quality. There were also reports of moderators, discussants, and chairs not adhering to their role.

**Quality of Sessions (n=69):** There were complaints about the quality of many papers. Several respondents expressed particular disappointment with the quality of some plenary presentations and keynote addresses.

**Conference Hotel and City (n=101):** AEA continues to face the challenge of identifying a conference hotel that is affordable to all attendees and meets all their needs. Many complaints were made about the high cost and poor service of the conference hotel. Safety issues and “deadness” of downtown Atlanta were also mentioned.

**Description of Sessions (n=81):** Respondents expressed difficulty in knowing what to expect from sessions based only on the titles in the conference book. Having a full description of all sessions available on the AEA website was definitely appreciated, but attendees could not easily access this while at the conference.

**Additional Facilities (n=26):** Respondents noted that they missed having free internet access at this year’s conference. The AEA website did inform attendees that only the hotels’ computer facilities would be available but they were not informed there would be a cost. Also, as has been the case in every prior evaluation, respondents wanted free snacks and cocktails throughout the conference.

**Networking (n=24):** Many respondents appreciated the networking available at the conference, but others thought more could be done to create additional networking opportunities.

**Professional Development Workshops (n=22):** Comments about the workshops concerned the quality of presenters and that the descriptions of workshops were not accurate.

**Topical Interest Groups (TIGs) (n=14):** Most of the comments about TIGs were that meetings are held at the same time. Respondents often want to attend more than one groups’ meeting.

**Manipulating the AEA Website (n=11):** Related to the issue of session description, respondents who used the AEA website’s conference program reported difficulties in easily accessing desired options, such as abstracts for sessions within a specific time period or for a full day’s sessions. A couple respondents also suggested that the information be available earlier.

## **Results: Conference Satisfaction Levels across Years**

### **Evaluation 2004 compared to Evaluation 2001-2003**

2004

**Overall Satisfaction and Expectations of the Conference.** Overall there has been a clear positive trend in that each consecutive year, conference attendees report greater overall enjoyment and having their expectations met than the respondents in the previous years. From 2000-2004, means scores range from 4.16-4.36 revealing that the mean ratings indicate satisfactory levels that range from more than acceptable to excellent.

2003

**Feeling Welcomed, Adequate Opportunities for Networking, Learning, and Content Relevance.** Satisfaction ratings regarding these conference components have increased each year. Mean satisfaction scores reveal that, on average, respondents rated each aspect as “more than acceptable” to “excellent”. The conference attendees’ satisfaction levels for two aspects of the conference, learning new things and content relevance, have mean discrepancy levels of .37 and .33 respectively. These scores represent the amount of difference between satisfaction ratings in previous years and current ratings, showing that significant strides have been made over the years to raise satisfaction levels in these areas.

2002

**Conference Worth the Money and Plan to Attend an AEA Conference in the Future.** It is noteworthy that mean scores throughout the years regarding these conference satisfaction ratings have been similar and consistently high. The maximum difference between years for a single item never exceeded .16. Attendees appear to appreciate what they are getting and opt to come back for more. Although these ratings have continued to move in a positive direction, *Evaluation 2004* ratings are slightly lower (.04-.06) than those of 2003 for both items.

2001

**Conference Support Staff, Conference Information on the AEA website.** Attendees rated *Evaluation 2004* similarly to prior years on the quality of the staff and the website. Ratings for 2003 were somewhat higher than 2004. Ratings from prior years were also slightly higher than *Evaluation 2004* (2002, 2000). The largest difference between the means for both conference support staff and information on the AEA website in a single item is .19. The mean for the support staff is between “more than acceptable” and “excellent”. The mean for the website is slightly above “more than acceptable.”

2000

**Quality of Presentations and Moderation of Session by Chairs.**

Satisfaction with the quality of presentations has been acceptable or above (3-4 range) over the past years and scores have been increasing. Nevertheless, *Evaluation 2004* received slightly lower satisfaction ratings compared to 2001-2003. The maximum discrepancy between items is .12. Moderation of sessions by chair received higher satisfaction ratings than in all other years except 2002. Overall, the satisfaction rating for this particular conference component has steadily increased over the past 5 years.

See Appendix C for detailed statistics.

# Conclusions

The AEA continues to host an annual conference that is well regarded and appreciated by its attendees. The results from this evaluation indicate that attendees were highly satisfied with most aspects of *Evaluation 2004*. In particular, they appreciated the variety in content and presentation format of the conference sessions, and the opportunities available throughout the conference for networking and developing evaluation skills. There are still a few aspects of the conference attendees believe AEA should keep in mind and try to improve, including:

- The quality of conference sessions including the skills of both presenters and moderators.
- The ease of finding and manipulating the relevant aspects for the conference on the AEA website.

# Appendix A: Survey Methods

## Promoting the Survey

### At- Conference Efforts

We advertised the web-based survey through,

1. Stickers reminding attendees to evaluate the conference, giving the location of the web-site and when the survey would be available were placed on the back of each registration folder.
2. Reminder notes for attendees to evaluate the conference were placed in popular gathering areas (e.g., on the ribbon table, on our table in the exhibition area).
3. An announcement that the evaluation would be web-based, and an appeal to attendees to evaluate the conference was made at plenary sessions.

### Post-Conference Efforts

After the conference attendees were encouraged to complete the web-based survey through the following methods.

**Initial Contact:** Nick Smith, the 2004-05 AEA President, supported our efforts by signing our first letter which supplied attendees with the web address of the survey. This letter was sent by electronic mail (email) to all persons listed on the register at the end of the conference on Wednesday November 10, 2004.

**Reminders:** We sent reminder emails to all attendees on the two subsequent Wednesdays after the initial letter was sent (i.e., November 17 and 24, 2004).

**Setbacks:** We encountered a number of problems sending out the emails. On our first attempt, there was a technical problem and the web address of the survey was not included with the letter. This was remedied within a few hours. We sent the letters using a mass e-mail program, and this resulted in many of the letters not reaching attendees' mailboxes as our letter was assumed to be spam. Also, some registered attendees did not provide their most current email address. In total forty-one contact attempts were problematic. A team member subsequently sent individual letters to each person where this was an issue and was successful in many instances. Although we worked diligently to ensure that conference attendees were able to access the survey, these setbacks may have affected our response rate.

**AEA Website:** Susan Kistler, AEA manager, made the survey website address available on the AEA website from the middle of November.

**Availability of Survey:** The survey was available to attendees up to December 3, 2004.

### Data Preparation

Principia© Products created the on-line survey free of charge using their product Remark Web Survey©, and prepared the SPSS database containing the responses. This was sent to the evaluation team approximately one week after the survey was no longer available to attendees. The data was then checked for inaccuracies, and any necessary corrections were made. One case had to be removed as the respondent reported they had not actually attended the conference.

### Data Analysis

**Quantitative.** Frequencies, percentages and other summarizing data were calculated for the quantitative conference survey questions. Analysis of variance techniques were performed in a few instances. SPSS was the statistical package used in all quantitative analyses.

**Qualitative.** A thematic analysis was used on the four qualitative questions. First, two team members each coded two questions individually. Then the other team member assessed the accuracy of the first coder's selected themes, and suggested needed changes. In this way, both team members looked at all four qualitative questions either as first or second coder. Final themes were agreed upon by both team members.

## Appendix B: Satisfaction Ratings

### Descriptive Results for Satisfaction Ratings (n=891)

#### 1. Please rate the following *Evaluation 2004* conference components

Rating Levels : 1 = Needs improvement      3 = Acceptable  
 5 = Excellent                                      9 = Not enough information to judge

Statements about the Conference	Frequency (%)						Missing (%)	Mean	SD
	1	2	3	4	5	9			
Conference support staff.	2 (.2)	7 (.8)	91 (10)	219 (25)	404 (46)	152 (17)	8 (1)	4.41	.77
Conference information on Evaluation 2004 web site.	25 (3)	25 (3)	150 (17)	334 (38)	320 (36)	23 (2)	6 (1)	4.05	.96
Quality of Presentations.	6 (.5)	42 (5)	220 (25)	442 (50)	151 (17)	17 (2)	6 (.5)	3.80	.81
Moderation of sessions by chairs.	12 (1)	37 (4)	219 (25)	409 (46)	144 (16)	59 (7)	11 (1)	3.77	.84

**Descriptive Results for Satisfaction Ratings (n=891)**

**1. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following**

Rating Levels : 1 = Strongly Disagree      3 = Neither Agree or Disagree  
 5 = Strongly Agree                              9 = Not enough experience to judge

Statements about the Conference	Frequency (%)						Missing (%)	Mean	SD
	1	2	3	4	5	9			
<b>I felt welcomed at the conference.</b>	2 (0.2) (1)	16 (1.8)	117 (13)	304 (34)	437 (49.8)	5	2 (0.2)	4.32	.79
<b>Evaluation 2004 met my expectations.</b>	3 (0.3)	52 (6)	85 (9.4)	386 (44)	344 (39)	10 (1)	3 (0.3)	4.17	.86
<b>The conference was worth the money.</b>	14 (2)	44 (5)	98 (11)	332 (37.7)	381 (43)	11 (1)	3 (0.3)	4.18	.93
<b>I found the program content relevant.</b>	2 (0.2)	29 (3)	70 (8)	395 (45)	383 (432)	3 (0.3)	1 (0.1)	4.28	.77
<b>I had adequate opportunity for networking.</b>	9 (1)	28 (3)	94 (10.8)	373 (42)	345 (39)	32 (4)	2 (0.2)	4.20	.84
<b>I learned things that will inform my practice.</b>	7 (1)	32 (4)	75 (8)	380 (43)	377 (42.8)	10 (1)	2 (0.2)	4.25	.82
<b>Overall, I enjoyed the conference.</b>	2 (0.2)	21 (2.4)	69 (8)	348 (39.4)	435 (49)	4 (0.5)	4 (0.5)	4.36	.75
<b>I plan to attend an AEA conference in the future.</b>	11 (1)	15 (2)	103 (11.7)	237 (27)	507 (57)	7 (1)	3 (.3)	4.39	.85

**Descriptive Results for Satisfaction Ratings by Membership Status**

(Only items with a significant difference are shown)

Conference Satisfaction Component	Professional Member		Student Member		Non-member	
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)
		n		n		n
Conference support staff.	4.45 <sup>a</sup>	(.75)	4.38	(.72)	4.09 <sup>a</sup>	(.83)
		568		78		74
Conference information on the AEA website.	4.11 <sup>a</sup>	(.95)	3.89	(1.01)	3.80 <sup>a</sup>	(1.00)
		668		93		91
Quality of presentations.	3.82 <sup>a</sup>	(.78)	3.90 <sup>b</sup>	(.82)	3.57 <sup>a,b</sup>	(.97)
		680		91		87
<i>Evaluation 2004</i> met my expectations.	4.19 <sup>a</sup>	(.85)	4.18	(.82)	3.94 <sup>a</sup>	(.95)
		684		93		90
The conference was worth the money.	4.20 <sup>a</sup>	(.91)	4.18	(.92)	3.93 <sup>a</sup>	(1.11)
		686		93		87
I found the program content relevant.	4.31 <sup>a</sup>	(.75)	4.33 <sup>b</sup>	(.76)	4.04 <sup>a,b</sup>	(.87)
		690		95		91
I plan to attend an AEA conference in the future.	4.45 <sup>a</sup>	(.80)	4.35	(.93)	3.97 <sup>a</sup>	(1.06)
		684		95		91

Note: Means in the same row with the same superscript are significantly different from each other.

**Descriptive Results for Satisfaction Ratings by Presenter**

(Only items with a significant difference are shown)

Conference Satisfaction Component	Not a Presenter		Presenter	
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)
		N		n
Conference support staff.	4.29	(.79)	4.50	(.73)
		336		385
Conference information on the AEA website	3.96	(1.02)	4.14	(.90)
		410		441
Quality of presentations	3.74	(.84)	3.86	(.77)
		409		449
I felt welcomed at the <i>Evaluation 2004</i> conference.	4.27	(.82)	4.37	(.76)
		420		453
<i>Evaluation 2004</i> met my expectations.	4.08	(.92)	4.25	(.79)
		414		453
I found the program content relevant.	4.20	(.82)	4.36	(.71)
		419		457
I plan to attend an AEA conference in the future.	4.30	(.94)	4.48	(.76)
		416		454

**Descriptive Results for Satisfaction Ratings by Attendance Patterns**

(Only items with a significant difference are shown)

Conference Satisfaction Component	First AEA Conference		Attend Intermittently		Attend Regularly	
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)
	n		n		n	
Conference support staff.	4.14 <sup>a,b</sup>	(.85)	4.50 <sup>a</sup>	(.70)	4.64 <sup>b</sup>	(.59)
	302		140		279	
Conference information on the AEA website.	3.84 <sup>a,b</sup>	(1.07)	4.16 <sup>a</sup>	(.85)	4.25 <sup>b</sup>	(.83)
	369		160		324	
I felt welcomed at the <i>Evaluation 2004</i> Conference.	4.21 <sup>a,b</sup>	(.87)	4.29 <sup>a</sup>	(.77)	4.47 <sup>b</sup>	(.67)
	378		168		328	
<i>Evaluation 2004</i> met my expectations.	4.05 <sup>a,b</sup>	(.95)	4.12 <sup>a</sup>	(.82)	4.33 <sup>b</sup>	(.74)
	373		168		327	
The conference was worth the money.	4.04 <sup>a,b</sup>	(1.02)	4.03 <sup>a</sup>	(.94)	4.41 <sup>b</sup>	(.76)
	373		168		326	
I found the program content relevant.	4.21 <sup>a,b</sup>	(.82)	4.27 <sup>a</sup>	(.72)	4.37 <sup>b</sup>	(.72)
	378		168		331	
I had adequate opportunities for networking.	4.06 <sup>a</sup>	(.75)	4.18	(.75)	4.35 <sup>a</sup>	(.73)
	358		164		325	
Overall, I enjoyed the conference.	4.26 <sup>a,b</sup>	(.79)	4.30 <sup>a</sup>	(.80)	4.51 <sup>b</sup>	(.65)
	377		165		331	
I plan to attend an AEA conference in the future.	4.13 <sup>a,b</sup>	(.79)	4.31 <sup>a,c</sup>	(.93)	4.72 <sup>b,c</sup>	(.03)
	374		166		331	

*Note:* Means in the same row with the same superscript are significantly different from each other.

## Appendix C: Conference Satisfaction Levels across Years

Respondents' ratings across the years.

Conference Satisfaction Components	2004		2003		2002		2001		2000	
	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	<i>n</i>								
Overall I enjoyed the conference.	4.36 (.75)	875	4.33 (.75)	592	4.28 (.75)	935	4.25 (.75)	720	4.16 (.75)	297
I felt welcomed at the conference	4.32 (.79)	876	4.31 (.79)	592	4.27 (.79)	938	4.08 (.79)	716	4.04 (.79)	295
The conference met my expectations.	4.17 (.86)	870	4.17 (.86)	592	4.08 (.86)	936	3.99 (.86)	717	3.97 (.86)	296
The conference was worth the money.	4.18 (.93)	869	4.23 (.93)	592	4.18 (.93)	937	4.11 (.93)	716	4.12 (.93)	299
I found the program content relevant	4.28 (.77)	879	4.25 (.77)	592	4.08 (.77)	928	4.00 (.77)	706	3.95 (.77)	301
I had adequate opportunity for networking.	4.20 (.84)	849	4.19 (.84)	592	4.04 (.84)	933	+	+	+	+
I learned things that will inform my practice.	4.25 (.82)	871	4.30 (.82)	592	4.18 (.82)	934	4.10 (.82)	716	3.93 (.82)	924
I plan to attend an AEA conference in the future.	4.39 (.85)	873	4.45 (.85)	592	4.29 (.85)	936	4.33 (.85)	714	4.29 (.85)	299

+ Data not collected

Respondents' ratings across the years.

Conference Components	2004		2003		2002		2001		2000	
	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	<i>n</i>								
Conference support staff	4.41 (.76)	723	4.52 (.76)	592	4.43 (.76)	877	4.33 (.76)	692	4.51 (.76)	261
Conference information on the AEA website	4.05 (.96)	854	4.08 (.96)	592	4.02 (.96)	914	3.92 (.96)	710	4.11 (.96)	281
Quality of presentations	3.80 (.81)	892	3.85 (.81)	592	3.89 (.81)	924	3.84 (.81)	708	3.77 (.81)	292
Moderation of session by chairs	3.78 (.84)	813	3.72 (.84)	592	3.80 (.84)	894	3.74 (.84)	707	3.73 (.84)	291