NACADA Region 2
2011 Conference Final

When: Pre-Conference April 6, 2011
Conference April 6-8, 2011
Where: Doubletree Hotel Charlottesville
990 Hilton Heights Road, Charlottesville, VA 22901
Theme: Looking Back to Move Forward
Co-Chairs: Jameela Anderson and Art Esposito

Final Report

Even though we are facing hard economic times and institutional budget constraints, we were pleasantly surprised by the number of conference registrants, who attended the conference and took advantage of exploring Virginia’s Wine Country. The conference planning committee, Angie Maher and the hotel staff exceeded our customer service expectations by being accessible to conference registrants to answer questions and address their issues and concerns. Our conference planning committee did an outstanding job and the volunteers made our jobs easier.

The overall conference evaluations are overwhelmingly positive and show that the membership feels the conference was positive and re-energizing. Conference registrants appeared to be pleased with our southern hospitality and appreciated the variety of concurrent session topics and evening activities. The following questions were the only questions which garnered a rating of “Fair” in double digits:

• Meeting Facilities: in Comments, respondents indicated that some rooms were cramped and stuffy, that there wasn’t sufficient water provided, and that writing surfaces would have been nice. The size of the rooms seems something site selection can be mindful of, and stuffy/water service is something future committees might keep a specific eye on. Though, with 86% rating them as “Good” or “Excellent” We’re not certain how much care needs be taken
• Meals: can’t imagine how future conferences can improve upon what we were offered and the price at which we received it. Nearly 77% rated meals “Good” or “Excellent
• Key Note Speaker: again, we’re baffled by this response, but over 77% rated Peter Hagen as “Good” or “Excellent”
• Variety of Topics Presented: in comments, some indicated a desire for the following topics; topics for experienced advisors, advising veterans, advising adults, transfers students, community colleges, topics from faculty who advise, topics on pre-health advising, diversity topics, doing more with less $, at risk students.
  ○ Over 87% rated “Good” or “Excellent.” Another common comment was that similar topics were offered at conflicting times—the proposals/program committee worked diligently to minimize this to the extent that we limited accepting excessive presentations on the same topic
  ○ Also, we are at the mercy of those who propose—a mention of some of the above might help in the call for next year?

Interesting observations future chairs should consider:
• include presenters’ institutions in program to aid attendees in searching for similar institutions, networking, etc.
  ○ don’t know if we’re the first to have omitted this
• Many touted the use of technology—the blog was mentioned often and the streaming was noted.
• Leave poster sessions up for the whole conference. Also mentioned poster session space was cramped and too hard to converse
• Session length was found to be perfect, though more than one person suggested a conference longer than a day and a half
  o I offer two suggestions for future region 2 conference Chairs:
  o consider starting pre-conference sessions in the morning and having a block of two concurrent sessions after lunch on the first day – Region 1 did this to great effect
  o consider brunch on the last day rather than breakfast, with two concurrents prior to the brunch: the Region Chair can deliver a business report, and state baskets, etc. can be given away at the end. This might encourage a larger number of attendees to stay through the final half day and encourage more people to hear the region’s business report—again, Region 1 did this to great effect.

In planning the conference, both co-chairs complimented each other’s strengths and weaknesses. We worked together on all aspects of the planning and wanted to ensure that the conference was a fun and enjoyable professional development/networking experience. Also, working with Angie Maher, Doubletree Hotel Liaison, was a pleasure and made the planning and coordination of the conference easy.

Food is always a key component in planning a conference. We were able to serve full breakfast buffets both Thursday and Friday, and plated lunch due to the discounted government food rate. We kicked-off the conference with a Welcome Reception. Our reception featured a cash bar, cheese and fruit tray, assorted finger sandwiches and hot hors d’oeuvres. The cost of the reception was $4784.00. The first breakfast for 320 totaled $2,230.40. We had our “First-Timers” meeting during the first breakfast. Lunch was plated with dessert at a cost of $12.40 per person (total of 340). The Mentoring Reception cost $480.00. The first day total food cost with taxes and gratuity was $8,935.06. Breakfast on the final day featured common reading and poster sessions. The total cost of breakfast with taxes and gratuity was $3127.22. We heard nothing but praises about the food and menu selection. The total food cost was $12,062.28.

The total number of registrants was 328, with an average registration fee of $140.00 (some registrants may have had late fees or may have paid student fees). Also, we had “no-shows” and/or cancellations, which will affect our final number of registrants and final budget. Our estimate is that NACADA collected approximately $45,920 in registration fees. Our balance due at the end of the conference to the Doubletree Hotel Charlottesville was $20,454.05, which leaves approximately $25,465.95 to cover other conference related expenses.

We were amazed by the room occupancy and surpassed our room block with the Doubletree Hotel Charlottesville (per our contract) a month prior to the conference. As a result, Diane Matteson assisted us with the coordination of two overflow hotels within 3 miles of the conference hotel. The overflow hotels were the Hampton Inn Charlottesville and Marriott Courtyard Charlottesville and graciously agreed to a comparable room rate.

Our technology cost was a major concern in planning this conference because we had to use an outside AV/Technology company, who is contracted with Doubletree Hotels. We were given a discounted presenters package rate of $60.00 per day (up to 6 breakout rooms) and charged regular presenters
package rate of $90.00 per day for additional breakout rooms. Our total technology cost was $1941.25. Also, Allen and Calley Taylor and Art Esposito did an excellent job with incorporating technology throughout the entire conference planning process and conference. They used social media to disseminate information and publicize the conference, events and activities and streamed selected concurrent sessions (presenter’s approval only) and keynote address live on the internet. Art and our AV/Tech chairs truly opened our minds to the endless possibilities, usage and benefits of technology.

Unfortunately, we do not have a final budget from Diane Matteson. Here are some of the conference related expenses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Expenses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keynote Speaker</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>Peter Hagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program/Printing</td>
<td>$1118.84</td>
<td>$3.19 unit cost (total of 350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padfolios</td>
<td>$2740.72</td>
<td>$7.83 unit cost (a total of 350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$141.06</td>
<td>Paper, decorations, envelopes, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>$174.23</td>
<td>Gifts for Program Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>$437.32</td>
<td>Door/Raffle prizes, Give-A-Ways, State Baskets Gifts, Food and Wine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Planning Committee</td>
<td>$333.86</td>
<td>CPC meetings and meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5719.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the conferences expenses are paid, our Regions estimated profit from the conference is a total of $19,746.92.
Summary
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Started: 151 out of 326
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Average completion times:

- Average Time To Complete Survey: 1 hours 2 minutes 9 seconds.
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Page 1
Question 1

The session that was most valuable to my situation was: (Session #, Session name, Presenter name)

- C29, Characteristics of Effective Teaching and Advising: One and the same? Exploring Potential Tools to Improve Total Student Success, Daniel Foster and Terry Musser
- C23 Connecting with Students Using a Blog
- Multicultural session about Latino students, last day of the conference
- Supporting Academic Success: Programs and Tools
- C44 - Advisors moving forward in a multicultural America
- C21. Reframing "Required": Helping Students Connect Academic Requirements to Their Personal Path. Edna Renee Macbeth
- C2, Using Technology to Prepare Students for Orientation & Beyond, PSU-Abington
- Writing for NACADA, Session one
- C23: Connecting with Students Utilizing a Syllabus and Blog
- Advising Adult Learners
- C2. Using technology to Prepare Students for Orientation and Beyond, Stephen Brown and Alissa Carpenter
- C11. Th online Major Fair: Advising for the YouTube Generation Presenter: Richard Sigal
- C11, The On-Line Major Fair by Richard Sigal. It provided an idea that I hadn't heard of before, one that will be useful on my campus.
- C29 Characteristics of Effective Advising and Teaching. D. Foster and T. Musser. It offered both a theoretical justification for its procedure and some practical applications.
- C1 - Podcasting - Kirkner, Levinson, Hawkins, and Bartolomeo. Anything related to technology and assessment is valuable to my situation. Most favorite/fun session...C29 with Foster and Musser.
- C47, Clusters and Cohorts and Themes, Oh My!: Making Learning Communities Work, Terri Baker and Emily Bogunovich.
- Catching students before they fall, session C34, naomi Parker
- C48 Simple Ways to Assist Students in their Personal and Professional Growth
- Undecided students advising program-Ashlyn Howell
- Actually, the most valuable session was the lunch key note address given by Paul Hagen. Paul Hagen session Narrative, Metaphor...and the Education of an Advisor
- C40, Advising in the Fast-Forward Lane: Working with High-Achieving Students, Chuck Allen, Lori Roseman, Amanda Neuber
- C44 Advisors Moving Forward in a Multicultural America... Tania Alvarez ans Jose Ramos
- The one about advising blogs and advising syllabi
- C4 Writing for NACADA. Peter Hagen and Leigh Shaffer. Great to get some pointers as a long time vet of advising ready for a new level.
- History of Higher Education
- Using Adobe Connect for Advising; Kirk Dewyea and Terri Wheaton
- Multicultural advising by GW Thompson
- C23 - Advising Syllabus and Blog
• Advising Syllabus and Blog
• The presenter was from JMU...the topic was blogs. Her presentation style was great and her material was very helpful for an "old dog"
• Assisting Students with Disabilities Online
• Divide and Conquer: How the CC of Baltimore County Academic Advising Manages the Enrollment Serge through Advising Labs and Triage
• All of them were very valuable.
• C56. Basic Counseling & Interpersonal Communication Skills for Advisers
• I no longer have my conf brochure - the session was called Student Advising Mentors (SAMs): Bringing Advising Into the Future
• C31. Difficult Dialogues: When High Achieving Students Don't Perform, Rachel Switalski & Terri Baker
• C23, Connecting with Students Utilizing a Syllabus and Blog, Heather Patterson
• PC4. From Graduate Student to First-Year Advisor: A Crash Course in Advising
• PSU's Daniel Foster & Terry Musser Teaching tools applied to advising AND Peter Hagen's Hermeneutics, Metaphor in Advising
• #1
• C18 Students in Grief: The Kubler-Ross Model & Academic Advising Jennifer Herst & William Biese
• C2, Using Technology to Prepare Students for Orientation and Beyond, Stephen Brown and Alissa Carpenter
• Can't recall but it was on Advising Blog
• C7. Going Beyond Advising: Applying a Student-Athlete Model to the General Student Population, Rebekah Gingras and Allison Vendt
• C43, In Search of those people who have worked the hardest to say the most profound things is the most beautiful ways. Dwight Williams
• C44 Advisors moving forward ia a multicultural America: Must have 'tool kit" to effectively advise Hispanic and Latino students(documented and undocumented)presenters: Tania Alvarez and Jose Ramos
• C10, Actuating a Transformation: The Reinvigoration of an Academic Support Program, Linda Bradbury & Jennifer daro
• My very first one on using software to help newly admitted students with instructions on what we would consider common everyday things at the college, ie, how to register on-line.
• On the last day, there was a session by two women from Penn State on basic advising skills that I found to be very helpful.
• The Virtual Major Fair - can't remember session # or presenter name, but he was from Rutgers
• C34: Catching Students Before they Fall - Naomi Parker
• C32, The Positive Employment Program, Crystal Coombes
• C21. Re-framing "Required": Helping Students Connect Academic Requirements to Their PErsonal Paths,Edna Renee Macbeth
• C23, Connecting Students Utilizing a Syllabus and Blog, Heather Patterson
• C51 - The 11th Hour: Transitional Advising at UM... - Evelyn Cooper and Jabari Bodrick
C1. Podcasting, Kirkner, Levinson, Hawkins, and Bartolomeo
C17, Your Own "Open Road:" VCU's Discovery Advising Program for Undeclared and Exploratory Students
C8, Transfer-mation, Corri Pfister, K.C. Mendez, and Liz Kane.
I mostly wanted to hear Peter Hagen speak. I was locked out of the Conference hotel and had to shuttle from another Hotel. That is never good. Very happy with NBCC clock hours - I heed this very mu
Don't remember
C11, The Online Major Fair: Advising for the YouTube Generation, Richard Sigal
Peter Hagen's paper discussion
C17, Your Own "Open Road:" VCU's Discovery Advising Program for Undeclared and Exploratory Students, VCU reps (multiple presenters)
I thought the history of advising would be the most valuable but it was too deep into background. We needed to see how advising is conducted in various college settings and compare to ours.
Considering Ethical Issues in Advising, Joanne K. Damminger
C35: Personalizing online advising: Engaging, Informing, and Building Community with Online Students
The ones most valuable to me were the assessment sessions.
C4, Writing for NACADA: The NACADA Journal, Academic Advising Today, the Clearinghouse and Monographs, Peter Hagen
common reading discussion
Hermeneutics & Advising
From Graduates to Professionals (3 part session)
Art's discussion about the use of Facebook.
I had such a great experience... I can't select only one. Writing for NACADA(C4) Historical Foundation of Current Theoretical Paradigms(C15) Effective Teaching and Advising(C29)
C42, Mentorship from Scratch, Jennifer Matthews
c23=Connecting with students utilizing a syllabus and blog, Heather Patterson
Session #: C12 Title: University Studies Program: A Holistic Approach to Major Decision-making Lead Presenter: Courtney Yount McGinnis
The session about advising adult students and peer mentoring programs (Lynchburg College)
cannot select a single session
I can't remember the exact name or number, but it was Friday morning. A woman from Virginia Tech presented on her peer mentoring program for business majors.
Technology and orientation by Penn State on the first day
C29. Characteristics of Effective Teaching and Advising: One and the Same?...Daniel Foster and Terry Musser.
The Five Stages of Grief
C29. Characteristics of Effective Teaching and advising: One and the same?.. Daniel Foster and Terry Musser
Question 2
Overall, I thought the conference was: Using the following scale, please indicate your evaluation of the following conference related issues:

2.1 Advance e-mails, publicity, etc.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5 (3.31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>60 (39.74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>82 (54.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 (0.66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>3 (1.99%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Conference location

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3 (1.99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>13 (8.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>47 (31.13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>86 (56.95%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2 (1.32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Dates of Conference

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3 (1.99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>11 (7.28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>71 (47.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>65 (43.05%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1 (0.66%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Pre-Registration Process

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5 (3.31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>58 (38.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>82 (54.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4 (2.65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2 (1.32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 On-site registration process

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>5 (3.31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>35 (23.18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>55 (36.42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>54 (35.76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.6 Hotel sleeping rooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (1.32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.7 Meeting Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (1.32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.8 Meals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (0.66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.9 Preconference Workshops</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.10 Welcome Reception</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.11 Keynote Speaker - Peter Hagen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>49.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.12 Conference Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.13 Variety of Topics Presented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.14 State Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>48.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.15 Common Reading Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>84.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.16 Poster Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.17 Hospitality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>64.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.18 Networking Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>55.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.19 Length of Conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.20 Overall, I thought the conference was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 3**

How many REGIONAL conferences have you attended before this conference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>72 (47.68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>32 (21.19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>23 (15.23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>19 (12.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>5 (3.31%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4**

How did you learn of this conference? (Mark all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking with a colleague</td>
<td>66 (43.71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail announcement from NACADA</td>
<td>91 (60.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Region 2 Conference Blog</td>
<td>13 (8.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching web</td>
<td>14 (9.27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Region Awards program</td>
<td>3 (1.99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact from a NACADA member</td>
<td>27 (17.88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>3 (1.99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>16 (10.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1 (0.66%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Text:
- NACADA website
- NACADA Website
- No Response
- NACADA Website
- My director and supervisor recommended it.
- NACADA website
- Call for submissions for presentations
- Conference Co-Chair
- I'm on the steering committee
- last year
- NACADA nat'l conference & website
- upon discovering the NACADA website
- member of steering committee
- NACADA volunteer
- NACADA website
- No Response
Question 5

What was your primary reason(s) for attending this conference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for continuing professional development</td>
<td>99 (65.56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>63 (41.72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference dates</td>
<td>20 (13.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference theme</td>
<td>15 (9.93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable registration fees</td>
<td>21 (13.91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>29 (19.21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2 (1.32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Text:
- New to advising
- Networking
- To learn how a conference is run so can do the same in Annapolis
- Opportunity to present
- I wanted to network and learn more about advising students.
- Receive award.
- Professional development opportunity
- Presentation
- I was a presenter
- On the Conference Committee
- Presenting
- Conference Co-Chair
- Presenting at conference
- No Response
- Professional dev
- To ease into presenting at NACADA
- Award recipient
- Support from employer
- Personal interest
- No Response
- Presenting
- Faculty academic advising project underway...
- Professional develop & networking
- Member of conference planning committee
- A friend offered me somewhere to stay so I could afford going!
- Presenting
- To present
- No Response
- Presented
Question 6

To what extent did the conference meet your expectations?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>70 (46.36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
<td>63 (41.72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>17 (11.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1 (0.66%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 7

Which of the following best describes your primary role at your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Advisor</td>
<td>7 (4.64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisor</td>
<td>67 (44.37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>2 (1.32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisor/Counselor</td>
<td>17 (11.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Administrator</td>
<td>26 (17.22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator with responsibilities over several areas, one of which is advising</td>
<td>17 (11.26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student</td>
<td>5 (3.31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional position supports advising i.e. Registrar, admissions, financial aid, etc.</td>
<td>1 (0.66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated with a college or university but not in any of the roles previously mentioned</td>
<td>2 (1.32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not affiliated with an institution of higher education</td>
<td>1 (0.66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>5 (3.31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1 (0.66%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Text:
- Retention
- No Response
- Advising Researcher
- previous advisor
- Faculty Counselor
Question 8
How many years have you been in advising? (as an advisor, administrator, or faculty member)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Count (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 5</td>
<td>64 (42.38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>38 (25.17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>29 (19.21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 20</td>
<td>18 (11.92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>2 (1.32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 9
In what ways was this conference valuable to you?

- Meeting and networking with others in my region; learning about new programs.
- Networking with colleagues, learning new techniques and perspectives in the sessions.
- This conference gave me the opportunity to network and meet advisors from other universities and to find out how they do things. The presentations were also extremely informative.
- It validated what we are doing in advising and provided new ideas / perspective in other areas.
- Great networking opportunities; helpful to share ideas.
- Networking and some of the materials shared in the sessions.
- New information and techniques that will assist me in my role; hearing how other institutions function and how that may be applied to my position; learning about different perspectives and best practices.
- I learned a lot.
- learned some specific tips
- In hindsight, the conference offered sessions better suited to me than the national conferences I've attended, or maybe I'm just better at reading the session blurbs now! I was very thankful for the opportunity to present a poster.
- networking and gaining ideas from other institutions' programs
- Discovered new approaches to apply to my school
- After many years of advising I was able to still take away wonderful and innovative ideas I can apply to my professions
- Getting other advisors perspectives regarding advising situations. Learning about best practices, so I could bring ideas back to my college.
- After not having any NACADA involvement for 2 years it allowed me to get back in the saddle so to speak. I'm also helping with the conference in Annapolis so it gave me insight on what to do for next year.
- Inspired me with ideas to present next year
- It provided an accessible, inexpensive, professional development opportunity for my new advising staff. It was their first NACADA event. It was a chance to experience a regional event before an overwhelming national conference.
- It allowed me access to many other resources. I have been taxed with creating a manual for using Facebook to better communicate with students. I have already used these resources to contact Art Esposito.
• topics
• Getting to hear what others are doing on their campuses, looking at some best practices.
• continuing professional development
• Networking with Region 2 members
• Professional growth.
• Networking with other colleagues and the opportunity to present at the poster session.
• Learning about what other colleagues are doing at their institutions. The opportunity to share ideas.
• This regional conference was in a location that enabled me to provide my entire advising unit with professional development. Our participation as a group helped with motivation and confirmation of value of advising.
• Networking; sharing ideas about advising, especially for honors students; effective communication about education and requirements, the liberal arts. Peter Hagen's advice, that "our customer is our product", is inspiring!
• networking, professional development, to learn more about other Region 2 colleges and universities
• There were some take aways, particularly the advising syllabus, that I will institute this summer. I guess I would say that it was learning new ideas from colleagues.
• I focused more on personal professional growth this time - rather than "office/advising center" enhancements.
• The new member program.
• Good networking opportunities and ideas.
• I enjoyed being able to exchange ideas with people in my field.
• Always great to hear what other people are doing and get ideas for our institution.
• Good concurrent sessions, though as always I wish we had one more day of sessions
• It give me some great ideas for our advising programs.
• Reenforced some of the things that I am currentl doing. Also, presented me with new ideas on how I can improve some processes.
• N/A
• Always helpful to get away from my own campus to spend some personal time with others from my very own campus. Helped me to reconsider uses of technology.
• I learned about how to view the role of an advisor as well as a number of new ideas for freshman orientation, accommodating students with disabilities, the first year experience, and assessing my performance as an advisor.
• Excellent range of topics and opportunities for discussion.
• the opportunity to hear various topics from many perspectives
• I learned about a variation of student mentors in advising- something I wish to implement in my center.
• It gave me a great opportunity to network, meet new people, and become more involved in NACADA at the region level.
• I really enjoyed this conference and felt that the range of topics allowed me to go to many different types of presentations.
• It provided invaluable networking opportunities and allowed me to present.
• I was able to network with other advisors and learn about various theories and practices at other schools.
I was able to get ideas from other institutions to bring home with me. With tight budgets, it was great to hear how other folks are thinking outside of the box when it comes to advising. It was valuable to gain perspectives from professionals outside of my college. It provided tons of information and accounts of professional experiences. It offered a preview of what academic advisors do and the challenges they face. I always come away with some practical implemental ideas. I had the opportunity to speak with several advisers working in honors programs. I also attended some very valuable lectures. Networking and volunteer opportunities Ability to network within my region. It is always helpful to learn from others and hear new ideas with relation to advising. I felt rejuvenated after the conference and anxious to get back to work and try to implement many of the strategies/techniques I learned. reinforced some of the best advising practices already in place Networking Gave us a lot of ideas that can be implemented in our roles as academic advisors who aren't affiliated with a university. networking, professional development and rejuvenation! Meeting and sharing ideas with people. the technology aspect was very interesting Networking, learning best practices, and as a new advisor, exposure to more seasoned advisors' experience networking, hearing about other programs and projects at other colleges Always good to hear how other colleges are doing things. I brought home new ideas that I am already implementing networking, some good sessions The chance to work with other people who have the same dedication to student education and academic success is always valuable as you walk away with ideas of how to apply the information you have learned. I appreciated the networking opportunities and sessions. I gained new information about advising. I met many individuals for networking purposes. It always helps to network with colleagues and learn about new ideas and best practices. I brought home ideas about new programs and technology that we could use on my campus. We are re-tooling our faculty academic advising program. The conference had a remarkable range of pertinent and valuable sessions. To get different perspectives and see how other universities advise their students. Learning from colleagues, content of presentations; defining academic advising. I attended 3 sessions that were incredibly helpful; I was able to share information/ideas with my colleagues afterwards. I attended 2 sessions that gave me a new advising perspective; I always enjoy opportunities to keep advising NBCC clock hours. Like my long term colleagues, I need to get away to keep perspective on what we do. Great to meet people with issues like the ones we are facing. Good networking. Ability to network with new colleagues, ability to learn from others and not "reinvent the
• It offered the opportunity to present and connect with others in the field.
• The exposure to other successful programs helped me see other possibilities for our programs.
• The conference gave me the opportunity to network with other NACADA members in our region.
• The conference provided a wonderful opportunity for networking, and as a new adviser, introduced me to the foundations of advising and effective methods of advising.
• The sessions were fairly interesting
• Networking opportunities with others in the field and best practices
• Hearing Peter Hagen three times was great. The rest was old wine in old bottles.
• I got a lot of good ideas to bring back to my campus.
• I enjoyed the networking opportunity and the chance to utilize my presentation skills. I also enjoyed learning more about how to use research in my job.
• professional development
• professional network, intellectual stimulation, new ideas/strategies
• Networking and learning new information that I can apply to my profession.
• further insights into issues of advising
• Professional development and networking opportunities were great.
• The networking and sharing of ideas is excellent. It also allows my staff the ability to learn and see what others are doing.
• Networking and workshops on Technology
• Networking and discussing advising as a profession with other advisors and further understanding and appreciation of history of advising and theories
• New information and topics in advising, networking.
• Information about publishing in NACADA and information on electronic advising helped to formulate my plans for the next two years.
• Provided new resources. Affirmation of programmatic goals. Networking with fellow arts advisors.
• It provided some tangible strategies I can use
• Seeing ways others are connecting with students
• it was a great networking opportunity. Great sessions by skilled advisors and university professionals.
• interaction with others in my profession
• I really enjoy the opportunity to see what other institutions are doing, even if it is very similar to my own current work. Having the opportunity to expand my own network outside of my own organization is very valuable.
• Networking and the opportunity to present
• As my institution moves to get more buy-in from faculty, I strive to find new ways to achieve this goal and assist with this on campus. NACADA offers a variety of sessions to assist with this, as well as wonderful networking.
• Learned more about retention and first year courses. Got to network a lot.
• To learn what other institutions are doing and to gain new ideas.
• Professional Development
• It was great to see the volume of advising professions and hear various ideas that have worked
for others and new technologies I can utilize.
• learning about trends and problem solving strategies

Question 10: My recommendations for future conferences include: (topics/speakers/external activities/type/length of sessions, etc.)

• More variety within different sessions. There were a couple sessions where I felt like nothing applied to me.
• Keep the registration open through the Welcome reception! I unfortunately missed registration by about 10 min and had to wait until the next morning to get all my materials.
• N/A
• Common reading is very important and useful in discussing hot topics/ides, but not well attended. Should be better attended.
• Larger rooms for each session.
• Add one more day. Include a bit more detailed information about the sessions. Allow for additional networking with having a mixer the last night of the conference.
• Please have more sessions that are directed at community colleges.
• bigger host hotel; presenters with more experience on their topics
• What's good for me might not be good for everyone, but it seems like there are a lot of people in positions like mine (staff/advising support) who attend these conferences. I cannot speak highly enough of Heather Patterson's topic.
• include presenters’ institutions in program to aid attendees in searching for similiar institutions, networking, etc.
• Incorporate more information from online programs. This is a growing trend that we want to keep up with.
• a session on motivation for advisors who have been in the profession for many years.
• This year's conference is a good template
• Have you considered hosting the Region 2 conference in May after most schools conclude commencement? April is a very busy advising month for us. Also, perhaps providing a stick or CD of all conference presentations.
• More on meeting the needs of millennials. More social networking.
• Offer the topics more than one time. I often can't pick between 2 or more sessions that are offered at the same time and then miss out on some great information.
• wider variety of session topics
• Maybe more topics on health careers (Nursing, PT, Pre-professional). Seemed many were sessions were geared to general college and undecided (they were good, and I can transfer over to my area), but just the same, more academic area
• Exploratory Students and at risk student, Students on Academic Probation.
• Please keep similar format -- it was very nice.
• I'd love to see more about how we do advising - small groups, blackboard, etc.
• more diversity topics, ideas on how to do more with less money as advisors
• Information on specialized student groups, particularly ambassadors.
• Keynote speaker with more focused point.
• I thought the conference was well planned and constructed. This was my first NACADA
event.

- Loved the blog and the constant communication from the committee
- Incorporate more forced ways to network. A "speed dating" type event called "speed networking" would be fun. i.e. You sit and talk to one person for 5 minutes then switch to a new one then switch again, etc.
- N/A
- Keeping the registration tables open during the opening reception would have been nice. The poster presentation was crowded and hard to hear. Would have been great out in the hallway opposite the breakfast.
- Approaches to technology with advising, different types of advisors, and the difference between advising and counseling.
- Consider a separate track of workshops for Community Colleges; we have specific issues that don't always easily mesh with what 4 yr schools are doing/planning.
- dates later in April
- The topics weren't varied - a lot of them fit the needs of advisors who work with first year students and/or community college students. I just transitioned into a new role working with upperclassmen - there was very little on this.
- The use of technology in the conference was great. In the future the blog, streaming, and Twitter should be a part of the conference as it was here. Also, providing pre and post conference activities in the area was great.
- I think that plenty was offered to do outside of the conference and that everything was pretty much on point. Great job!
- Would love to see more sessions on career advising, more social opportunities outside of the hotel
- I would definitely like to see more workshops about advising at risk, underrepresented, and students who are in STEM majors. I also would keep the presentation lengths the same so we are able to attend more sessions.
- Networking/Interviewing opportunities for open advising positions.
- Hagen's address & session were hard to hear, perhaps acoustics could be checked prior to. As a historian who has attended MANY conferences, this conf moved at a nice clip, a good pace. Some Friday presenters weren't up to par :(  
- I was often torn between choosing sessions; perhaps there is a way to offer the same session more than once at a conference?
- More sessions on advising adults and the military if session proposals are submitted.
- I would like to see more regarding Adult (non-tradisional students). More and more adult students are returning to college, their needs are very different, so I would like to see more session geared to this student population
- consider going for more than a day and a half.
- Loved Peter Hagen! The conference was very well organized. The organizers were fabulous. The only thing I did not like were the lack of tables/desks at the sessions. It is always easier & more comfortable to take notes at a table.
- Have more topics during the specified conference dates instead of pre-conference sessions to cut down on cost.
- Diversity would be nice
- same length. more diverse topics.
Posters should be on display during the entire conference in the registration area. Poster conversation should NOT be during breakfast. Perhaps an exclusive period should be devoted to poster presentation in a larger more navigable
• keep up the good keynote speakers
• make it longer! :)
• Everything was great!
• Topics for new advisors
• Better organization. I had offered via registration to volunteer and received no follow-up. I then filled out the online volunteer form and didn't get any further information until I'd arrived.
• Retention, roundtable discussions
• A couple of the sessions were not quite what I expected. Perhaps the session write-ups could be explained more thoroughly.
• I was very happy with the conference. The hotel was very nice, the food was good, it was nice to visit Charlottesville (and Monticello!), and the topics at the conference were very useful. Great job!!!
• Just fine, as is. I had the good fortune to experience Peter Hagen in a concurrent sessions, which was excellent. I felt his keynote role was less effective.
• Not so many sessions on undecided or first year advising. More specialized topics, like pre-health, and pre-law advising.
• If it is possible it would be great if the conference hotel site was walking distance to popular attractions; while the Doubletree was a great property it was kind of on an island.
• I loved the idea of the shuttle which went downtown, but I think having more than two return times would have been helpful. 10pm and 11pm seemed late for those of us who had to present in the morning.
• Continue to attract teaching faculty to NADACA
• More focus on different advising populations (undeclared, transfer students, student veterans).
• not incorporating Todd Siben in a shared round table discussion. He monopolized the majority of the session and offered poor preparation for other participating presenters.
• I recommend the big group session (i.e., all attendees present) include a brief, upbeat presentation on a fundamental topic, such as ethics or principles of advising. Professionalism refresher training is a good thing.
• As conference co-chair, here are my suggestions... increase the hotel room block because the region typically has a great attendance for the annual conference.
• I noticed multiple folks looking for career/employment information. Maybe increased visibility of a career focused table will help everyone.
• I would like to see more sessions focused on adult and online learners, and graduate student advising.
• more variety of topics
• More substance, more academic in nature. The conference seemed to be a love-fest of academic advisors. While making others feel valued is important, I needed more meat and less fluff.
• Have a conference theme on the relationship between advisor and student. Too many sessions are about programs, technology, theories, not people.
• The hotel was in the middle of no where. There we not any resturants in the area and it was not possible to get around to town without transportation. The poster sessions were too close.
together. People could not move around.
- I know it is difficult, but I would like to see a bigger variety of topics. It might be interesting to try to get some "advanced" sessions for those advisors who have been doing this for awhile.
- earlier in the semester- they are always the week of or the week before registration for my school so it's difficult to leave, early/mid-March would be much better.
- More workshops on social networking and how it applies to advisement/counseling. Also, it would be useful to do more hands-on/interactive workshops that involve hypotheticals and role-plays.
- posting conference schedule with all sessions and topics earlier would be helpful; some of the meeting rooms had loud air conditioning and made it difficult to hear the speakers
- Continue the grads to professional advisor sessions.
- Continue to focus on technology and engaging all stakeholders in the advising process...especially with budget cutbacks.
- Continue with technology focus
- better location
- Include a student panel with a wide range in levels of preparation to discuss what they want from their advisor.
- More information geared toward specific populations (Arts, Pre-Health, etc.)--Arts and Undeclared were fairly well represented, but other populations were not as well represented.
- Retention
- I would like the opportunity to get handouts before sessions
- More sessions about transfer advisors.
- I was disappointed by the lack of professionalism of some of the other attendees. It was embarrassing to be in a session or workshop and have colleagues in the audience talking, texting, typing on their laptops, etc. It was rude.
- Career exploration for students looking to change out of a technical field of study.
- Have microphones in the room for all presenters, maybe have a networking workshop
- More distance learning topics
- At least one or two topics dealing with community college issues

Question 11

Was the length of the sessions sufficient to cover a topic? Would you have preferred to have longer sessions, even if it meant fewer to choose from?
- Yes. I would not prefer longer sessions. An hour is sufficient for most; any longer & you have to have an engaging speaker; I also appreciate the diversity of topics offered.
- I think the length was good.
- Perfect for most presentations.
- Yes, the length of the sessions were perfect.
- Session length was good; not too long, not too short. Plenty of time to ask questions in most cases.
- Not really, Consider adding 30 minutes or repeating some sessions that may seem to cater to larger crowds.
- I think the length was good!
- I thought the session lengths were good. A nice balance between time and number of
presenters
- length = fine
- The timeframe seems pretty standard. I had a hard time picking "best" between Heather Patterson & Peter Hagen. Two very different presentations, but both were excellent and fit the time...
- length sufficient mostly, but maybe offer two types of presentations -- 1 as a traditional presentation with time for a few questions/remarks & 1 as almost a guided discussion where there is time for a real discussion of topic
- Most of the sessions were fine. A few were a little shorter but the information was still covered. Could have used just a little bit more time for extra questions.
- There were a few were I wish there was more time, but it allowed me to network and to contat at a later point.
- Length was great.
- Yes.
- No
- Yes, sufficient time. I would prefer more choices over longer sessions.
- The length was fine. I think more sessions is better than less.
- yes
- Session length was okay. Wouldn't mind them being a little bit longer, maybe 1 hour and 15 mins.
- yes
- for most sessions, the length was good. for some specific session, you could give them 2 back-to-back spots.
- Yes
- I think the length was appropriate.
- Time sufficient to cover topics. Shorter periods would not provide enough time. Prefer time you provided instead of attempt to squeeze more topics/presentations. Longer sessions would not have produced better results.
- I felt most of the sessions were long enough, and the presenters available for further questions or discussion!
- hard to gage, it depends on the topics.
- The length was good. Any longer and there would have been a "boredom" factor.
- All good!
- Adequate times.
- an hour session is enough time to cover a topic, and to leave time for discussion and questions.
- I thought the session length was good.
- Sufficient
- Concurrent sessions were a good length, but would have liked another day or half day of sessions.
- There were a lot of sessions to choose from. The lengths were fine but it might be nice to have a few tracks. i.e. New to Advising track, New to NACADA Track, Web 2.0 Track, etc.
- length of sessions is fine.
- N/A
- Shorter sessions are best. Less for presenter to prepare and better when sitting all day to have
mental/physical breaks. I am much more likely to stick with a "bad" session if it is short to not have the presenter feel bad.

- I would prefer to have longer sessions with fewer to choose from; at times, the end of the sessions seemed rushed.
- I don’t prefer longer sessions but would certainly welcome that option.
- Length was sufficient
- No, it was sufficient time.
- I would prefer longer sessions. Often, just as we were getting into a topic, the session was over.
- Yes. I felt that the length of sessions was perfect!
- The length was just about right.
- I believe the length was perfect. It was long enough to present needed information, but short enough to attend several different sessions.
- Yes.
- The length of the sessions is sufficient.
- I think that the length of the sessions was fine. I would have preferred more sessions, not fewer.
- Yes, with activities AND a Q & A, many THursday sessions could have been longer - Friday, which I gathered were grad students - not a single one I attended would benefit from a longer time.
- yes - longer sessions
- The time was sufficient and I would prefer they were kept the same length. As long as the presenters have a good handle on time-management, the length is sufficient.
- Yes
- Yes, it was sufficient.
- The length was perfect. I don’t think sessions should be longer and I would not want fewer sessions to choose from. Don’t change a thing.
- The length of the sessions were sufficient to cover a topic.
- Yes
- Yes, but yes. I would have loved to have had more time to do "Reframing Required," for example. That would have been a great pre-conference workshop that I would have preferred to pay for than the one I did.
- session lengths could have been longer. the conference itself was about right.
- yes
- no session lengths were good
- I think the length of each session was perfect - it provides an opportunity for us to continue the conversation and network, and allows us to fit more sessions in
- Yes
- Length was very good, but some of the conference rooms were way too small and became stuffy.
- Length was great
- No, I’m finding it harder to concentrate for more than 1 hour the older I get!
- yes.
- I would have preferred longer sessions. As a presenter it was hard to do the presentation that
we really wanted to do and was needed to get anywhere on the topic we were presenting on.

- I felt the length was sufficient
- The length of sessions was perfect. I enjoyed having many options to choose from.
- I would not want the sessions to be any longer.
- Yes. Adequate, and did not drag things out. Gave me a chance to experience a range of sessions.
- The length of the sessions were fine.
- Yes.
- Many sessions had to wrap up very, very quickly at the end, so even adding 15 minutes to each session as a cushion—or for the opportunity for participants to chat with the presenters afterward would be great.
- Actually, I could have taken another day. I thought it was a little short.
- Session length was fine for most.
- I think the session length was good. I think in this case variety of content is more important than detail, so I would not have wanted longer sessions.
- Yes. No longer.
- Yes. No.
- No, I think the length of the presentation are great.
- There may have been too many sessions; often, there were several sessions with a time period that I would have liked to attend.
- yes
- yes
- The length was fine, but the substance was lacking. Most of the information covered was common sense. I would have liked to see more panel discussions.
- Mostly fine. In some sessions the time was too long—the presenter didn’t have enough to say.
- I would have like to see a pre-conference session on the use of technology in advising. The presentation on Camtasia was great but it would have been helpful to be have time for a hands on project.
- I think the time was enough in many instances, but having some options of longer sessions would be great too particularly if there are some advanced or in depth topics presented.
- good length.
- yes.
- Yes. No.
- good length
- Length was sufficient
- Yes
- Yes - session length was just right!
- yes
- yes
- Length of sessions was sufficient.
- The length was sufficient to cover most topics, like having many too choose from
- The length of the sessions were good.
- always seems like sessions need an extra few minutes because attendees are often a few minutes late in getting to "next" sessions
- I thought the timing was perfect.
- Combination of length of session -- some needed to be longer
- yes. I like the session times the way they were.
- Yes. That would be fine to have fewer sessions that would give you a longer one.
- The length was fine.
- The timing was good, I would have preferred more handouts especially as a reference for the more technical topics.
- Longer sessions with better materials/handouts or materials posted on blog

Question 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What conference costs were covered by your institution? In the comments section, indicate other sources of funding or any explanations of your answers to help us in our future planning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference registration fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACADA membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage and tolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Text:
- All
- train ticket
- No Response
- None
- State Basket Items
- Trainfare
- all
- Everything
- None
- train tickets
- none
- None
- Transportation
- Our institution provides limited funding & future conference funding will be less.
- No Response
- None this time
- max of $500 Comments Text:
- Great conference and location!
- n/a
- As a FYI - My State funds do not cover memberships, so it was hard to get the "bundled" discount rate at registration.
• Institution was very generous in providing support for me to attend conference
• I did not fly, but airfare would likely have been included.
• The cost was quite high for the lack of academic and substantive ideas with which to bring into my advising sessions.
• Diversity would be nice
• Several advisors went so the costs were shared.
• everything was covered but our budget is tight and will be getting tighter
• Only because I was presenting did my institution cover the expenses
• without college financial support I would not be attending
• I am very fortunate in that my department is willing to pay for my membership and conference-related fees. Because I "doubled up" on national & regional conferences this year, I applied for and received a staff development grant to help with this one.
• conference and NACADA membership was paid for by NACADA, as I was an award recipient
• My institution will pay up to $500.
• Enjoyed opportunity to participate by volunteering. Volunteer program/process managed very well.
• The regional conference is so much more reasonable cost-wise, because we can take the train and the conference registration is much cheaper
• I paid gas & lodging and I won a national NACADA scholarship that covered the conference registration - although not pre conference fees.
• No room elsewhere to post this but the conference was well organized, informative and a great deal of fun!
• Our institution indicated recently that no out of state travel will be supported. Fewer approvals for conferences will be seen in the next year.
• It is very difficult to get my institution to cover professional development costs- this $ goes to faculty.
• We were fortunate to be able to drive this year. In the future, we may have to alternate who attends based on expenses.
• personal funds
• other costs (hotel and meals) would be covered also had I needed/requested them
• Very happy to have had the chance to attend!

Question 13

Additional comments:
• N/A
• This was a great conference!
• It is not clear how the first time attendees are "chosen". If someone is a true first time attendee, shouldn't it be understood that all should be provided a mentor, or at least have the choice to opt out if they so choose?
• I was a great conference!
• Many, many thanks to Art Esposito, Jameela Anderson, and everyone else involved in bringing this conference together! It was a great experience. Could've done without the stinkbugs in hotel room, though...