Academy of Process Educators
Annual Board Meeting
Following Annual Conference (7/11/09) – Gaston College, Dallas, NC

Present: Steve Beyerlein, Carol Nancarrow, Jackie El-Sayed, Mohamed El-Sayed, Tris Utschig, Peter Smith, Cy Leise, Jim Morgan, Virgil Cox, Barbara Williams, Joann Horton.

1. President Steve Beyerlein proposed the following meeting outcomes, which were agreed upon by the group:

> **Meeting Outcomes**:
> * Conference Plan 2010
> * IJPE Plan for 2010
> * Research Project Plan for 2010
> * Member Communication/Service Plan for 2010

2. Pacific Crest overview - Joann Horton

- Joann referenced Pacific Crest materials that were included in the Conference Binder, which included information about recent publications, the Transformation of Education Table, a new presentation of Classification of Learning Skills, and upcoming electronic publications as of September 1, 2009:
  DIALOGUES IN PROCESS EDUCATION – via email on the 1st of each month. Annual subscription (26 issues) is $39.95 with 50% discount for faculty or staff affiliated with an educational institution(K-12, colleges, community colleges, universities). View sample issue at *www.pcrest2.com/dialogues*
  INSIGHT! – via email, free bi-weekly. View sample issue at *www.pcrest2.com/insight*
- Joann also provided a review of the Academy's 2007 strategic plan elements for Transformation of Institutions, with the following emphases:
  o Look at holistic solutions
  o Package information so not overwhelming
  o Not just Institutes but also coaching
  o Student retention and completion
  o STEM development (Jackie made an excellent case for women in STEM, also)
  o National engagement project
- She specifically highlighted 3 elements of the Strategic Plan that had already been accomplished:
  o Academy is independent from Pacific Crest
  o There are Faculty Development Centers spread around the nation
  o A significant accomplishment was detailed preparation of the Institute Handbooks so that people other than Dan can administer them.

- With respect to the status of Pacific Crest at this time, Joann provided the following practical facts:
    - There have been many significant negative financial impacts in the last year, because of the economy and its effects on institutions of higher education.
    - Suite 206 is the new physical address of Pacific Crest in Lisle, IL
    - Carol Nancarrow is the new Director of Faculty Development
- Joann listed these suggestions for Partnership between the Academy and Pacific Crest:
    - Finding research funding sources for hard measurement data demonstrating success.
    - Access to the e-faculty guidebook – encourage Academy membership ($20 goes to Pacific Crest for this product at non-license schools.)
    - Making joint presentations at State, National, and Regional Conferences.

3. <u>Conference Assessment</u> – Mohamed El-Sayed (and Kathy Burke)

It appears that the survey monkey only collected 12 surveys; we know that more were submitted. It may be that the setup didn't allow more than one survey from an IP address; we will have to ask Kathy how she set up the survey monkey.

A MORE DETAILED BREAKDOWN OF RESULTS IS AVAILABLE IN THE ATACHED FILE.

Mohamed provided a results summary, below. The "Question" numbers refer to the following topics:

1. Productive	6. Egalitarian
2. Synergistic	**7. Participant-Based**
3. Creative	8. Accessible
4. Mind-Expanding	**9. Credible**
5. Values-Based	

Explanation of Results summary below:
- The question numbers correlate to the topic list above; see appendix of this document for complete wording of each question
- *Quality Index = Importance x (Satisfaction level – Expected level)*
- Therefore 0 = neutral, positive = excited, and negative = unsatisfied
- All elements were either positive (excited), and one neutral
- The only element about which people were not excited, was whether things are egalitarian. The low quality index is due to the low % importance rating.

Results Summary

Question	Quality Index	% Satisfaction	% Importance
1.	1.73	108.6	83.3
2.	1.56	107.8	75.0
3.	1.04	105.2	50.0
4.	4.19	120.8	66.7
5.	3.64	118.2	58.3
6.	0.0	100.0	50.0
7.	2.48	112.4	54.5
8.	0.83	104.2	18.2
9.	2.6	113.0	41.7

Suggestions for next time:

Cy: Have people rank the categories quickly at the beginning, before they rate each category.

Virgil: We need to remember that some become important only when something goes wrong

_____

4. Quick SII on Conference: Facilitated by Tris

Strengths

- Practitioner access to PE--All of the participants were concerned about how to integrate; discussions helped them realize that they could take it a piece at a time
- Keynote engagement--The keynotes were truly interested in further elaboration, interaction, etc. Bonnie, especially, did a great job molding her presentation to the audience and contributed significantly by staying with us for the entire day, including dinner.
- Relevant plenary topics—Especially the session on rubrics is accessible to all faculty, transferable into many contexts, and measurement related.
- Literacy about reliability and validity – This was largely new to us as a group and something that we need to address in our Academy research program.
- Pacing--We were never more than 15 minutes behind.
- Networking Time-- Open time for the lunches allowed for networking (last year we had a speaker at a lunch).
- Host Campus Logistics—Thoughtful preparation of materials and room amenities by Virgil as well as assignment of moderators & recorders for every session.
- Critical mass for breakouts – Having only 2 concurrent sessions increased audience size in each session and enriched results from collaborative activities.
- Survey monkey—Assessment data was in our possession by 5:00 PM on the last day of the conference and results were summarized in the Saturday Academy meeting

Improvements

- Preparation of participants – Not enough is available to assimilate materials in the binder (received on Wednesday) before session start-up (on Thursday and Friday). We could we post on the web or provide access to buzzword for interested/motivated parties to do their homework.
- Breakout session orientation— Make sure that session chairs and recorders know their role in introducing presenters, keeping the session on-time, recording insights, and how to get a replacement.
- Specificity in Vocabulary—As a group we need to get away from using the word 'assessment' when we mean specific other actions such as analysis, synthesis, and, measurement, and decision-making.
- Keynote Orientation--Dr. Ackerman needed more prep on what PE is about. We should prepare a set of readings/resources as well as some talking points for those who recruit and orient keynote speakers to better engage them with our PE community.
- Pre-Conference Session for Novices—This was provided through the POGIL workshop in past years. Reincarnate this as an introduction to PE that can help those who are new to PE understand key concepts, become familiar with concrete tools/techniques, and make realistic plans for getting started in their own classes. This might only be a ½ day workshop before the opening of the Hall of Innovation.   Carol Nancarrow agreed to take the lead on this.
- Larger attendance--Use host institution recruiting of non-exposed people. Need to do a multipronged approach. Needs to start months in advance.
    - host recruiting
    - word of mouth
    - goals – past participants each bring two people
    - notification of leads from PCrest events
- Proceedings--Must be a citable document so university professors can get credit for it.
- IJPE—Recognize opportunity to elevate conference submissions to articles in next year's edition.
- Checklists—Based on their successful leadership in the program and local logistics, ask Tris and Virgil to prepare checklists/timetables for future use/reference.
- Partner Activities—Create a partner (spouse) registration process.

Insights

- It is especially important for early sessions (i.e. Hall of Innovation and first day orientation) to generate excitement about conference outcomes and to get the audience in the proper mindset.
- Recruiting requires a person-to-person touch.

- Having the president being available adds credibility and excitement (last 2 years they have been prominent)
- Need a rubric on rubric quality. Characteristics, level – could ask Bonnie to present a paper.
- Synergy with other vendors (than Pacific Crest) will occur. The Academy disconnects us from Pacific Crest, we are sensitive to this, but we don't see this is as a delicate issue.
- We have a new opportunity to ask other vendors to advertise our conference to their clients. Joyce Adams at NADE. Bonnie's clients, etc.

5. PLANNING FOR NEXT YEAR's conference – Steve Facilitated

Ideas for Themes (and/or panel discussions, etc.) – list of brainstorms for future consideration:
* Leadership Across the Curriculum (aligns with Kettering Initiative)
* Promoting? Scholarship in Process Education (could support IJPE)
* Leading Scholarship
* Leadership & Innovation Across the Curriculum
* Innovation (under uncertainty?)
* Leading Instructional Design Through Process Education
* Keeping the Momentum after Accreditation Visits
* Continuous Improvement Across the Curriculum
* Leveraging the Accreditation Process for Continuous Improvement
* Aligning success with Accreditation across the curriculum

Ideas for conference elements
* Terry Lynch-Caris, Jennifer Arndt, Andy Borchers → modular instructor pedagogy
* Wednesday orientation workshop (full day and/or half day option)
        - difference between assessment & evaluation
        - group roles
        - use of rubrics
* Thursday evening social
* Hall of Innovation social
* Formal Proceedings (materials + recorder notes)
* Plenary (or other) Session Ideas
     Roxanne Cullen & Michael Harris - Syllabus design
     Bonnie Mullinix again?
     Using Accreditation Visits to Improvement Curricula (Mohamed & Mark Wicks)

Joint Sponsorship?
Kettering University
Baker College
Mott Community College
University of Michigan—Flint

<u>Nearby</u>
Saginaw State University
Western Michigan University
Grand Rapids Community College

<u>Roles</u>
Tris – help with program
Jim, Virgil – help with program
Cy – program chair
Mark Palmer? – host chair/logistics coordinator (get feedback from Mark Wicks)
Mohamed – help host chair
Kathy—conference survey
Marie—Hall of Innovation
Steve B – executive contact/participant recruiting
Carol N – Wednesday workshop
Vicky - Communications/Website/participant recruiting

<u>Timing</u>
7,8,9th of July? (ASEE is June 20-23 in Louisville)

<u>Conference Hotel</u>
Holiday Inn – next to campus (Mohamed to negotiate possibilities)

6. <u>IJPE Plan for 2010</u> – Presentation by Jackie

History of development since the conception in January 2007.
- Timing: Aligned inception with the creation of the Academy
- Have been using PE methodology for the development of the journal from the start
- Academy did get funding to the journal
- Website was created
- Exceed expectations on page length
- Did it on a shoe-string with significant time and infrastructure support from Pacific Crest (Denna's) help
- Several papers from 08 conference proceedings went through a review process
- Several workshops from 08 conference were invited to be developed into papers

- Jackie has a blackboard site with access codes; she shared this with the group
  - kettering / current students / mykettering / under info systems, go to Blackboard /
    - login:
    - username: emailid-ijge
    - Password: IJPE031207

- Area for discussion (Steve question: When you get reviews back, they are not posted on blackboard): she had an excel file what the status and review feedback, didn't do blind review (didn't strip paper of info). The reviewer was anonymous (blind). So it wasn't double-blind. Right now everything goes to Jackie's email address. Future improvement may be to upload documents directly to the IJPE web site.
- One area for improvement: Folder for draft papers as they come it, then go out for review, then revised by the authors.
  - un-reviewed
  - revised paper
  - Proofing / editing / formatting
  - More detailed and standardized expectations; perhaps using a review form. We had one, but not everyone used it. Needs to be added.
  - May need to take off the inactive members (e.g. Jack Wasserman, Wendy Duncan-Hewitt, Dan Litynski)
  - Adding (Tris Utschig, Bonnie Mullinix, Barbara Williams)

- Get authors to sign up as Academy Members, because hard copy goes to all academy members; one copies for authors;
- Extra copies (to members) would cost $10 (while supplies last)
- $50 – get a copy when you are a member (includes shipping and handling)
- Carol: Is there any way to get it indexed in databases? Mohamed filed a form for another journal
- Electronic Journals – elsevier and other packages, find out how to get connected with them. EBSCO is the most commonly used; ERIC

Action Items for the Journal:

Timeline for 2010 edition (including invited papers)
What do we have in mind for the electronic version
Website update

Dissemination, policy for authors, etc.

* Involvement of Pacific Crest – publisher

> Denna charges by the project. We should be budgeting for the set fee.
> Denna + tech editor + printing = $2000
> If we print 100 copies, we should charge $30 for shipping and handling
> Pacific Crest as the vendor interface? President of the Academy will work this out
> with PCrest – he will do the business study.

* We will send extra copies to PCrest. When Demetria gets membership input,
* Jackie will send inaugural copies to authors and Board members
* Every member ($50) gets a hard copy*, and $30 for every additional copy
* Peter is sending them to the approximately 8 people who are members but who weren't here at this meeting.

7. <u>Research Project Plan for 2010</u> - CY

Enumeration of possible projects:

I. New Measures:
> a. Skill development
> b. System performance

II. Reliability Study – start with the writing rubric, and use it as a starting point. Identify 3 types of papers to show that this rubric is generally applicable: a growth paper, executive summary, project proposal.   Maybe we could use papers from the Northeastern graduate program, or institutes. Must be a well-defined assignment so that all levels of the rubric might potentially be used. If we can establish high reliability among the raters, then you could get comfortable that it was transferable, and also usable for simpler products.

Next step – training program – then see whether people can do reliable performance – come up with the same rank for.

Note from Carol: there is a considerable body of knowledge already for grading SAT's and ACT's.

Tris: They have a holistic rubric to come up with the score. We would be breaking ground with respect to addressing process and skills.

Cy: doesn't have to be writing.

Steve: Pick a common context of wide interest, and where we can get data that can be shared, and we can collect it from our own observations.

Is there a chance we can piggyback this off of all faculty PD events?? Studying faculty development is not widely published. We have a lot to gain with community building and establishing reliability for our rubrics. Then, when people use our rubrics, there would be a great amount of credibility. Ackerman has reviewed for us a start on the methodology, but we can enhance sophistication of social element of training. None of our materials has been tested empirically.

  -- could use this for journal articles
  -- could use it for modules

Carol: warning – we wouldn't have enough examples for the bottom categories.

Validity and Reliability on one (of the 5-10 fully developed rubrics we have) would make a good paper.

We would want a fully crossed design. 3 different papers, all the same 2 raters. It becomes a problem if different pairs of people review the same article. If we do it, we should do the simplest but tightest design. A, B and C would be 3 different types of documents. 50 examples under each letter.

Steve and Cy ended up with 6 criteria when they addressed quality integration of PE into a course during one of the conference workshops.

Comments from Jim: Engineering professors don't know how to assess writing. But if we gave them a good tool, and didn't mind brief training. Jim's university has this workshop, but the engineers don't go. The English profs do, and they already had a method.

Cy: Engineering profs might be more responsive if there were data to demonstrate effectiveness.

Carol: Idea: Pair a writing prof with a STEM prof, compare their results, work for convergence.

Jim: writing-intensive requirement for graduation. Many faculty interpret this to mean – Oh, if they're doing it, we don't have to do it in the engr courses.

TRIS, of the 3 alternatives, reliability studies get us the most benefit.

Mohamed: Let's not just focus on the student. Let's also look at faculty.

Jim: If you're going to do writing, need to cover the range.

Steve: For student work, need to file IRB report. If we use our case studies, we don't have to get permission. Either way, we have to have a plan to write an IRB report.

Jim: Use the rubric that gets your article accepted.

Jackie: Develop a generically useful rubric – have different people test it. That would be a validity problem.

Cy: we need to demonstrate its reliability first, and then address validity for different contexts.

Steve: This is a research activity that develops our research capacity.

Mohamed: The faculty guidebook needs a self-development roadmap.

BRAINSTORM:
 Cy: What would be the range of system measures that would be useful? Set of most important measures (in teaching, service, and scholarship)

Mohamed: Check that administrators are advised of a rubric of systems checks – such as the PE star diagram. Anything in there could be a systems-related issue – do you need a measure for each?

Steve: Academy project activity could focus on any of the following steps:

0. Write proposal
    - Jim, Mohamed, & Jackie advocate identifying promising opportunity
    - Carol suggested at looking at *Learning to Learn Camp* students
    - need to gain IRB approval at lead institution & participating institutions
1. Needs analysis (both for learners and systems)
    - may result in focus on life vision portfolios
2. Develop Measures/Materials/Experiences
    - may be able to using existing measures and materials
3. Testing of Measures/Materials/Experiences (reliability study)
    - Cy thinks this is where we need to step in the water
4. Dissemination

Jackie: Right now, RETENTION is one of the big issues. We could get funding. It's critical especially in this climate. If you could decrease attrition by 10%, administrators would notice. High schools would notice. Obama would notice. They don't know the measures, and we could add to it. There's a lot of research out there on this.

PATH FORWARD – Research Plan

Initiative #1 – Proposal to Improve (and document) Retention Through Learning to Learn Camp Participation

Credible Goal: Proposal submitted to relevant funding agency
Leads: Carol (Pacific Crest) + Wendy (St Louis College of Pharmacy) +
Joyce Adams (Hinds) + Sandy (MATC) + Buffalo State + IIT
3 month action Items: Identify proposal team, screen funding sources, complete literature review

Initiative #2 – Reliability study surrounding specific rubric (writing) across three different types of work → opportunity to involve Kathy and Carol

Credible Goal: pilot study completed (3 types of work--maybe 5 pieces each--with 3 raters from different backgrounds) based on Blackboard collaboration
Leads: Cy, Kathy (need to ask), Tris, Mohamed, Steve, Jim, Barbara with assistance from other Academy members
3 month action Items: share IRB models, write IRB proposals, identify target work products, review/revise writing rubric

Initiative #3 – Needs analysis for systems measures (people, processes, products)

Credible Goal: Paper for Next Year's Conference
Lead: Mohamed with assistance from board
3 month action items: abstract by September, link with compass for HE

8. MEMBER COMMUNICATION & SERVICE PLAN

member recruiting
- contact all who have attended Academy events or participated in IJPE activities in the past 2 years (add 40 people beyond conference attendees)
 – it takes phonecalls and 1-on-1 emails – Steve in conjunction with Vicky
– each of us could share these with colleagues.
- Goal for member recruiting 50 (30 at conference plus 20+ others)
- contact all centers who had no one here – Brevard, St. Louis, SUNY, etc.
- good prospects from PCrest events referred from Denna to Steve/Vicky

newsletters
- conference write-up for newsletter – by the end of July for PCrest
- members will receive PCrest every 3 months (our column on last page)
- Vicky and Kathy to pilot special Academy communiqués

academy webpage

- questions about academy, e.g. faculty guidebook access – **contact current President*.** Peter plans to coordinate with Denna re: this year's new members, as triggered. Funds go to PCrest at periodic times during the year.

conference recruiting

- all members of Academy + all who previously attended an Academy event.
- everyone who is on the PCrest mailing list
- it takes phonecalls and 1-on-1 emails – Steve in conjunction with Vicky
- List of CLT directors (Bonnie said it was on the POD website)
- Set goal of 70-90
- continue uploading events to LinkedIn - ask Betty to take the lead

Actions for Academy Website:

Show current president as contact on the website.

Update board membership on the website.

Update website with respect to some of the benefits – align with the brochure. (Remove the "postings", because we will use Dialogue/Insights of PC newsletter)

Hard copies of Journal (while supplies last)

9. Annual Meeting SII

Strengths

- Finished before time
- Agenda was outcome-oriented, so focused work on achievable and concise statement
- Pre-materials were complete and reviewed by everyone.
- Facilitators kept each section moving. Benefited from a format involving Facilitators + key presenter
- Good representation of board members
- Convenient to be in motel
- Getting out of here for lunch is a strength – took easy agenda items with us, but moved to a refreshing environment
- We were prepared, but we were also very flexible

Areas for Improvement (Missed opportunities)

- Difficulties with presentation technology, website connections
- Could have more people, but not too many more. We had 11. Probably depends on whether we break into work groups.
- Could have focused more on the skill development of individuals here today

Insights

- We don't need an external facilitator (e.g. Dan) for an Academy Mtg.
- We've matured into a focused, functioning organization.
- We continue to benefit from participate with PCrest representatives; we are professional with respect to our autonomy/synergy with PCrest.
- Sometimes it is OK to be product-oriented instead of process-oriented ☺

Appendix: Assessment Summary of 2009 Annual Conference

![chart icon] **Response Summary**

Page: Academy of Process Educators Assessment

DownloadCreate Chart1. A Highly Productive Conference –Participants are well prepared by the conference website, preliminary information, and the conference program notebook to engage in learning that will transform their educational theory and practices. The conference program builds on past program activities and content; it has an efficient schedule that results in high energy and significant takeaways.

					answered question	**12**
					skipped question	**0**
	1 Not important/satisfied	**2 Somewhat unimportant/ somewhat unsatisfied**	**3 Neutral**	**4 Somewhat important/ somewhat satisfied**	**5 Very important/satisfied**	**Response Count**
How important is this characteristic to you?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	16.7% (2)	**83.3% (10)**	12
What was your expected level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	25.0% (3)	**66.7% (8)**	12
What is your current level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	25.0% (3)	**75.0% (9)**	12

DownloadCreate Chart2. A Synergistic Conference – Brings together a very diverse and interdisciplinary group of PE educators from community colleges, liberal arts colleges, and research universities with different experiences, practices, and research base and producing a productive learning environment where participants and presenters are willing to share, challenge and learn from each other through various forms of activities and reflection time.

	answered question	**12**
	skipped question	**0**

2. A Synergistic Conference – Brings together a very diverse and interdisciplinary group of PE educators from community colleges, liberal arts colleges, and research universities with different experiences, practices, and research base and producing a productive learning environment where participants and presenters are willing to share, challenge and learn from each other through various forms of activities and reflection time.

	1 Not important/satisfied	2 Somewhat unimportant/ somewhat unsatisfied	3 Neutral	4 Somewhat important/ somewhat satisfied	5 Very important/satisfied	Response Count
How important is this characteristic to you?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	25.0% (3)	**75.0% (9)**	12
What was your expected level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	**66.7% (8)**	25.0% (3)	12
What is your current level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**66.7% (8)**	33.3% (4)	12

3. A Creative Conference – Takes risks to use non-standard approaches, incorporates best practices from professional development, integrates best practices and features of conferences from many disciplines and through an assessment culture continually explores new ways to enhance the conferences outcomes by incorporating ideas from the diverse population of participants.

					answered question	12
					skipped question	0

	1 Not important/satisfied	2 Somewhat unimportant/ somewhat unsatisfied	3 Neutral	4 Somewhat important/ somewhat satisfied	5 Very important/satisfied	Response Count
How important is this characteristic to you?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**50.0% (6)**	**50.0% (6)**	12
What was your expected	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (4)	**50.0% (6)**	16.7% (2)	12

3. A Creative Conference – Takes risks to use non-standard approaches, incorporates best practices from professional development, integrates best practices and features of conferences from many disciplines and through an assessment culture continually explores new ways to enhance the conferences outcomes by incorporating ideas from the diverse population of participants.

level of satisfaction?						
What is your current level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	16.7% (2)	**58.3% (7)**	25.0% (3)	12

4. A Mind Expanding Conference – Challenges all participants about current thinking through new paradigms, theory, and associated practices through modeling, active discussion, research activities, breakout sessions, casual conversations, and documentation of discoveries

					answered question	**12**
					skipped question	**0**

	1 Not important/satisfied	2 Somewhat unimportant/ somewhat unsatisfied	3 Neutral	4 Somewhat important/ somewhat satisfied	5 Very important/satisfied	Response Count
How important is this characteristic to you?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (4)	**66.7% (8)**	12
What was your expected level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	**66.7% (8)**	25.0% (3)	12
What is your current level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	41.7% (5)	**50.0% (6)**	12

5. A Values-Based Conference —Participants find their educational values and principles to be validated and deepened by the learning and growth experiences in a program that demonstrates how to actively and directly apply process education to many contexts and purposes important for the future of higher education. Participants feel an increased commitment to become part of the larger process movement and to bring change to their own institutions.

5. A Values-Based Conference —Participants find their educational values and principles to be validated and deepened by the learning and growth experiences in a program that demonstrates how to actively and directly apply process education to many contexts and purposes important for the future of higher education. Participants feel an increased commitment to become part of the larger process movement and to bring change to their own institutions.

				answered question		12
				skipped question		0
	1 Not important/satisfied	**2 Somewhat unimportant/ somewhat unsatisfied**	**3 Neutral**	**4 Somewhat important/ somewhat satisfied**	**5 Very important/satisfied**	**Response Count**
How important is this characteristic to you?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	33.3% (4)	**58.3% (7)**	12
What was your expected level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	**75.0% (9)**	16.7% (2)	12
What is your current level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**58.3% (7)**	41.7% (5)	12

6. An Egalitarian Conference —Everyone feels welcome and has many opportunities to express their views and insights. Sessions and events are varied so that those new to process education as well as those with more experience find a full set of satisfying conference experiences. The keynote and plenary sessions include all participants in discussion, questioning, and decisions about how process education can make a difference for all of higher education.

				answered question		12
				skipped question		0
	1 Not important/satisfied	**2 Somewhat unimportant/ somewhat unsatisfied**	**3 Neutral**	**4 Somewhat important/ somewhat satisfied**	**5 Very important/satisfied**	**Response Count**
How important is this characteristic	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**50.0% (6)**	**50.0% (6)**	12

6. An Egalitarian Conference —Everyone feels welcome and has many opportunities to express their views and insights. Sessions and events are varied so that those new to process education as well as those with more experience find a full set of satisfying conference experiences. The keynote and plenary sessions include all participants in discussion, questioning, and decisions about how process education can make a difference for all of higher education.

to you?						
What was your expected level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	16.7% (2)	33.3% (4)	**50.0% (6)**	12
What is your current level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	41.7% (5)	**50.0% (6)**	12

7. A Participant-based Conference —Design of program meets stated outcomes of participants by encouraging and mentoring active involvement in relevant roles and growth opportunities during the conference that also will add extra value and expanded perspectives for others; involvement of leaders and participants will be balanced in terms of time, program options, and interactions. Assessment of participants' expectations results in substantive modification of planning for future conference.

					answered question	11
					skipped question	1

	1 Not important/satisfied	2 Somewhat unimportant/ somewhat unsatisfied	3 Neutral	4 Somewhat important/ somewhat satisfied	5 Very important/satisfied	Response Count
How important is this characteristic to you?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	45.5% (5)	**54.5% (6)**	11
What was your expected level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**81.8% (9)**	18.2% (2)	11
What is your current level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	9.1% (1)	9.1% (1)	**45.5% (5)**	36.4% (4)	11

8. An Accessible Conference —The location and overall venue for the conference meets the practical and logistical needs of participants. The timeliness of information, number of days, registration cost, lodging, food, airline options, local travel arrangements, and social opportunities are better than most conferences experienced by participants.

		answered question	11
		skipped question	1

	1 Not important/satisfied	2 Somewhat unimportant/ somewhat unsatisfied	3 Neutral	4 Somewhat important/ somewhat satisfied	5 Very important/satisfied	Response Count
How important is this characteristic to you?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	9.1% (1)	**72.7% (8)**	18.2% (2)	11
What was your expected level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	9.1% (1)	18.2% (2)	**45.5% (5)**	27.3% (3)	11
What is your current level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	18.2% (2)	9.1% (1)	27.3% (3)	**45.5% (5)**	11

9. A Credible Conference —The conference generates positive and extensive word-of-mouth praise that will strengthen participation in the future. The keynote speakers are well known and provide powerful messages to move participants to action. The proceedings demonstrate careful recording, assessment, and peer review to provide professionally valuable documentation of sessions and of the conference as a whole.

		answered question	12
		skipped question	0

	1 Not important/satisfied	2 Somewhat unimportant/ somewhat unsatisfied	3 Neutral	4 Somewhat important/ somewhat satisfied	5 Very important/satisfied	Response Count
How important is this characteristic	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	16.7% (2)	**41.7% (5)**	**41.7% (5)**	12

9. A Credible Conference —The conference generates positive and extensive word-of-mouth praise that will strengthen participation in the future. The keynote speakers are well known and provide powerful messages to move participants to action. The proceedings demonstrate careful recording, assessment, and peer review to provide professionally valuable documentation of sessions and of the conference as a whole.

to you?						
What was your expected level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	25.0% (3)	**50.0% (6)**	25.0% (3)	12
What is your current level of satisfaction?	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	41.7% (5)	**50.0% (6)**	12

10. Please rate the quality of the following conference components

					answered question		12
					skipped question		0
	Minimally met expectations	**Below Expectations**	**Met Basic Expectations**	**Above Expectations**	**Strongly above Expectations**	**Rating Average**	**Response Count**
Preparedness of participants.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (4)	**50.0% (6)**	16.7% (2)	3.83	12
Preparedness of presenters.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	16.7% (2)	**58.3% (7)**	25.0% (3)	4.08	12
Overall energy level.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	25.0% (3)	**50.0% (6)**	25.0% (3)	4.00	12
Significance of "take-away".	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	16.7% (2)	**41.7% (5)**	**41.7% (5)**	4.25	12
Diversity of participants' backgrounds.	0.0% (0)	16.7% (2)	25.0% (3)	**33.3% (4)**	25.0% (3)	3.67	12

10. Please rate the quality of the following conference components

Interdisciplinary mix of participants.	0.0% (0)	16.7% (2)	25.0% (3)	**41.7% (5)**	16.7% (2)	3.58	12
Mix of institutions represented.	0.0% (0)	25.0% (3)	25.0% (3)	**33.3% (4)**	16.7% (2)	3.42	12
New collaborations among participants.	0.0% (0)	16.7% (2)	**41.7% (5)**	33.3% (4)	8.3% (1)	3.33	12
Challenges to current thinking.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	33.3% (4)	**58.3% (7)**	8.3% (1)	3.75	12
Creation of new knowledge.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	25.0% (3)	**58.3% (7)**	16.7% (2)	3.92	12
Experience of new perspectives.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	25.0% (3)	**50.0% (6)**	25.0% (3)	4.00	12
Documentation of discoveries.	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	25.0% (3)	**50.0% (6)**	16.7% (2)	3.75	12
Deepened of educational values.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**41.7% (5)**	**41.7% (5)**	16.7% (2)	3.75	12
Enhancement of personal growth.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**41.7% (5)**	**41.7% (5)**	16.7% (2)	3.75	12
Commitment to future of higher education	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	**41.7% (5)**	25.0% (3)	33.3% (4)	3.92	12
Commitment to change in own institutions.	0.0% (0)	9.1% (1)	**54.5% (6)**	27.3% (3)	9.1% (1)	3.36	11

DownloadCreate Chart10. Please rate the quality of the following conference components						
Session and event variety.	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	33.3% (4)	**50.0% (6)**	8.3% (1)	3.58	12
Quality of experience for new participants.	0.0% (0)	16.7% (2)	**41.7% (5)**	33.3% (4)	8.3% (1)	3.33	12
Inclusiveness of keynotes & plenary.	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	8.3% (1)	16.7% (2)	**66.7% (8)**	4.42	12
Involvement of all in setting future course for process education.	0.0% (0)	16.7% (2)	16.7% (2)	**50.0% (6)**	16.7% (2)	3.67	12
Connections to participants' expected outcomes.	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	33.3% (4)	**58.3% (7)**	0.0% (0)	3.50	12
Mentoring of active involvement by leaders.	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	33.3% (4)	**50.0% (6)**	8.3% (1)	3.58	12
Balance of time and opportunities for all.	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	25.0% (3)	**58.3% (7)**	8.3% (1)	3.67	12
Quality of growth opportunities for all.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	41.7% (5)	**50.0% (6)**	8.3% (1)	3.67	12
Logistical accessibility of venue.	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	**50.0% (6)**	8.3% (1)	33.3% (4)	3.67	12
Costs to participants.	0.0% (0)	25.0% (3)	**50.0% (6)**	8.3% (1)	16.7% (2)	3.17	12
Timing and length of	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	**50.0% (6)**	8.3% (1)	33.3% (4)	3.67	12

conference.							
Information resources for participant planning.	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	**58.3% (7)**	16.7% (2)	16.7% (2)	3.42	12
Emotional expectations for next conference.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	18.2% (2)	**63.6% (7)**	18.2% (2)	4.00	11
Variety of word-of-mouth praise.	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	41.7% (5)	**50.0% (6)**	0.0% (0)	3.42	12
Effectiveness of keynote speakers.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	16.7% (2)	33.3% (4)	**50.0% (6)**	4.33	12
Attention to recording and assessment.	0.0% (0)	8.3% (1)	**50.0% (6)**	41.7% (5)	0.0% (0)	3.33	12

Results Summary

Question	Quality Index	% Satisfaction	% Importance
1.	1.73	108.6	83.3
2.	1.56	107.8	75.0
3.	1.04	105.2	50.0
4.	4.19	120.8	66.7
5.	3.64	118.2	58.3
6.	0.0	100.0	50.0
7.	2.48	112.4	54.5
8.	0.83	104.2	18.2
9.	2.6	113.0	41.7