

2008 NASC Conference Evaluation (by Executive Directors)

1. Name of state		Response Count
		25
<i>answered question</i>		25
<i>skipped question</i>		0

2. Please rate the following administrative aspects of the 2008 NASC Conference in terms of your satisfaction rate as an Executive Director.								
	Extremely satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Dissatisfied	Extremely disastified	N/A	Rating Average	Resp Co
1. Pre-conference information	4.0% (1)	64.0% (16)	28.0% (7)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	2.32	
2. Registration process	4.0% (1)	44.0% (11)	28.0% (7)	24.0% (6)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	2.72	
3. Confirmation process	16.0% (4)	48.0% (12)	12.0% (3)	20.0% (5)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	2.38	
4. Response time to questions from host school	44.0% (11)	28.0% (7)	4.0% (1)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	16.0% (4)	1.71	
5. Response time to questions from NASC Office	40.0% (10)	20.0% (5)	20.0% (5)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	12.0% (3)	1.95	
6. Flexibilty in handling special circumstances by the host school	24.0% (6)	36.0% (9)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	32.0% (8)	1.76	
7. Flexibility in handling special circumstances by the NASC Office.	16.7% (4)	20.8% (5)	8.3% (2)	0.0% (0)	4.2% (1)	50.0% (12)	2.08	
								Other (please specify)
								<i>answered question</i>
								<i>skipped question</i>

3. Please rate the on-site registration process from your perspective as an Executive Director

	Extremely satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Disatisfied	Extremely dissatisfied	N/A	Rating Average	Resp Co
1. Organization of registration process	20.0% (5)	24.0% (6)	32.0% (8)	12.0% (3)	4.0% (1)	8.0% (2)	2.52	
2. Welcoming of delegations	44.0% (11)	44.0% (11)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	1.63	
3. On site directions for state registration	20.0% (5)	36.0% (9)	24.0% (6)	8.0% (2)	4.0% (1)	8.0% (2)	2.35	
4. Efficiency of state room registration	24.0% (6)	36.0% (9)	24.0% (6)	8.0% (2)	4.0% (1)	4.0% (1)	2.29	
5. Efficiency of trouble-shooting problems	12.0% (3)	44.0% (11)	32.0% (8)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	2.38	
6. Luggage handling if applicable	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	95.8% (23)	3.00	
Other (please specify)								
answered question								
skipped question								

4. Please rate the value and curricular strength of the following segments of the program:

	Very strong	Strong	Neutral	Weak	Very weak	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
1. Student-led small group workshops	0.0% (0)	41.7% (10)	33.3% (8)	4.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	20.8% (5)	2.53	24
2. Adviser Orientation	8.0% (2)	44.0% (11)	20.0% (5)	20.0% (5)	0.0% (0)	8.0% (2)	2.57	25
3. Adviser Workshops	12.0% (3)	44.0% (11)	20.0% (5)	20.0% (5)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	2.50	25
4. Adviser Roundtables	52.0% (13)	36.0% (9)	4.0% (1)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.68	25
5. New Adviser Orientation	0.0% (0)	16.0% (4)	8.0% (2)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	72.0% (18)	2.57	25
6. Middle Level Orientation	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	12.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	84.0% (21)	2.75	25
7. Middle Level Program	0.0% (0)	4.2% (1)	8.3% (2)	4.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	83.3% (20)	3.00	24
8. Showcase speakers	16.7% (4)	54.2% (13)	12.5% (3)	8.3% (2)	0.0% (0)	8.3% (2)	2.14	24
9. General Session speakers	28.0% (7)	48.0% (12)	8.0% (2)	12.0% (3)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	2.16	25
10. Community Service Training	4.0% (1)	12.0% (3)	20.0% (5)	32.0% (8)	28.0% (7)	4.0% (1)	3.71	25
11. State Presidents' Meeting/Training	8.7% (2)	39.1% (9)	21.7% (5)	8.7% (2)	0.0% (0)	21.7% (5)	2.39	23
12. Team-building at Billy Bob's	8.0% (2)	16.0% (4)	16.0% (4)	44.0% (11)	16.0% (4)	0.0% (0)	3.44	25
13. Political groups/mock election	0.0% (0)	28.0% (7)	12.0% (3)	44.0% (11)	16.0% (4)	0.0% (0)	3.48	25
14. State Meetings	8.0% (2)	44.0% (11)	24.0% (6)	8.0% (2)	12.0% (3)	4.0% (1)	2.71	25
15. Regional Meetings	8.0% (2)	44.0% (11)	24.0% (6)	16.0% (4)	4.0% (1)	4.0% (1)	2.63	25
16. Community Dinners	66.7% (16)	16.7% (4)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (3)	4.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.71	24
17. Candlelighting	40.0%	44.0%	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	4.0% (1)	1.79	25

18. Exhibits	8.0% (2)	36.0% (9)	32.0% (8)	8.0% (2)	12.0% (3)	4.0% (1)	2.79	25
Other (please specify)								15
answered question								25
skipped question								0

5. Please rate the effectiveness of the state meetings								
	Extremely satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Dissatisfied	Extremely dissatisfied	N/A	Rating Average	Resp Co
1. The meetings ran smoothly and efficiently	16.0% (4)	52.0% (13)	8.0% (2)	8.0% (2)	12.0% (3)	4.0% (1)	2.46	
2. Guides made the purpose of the meeting clear to all.	16.0% (4)	28.0% (7)	24.0% (6)	8.0% (2)	20.0% (5)	4.0% (1)	2.88	
3. Guides were well-informed about the entire program.	16.0% (4)	24.0% (6)	20.0% (5)	16.0% (4)	20.0% (5)	4.0% (1)	3.00	
4. Guides were strong facilitators and good communicators.	28.0% (7)	24.0% (6)	12.0% (3)	16.0% (4)	16.0% (4)	4.0% (1)	2.67	
5. The activities conducted in the meetings were meaningful.	12.0% (3)	20.0% (5)	24.0% (6)	24.0% (6)	16.0% (4)	4.0% (1)	3.13	
6. Required supplies/materials were easily made available to the delegates.	16.0% (4)	44.0% (11)	20.0% (5)	8.0% (2)	8.0% (2)	4.0% (1)	2.46	
7. Guides were friendly and hospitable.	60.0% (15)	20.0% (5)	12.0% (3)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	1.58	
8. Guides were responsive to student and advisor questions.	56.0% (14)	20.0% (5)	12.0% (3)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	1.71	
9. Our students responded positively to the guides.	52.0% (13)	24.0% (6)	12.0% (3)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	1.75	
Other (please specify)								
answered question								
skipped question								

6. Please rate speakers based on effectiveness of delivery and value of message

	Excellent	Good	OK	He/she is still a "work in progress"	I wouldn't hire him/her in my state	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
1. Keith Hawkins	68.0% (17)	16.0% (4)	16.0% (4)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.48	25
2. Bill Sanders	28.0% (7)	20.0% (5)	36.0% (9)	0.0% (0)	12.0% (3)	4.0% (1)	2.46	25
3. Ken Walsh	64.0% (16)	20.0% (5)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	4.0% (1)	1.54	25
4. Nika Maples	37.5% (9)	25.0% (6)	8.3% (2)	4.2% (1)	4.2% (1)	20.8% (5)	1.89	24
5. Willow Sweeney	25.0% (6)	20.8% (5)	4.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (12)	1.58	24
6. Chris Bowers	12.5% (3)	12.5% (3)	12.5% (3)	12.5% (3)	12.5% (3)	37.5% (9)	3.00	24
7. Ian Tyson	0.0% (0)	4.3% (1)	13.0% (3)	8.7% (2)	0.0% (0)	73.9% (17)	3.17	23
8. Jill Esplin	4.2% (1)	29.2% (7)	20.8% (5)	25.0% (6)	4.2% (1)	16.7% (4)	2.95	24
9. Patrick Perez	4.2% (1)	12.5% (3)	16.7% (4)	0.0% (0)	8.3% (2)	58.3% (14)	2.90	24
10 Joshua Sundquist	37.5% (9)	16.7% (4)	0.0% (0)	4.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	41.7% (10)	1.50	24
Other (please specify)								10
answered question								25
skipped question								0

7. Please rate the effectiveness of the NASSCED meeting								
	Very good	Good	OK	Not go good	Weak	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
1. Agenda was delivered to members in advance.	72.0% (18)	20.0% (5)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.36	25
2. The purpose of the meeting was clearly communicated.	60.0% (15)	32.0% (8)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.48	25
3. The length of time of the meeting was reasonable.	36.0% (9)	24.0% (6)	4.0% (1)	28.0% (7)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	2.48	25
4. Board members seemed well prepared.	58.3% (14)	33.3% (8)	4.2% (1)	4.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.54	24
5. Board members were responsive to questions and members' needs.	52.0% (13)	36.0% (9)	4.0% (1)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.68	25
6. The meeting format allowed for discussion and input.	20.0% (5)	32.0% (8)	16.0% (4)	24.0% (6)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	2.68	25
7. The physical setting of the meeting was conducive to the overall effectiveness.	28.0% (7)	40.0% (10)	28.0% (7)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	2.08	25
Other (please specify)								13
answered question								25
skipped question								0

8. Please rate the entertainment provided by the conference in terms of student response and appropriateness of the activity								
	Very strong	Strong	Neutral	Not so strong	Weak	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
1. Welcoming activities	16.0% (4)	44.0% (11)	28.0% (7)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	8.0% (2)	2.22	25
2. First night activity	13.0% (3)	34.8% (8)	26.1% (6)	13.0% (3)	13.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	2.78	23
3. Overall success in getting student delegates to mix	8.0% (2)	36.0% (9)	8.0% (2)	20.0% (5)	28.0% (7)	0.0% (0)	3.24	25
4. NRH20 Water Park	24.0% (6)	44.0% (11)	28.0% (7)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	2.04	25
5. Six Flags	28.0% (7)	48.0% (12)	12.0% (3)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	2.00	25
Other (please specify)								15
answered question								25
skipped question								0

9. Please rate your experience regarding food services								
	Extremely satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Dissatisfied	Extremely dissatisfied	N/A	Rating Average	Res C
1. Length of serving lines for breakfast	12.0% (3)	36.0% (9)	28.0% (7)	12.0% (3)	4.0% (1)	8.0% (2)	2.57	
2. Length of serving lines for lunch	8.0% (2)	28.0% (7)	32.0% (8)	24.0% (6)	4.0% (1)	4.0% (1)	2.88	
3. Length of serving lines for evening meal	4.0% (1)	24.0% (6)	28.0% (7)	32.0% (8)	8.0% (2)	4.0% (1)	3.17	
4. Quality of food	8.0% (2)	48.0% (12)	36.0% (9)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	2.38	
5. Variety of food	4.0% (1)	40.0% (10)	32.0% (8)	16.0% (4)	4.0% (1)	4.0% (1)	2.75	
6. Responsiveness to special dietary needs	8.0% (2)	16.0% (4)	12.0% (3)	12.0% (3)	4.0% (1)	48.0% (12)	2.77	
7. Method of handling clean-up and trash	20.0% (5)	64.0% (16)	12.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	1.92	
8. Availability of advisor hospitality	40.0%	44.0%	8.0% (2)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0%	1.84	

	(10)	(11)				(0)	
9. Availability of healthy snacks and meals	28.0% (7)	24.0% (6)	24.0% (6)	4.0% (1)	12.0% (3)	8.0% (2)	2.43
10. Availability of water for delegates.	48.0% (12)	32.0% (8)	8.0% (2)	12.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.84
Other (please specify)							
answered question							
skipped question							

10. Please rate student health services for this conference								
	Extremely satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Dissatisfied	Extremely dissatisfied	N/A	Rating Average	Res C
1. Health services staff were available at appropriate times.	24.0% (6)	40.0% (10)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	36.0% (9)	1.63	
2. Delegate and advisers knew how to access the services.	20.0% (5)	36.0% (9)	16.0% (4)	12.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	16.0% (4)	2.24	
3. Health services staff were knowledgeable and helpful.	20.0% (5)	32.0% (8)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	48.0% (12)	1.62	
4. Health services staff were friendly.	28.0% (7)	28.0% (7)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	44.0% (11)	1.50	
5. Health services staff were visible and available at non-school venues.	16.0% (4)	20.0% (5)	20.0% (5)	12.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	32.0% (8)	2.41	
Other (please specify)								
answered question								
skipped question								

11. Please rate your experience with transportation services.

	Extremely satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Dissatisfied	Extremely dissatisfied	N/A	Rating Average	Res C
1. Pick up at airport	12.0% (3)	4.0% (1)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	80.0% (20)	1.60	
2. Pick up at hotel	41.7% (10)	29.2% (7)	12.5% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	16.7% (4)	1.65	
3. Daily travel to and from the school	52.0% (13)	36.0% (9)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	8.0% (2)	1.57	
4. Travel to the evening venues excluding the last night	44.0% (11)	36.0% (9)	12.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	8.0% (2)	1.65	
5. Effective communication of information regarding transportation.	36.0% (9)	32.0% (8)	16.0% (4)	4.0% (1)	4.0% (1)	8.0% (2)	2.00	
6. Safety related to loading and unloading buses.	44.0% (11)	36.0% (9)	8.0% (2)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	8.0% (2)	1.70	
7. Transportation to community dinners	48.0% (12)	40.0% (10)	4.0% (1)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	1.63	
8. Sunday transportation	48.0% (12)	16.0% (4)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	36.0% (9)	1.25	
Other (please specify)								
							answered question	
							skipped question	






12. Please name the hotel(s) your delegation stayed at

	Response Count
	25
answered question	25
skipped question	0




13. Please rate your experience with your hotel and its services

	Extremely satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Dissatisfied	Extremely dissatisfied	N/A	Rating Average	Res C
1. Ease of check in procedure	84.0% (21)	8.0% (2)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.32	
2. Quality/comfort of rooms	72.0% (18)	16.0% (4)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	1.33	
3. Timely response to requests	60.0% (15)	24.0% (6)	12.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	1.50	
4. Room location assignments for optimum supervision	64.0% (16)	4.0% (1)	8.0% (2)	8.0% (2)	4.0% (1)	12.0% (3)	1.68	
5. Effectiveness of advisers' supervision	44.0% (11)	32.0% (8)	8.0% (2)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	12.0% (3)	1.68	
6. Amount of hotel security	41.7% (10)	16.7% (4)	12.5% (3)	8.3% (2)	8.3% (2)	12.5% (3)	2.14	
7. General feeling of safety in the hotel	62.5% (15)	33.3% (8)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.2% (1)	1.35	
8. Friendliness of staff	76.0% (19)	16.0% (4)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	1.29	
9. Timeliness of food service	44.0% (11)	12.0% (3)	4.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	40.0% (10)	1.33	
10. Reservation process	68.0% (17)	16.0% (4)	8.0% (2)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.56	
11. Check out process	84.0% (21)	8.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	4.0% (1)	1.25	
12. Cleanliness of common areas.	80.0% (20)	16.0% (4)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	4.0% (1)	1.17	
Other (please specify)								
answered question								
skipped question								

14. Please respond to the following questions so next year's host can use them for program development.

		Response Percent	Response Count
1. Overall commendations		92.0%	23
2. I wish we had...		96.0%	24
3. I am glad we ...		96.0%	24
4. Next year we need to ...		96.0%	24
5. Other thoughts		68.0%	17
		<i>answered question</i>	25
		<i>skipped question</i>	0

15. Do you plan to bring a state delegation to next year's conference?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		76.0%	19
No		4.0%	1
Unsure at this time		20.0%	5
If NO or UNSURE, please explain. We also request you contact the NASSCED President (apostlewaite@nassced.org) to discuss your concerns.			7
		<i>answered question</i>	25
		<i>skipped question</i>	0