Economic & Community Development Institute  
2012 Assessment Report

Expected Outcome: Quality of program (ACLC)

Alabama Community Leadership Conference participants will be satisfied with overall quality of the program.

Assessment Method: Participant feedback surveys

Participants in ECDI’s ACL Conference were asked to complete post program surveys utilizing a scaled measure of satisfaction with the overall quality of the conference. On the scale from 1-Poor to 10 - Excellent, respondents were asked to evaluate the following:

- Overall experience of the 2012 ACLN Leadership Conference

Participants were also asked to provide comments to the following questions:

- What did you like most about the conference?
- What did you like the least about the conference
- What was your favorite breakout session?

The survey of 162 participants yielded 37 responses for the response rate of 22.8%.

Findings: Quality of program

Rankings were calculated for the following item.

Table 1 Quality of program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1- Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10- Excellent</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(0) (0) (0) (0) (1) (2) (4) (13) (17)

answered question 37

skipped question 0

The very high rating indicates that participants are satisfied with the quality of training and that the conference is relevant to their needs. Written comments were solicited regarding the quality of the program and participant satisfaction with the program.

To the question “What did you like most about the conference?” most of the 37 responses focused on satisfaction with speakers. Comments on other aspects of the program included:

- A diversity of representatives from all over Alabama, especially the Black Belt.
- Networking opportunities
- Opportunity to meet nice people. All the breakout sessions…
- The environment, the presenters, the food
- Location and organization
- Workshops (2 comments)
- Networking
To the question “What did you like least about the conference?” many responses indicated the participant “liked it all” or had no complaints. Of those reporting negative aspects, these included:

- Needed more time on some speaker[s]
- Not enough networking time
- Broadband [session]
- Too few people in networking (2 comments)
- Tuskegee session
- Speaker 4
- Keeping on schedule
- Workshops not as helpful as expected
- Environment or food quality.

To the question “What was your favorite break out session?” several sessions or speakers received positive notice:

- Youth programs (5 comments)
- Speaker 5
- Speaker 6
- Speaker 7 (3 comments)
- Grant writing (5 comments)
- Leadership (3 comments)
- Speaker 8

**How were the findings used for improvement?**

To the extent that few negative comments were received and the overall near “excellent” rating for the program, improvements to implements focus on enhancing positive program elements. Information on the survey demonstrating preferences for more networking advise the unit to place emphasis on this element for the next year’s program. Similarly grant writing, leadership and youth programs are probable elements to expand upon. Sessions on grants and leadership were held during 2012-13 academic year. Overall, comments will be used to make adjustments in the method of information delivery and program scheduling.

**Expected Outcome:** Quality of instruction

Alabama Community Leadership Conference participants will be satisfied with overall quality of the instruction.

**Assessment Method:** Participant feedback surveys

Participants in ECDI’s ACL Conference were asked to complete post program surveys utilizing a scaled measure of satisfaction with the overall quality of the conference presenters. On the scale from 1-Poor to 10 -Excellent, respondents were asked to evaluate the following individuals:

- Speaker 1 – Opening session
- Speaker 2 – Luncheon
- Speaker 3 – Closing session
- Speaker 5 – Closing session

The survey of 162 participants yielded 37 responses for the response rate of 22.8%.
**Findings:** Quality of instruction

Rankings were calculated for the following item.

**Table 2** Quality of instruction

On a scale of 1 – 10 (1 being poor and 10 being excellent), rate each keynote speaker:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker 1 – Opening Session</th>
<th>1- Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10- Excellent</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.6% (20)</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 2 – Luncheon</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.6% (20)</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 3 – Closing Session</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>40.0% (12)</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker 4 – Closing Session</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>26.7% (8)</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>26.7% (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high ratings, especially for speaker 2, indicate that participants were very satisfied with the overall quality of instruction at the conference. The exception is speaker 4, who had the lowest rating of the group (7.8) and also drew a negative comment on the previous comments section.

**How were the findings used for improvement?**

Overall, speaker rankings will be used to make decisions on speakers for future programs. Lowest rated speakers will be replaced in next year’s program.