

AIRPO - June 2008 Evaluation

Administered by: SUNY New Paltz

July 2008

1. Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following items:					
Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Response Count
The campus setting	0 0%	0 0%	23 55%	19 45%	42
Lecture hall setting for presentations	0 0%	7 17%	18 44%	16 39%	41
The conference packet	0 0%	1 2%	18 43%	23 55%	42
The BBQ	0 0%	0 0%	15 45%	18 55%	33
The music at the BBQ	0 0%	2 6%	12 36%	19 58%	33
The food at breakfast	0 0%	3 9%	12 34%	20 57%	35
The food at lunch	0 0%	1 2%	15 37%	25 61%	41
The food at the BBQ	0 0%	1 3%	17 53%	14 44%	32
The box lunches	0 0%	3 10%	18 58%	10 32%	31
The residence hall rooms	0 0%	3 30%	5 50%	2 20%	10
The walk between the Terrace and the Lecture Center	1 3%	0 0%	19 50%	18 47%	38
Parking	0 0%	0 0%	7 19%	30 81%	37
Temperature in the Lecture Hall	0 0%	4 10%	16 38%	22 52%	42
Time to play	0 0%	1 3%	20 61%	12 36%	33
Directions while on campus to make sure you did not get lost	0 0%	1 2%	11 27%	29 71%	41
Sense of belonging-ness	0 0%	2 5%	18 45%	20 50%	40
If new, sense of welcome	0 0%	0 0%	2 29%	5 71%	7
Access to Internet	0 0%	6 38%	7 44%	3 19%	16

2. How well did the conference meet your expectations?

Very well	30	71%
OK	10	24%
Not very well	2	5%
Disappointing	0	0%
Other, please specify	0	0%
Total	42	100%

3. We'd like to know how interesting and how useful you found the sessions. Each session is listed below twice - the first is about interest and the second is about usefulness. You may have found a session(s) useful without it being interesting, and vice versa. The first dimension is Interest. How interesting did you find the session? The second dimension is usefulness. How useful did you find the sessions?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Not At All	Not Very	Somewhat	Very	Response Count
National Student Clearinghouse (Richard Reeves) - How interesting?	0 0%	0 0%	10 32%	21 68%	31
Institutional Effectiveness and Middle States (Michael Middaugh) - How interesting?	0 0%	2 5%	7 17%	32 78%	41
SUNY System Update (John Porter) - How interesting?	0 0%	4 10%	19 49%	16 41%	39
Oracle Business Intelligence Tool (Helen Ernst) - How interesting?	0 0%	6 15%	17 43%	17 43%	40
Best Practices in Institutional Effectiveness (Rita Ward Slater) - How interesting?	0 0%	2 7%	13 43%	15 50%	30
CTEA (James Donsbach and Margaret Watrous) - How interesting?	2 10%	1 5%	7 33%	11 52%	21
Assessing IR Offices (Jackie Andrews) - How interesting?	0 0%	1 6%	3 18%	13 76%	17
Banner FAUG (Carol Runge) - How interesting?	0 0%	1 7%	10 67%	4 27%	15
Communicating Institutional Effectiveness Results (Tom Wright, Eric Kimmelman, Pete Partell, Laurel Garrick Duhaney) - How interesting?	0 0%	0 0%	5 36%	9 64%	14

3. We'd like to know how interesting and how useful you found the sessions. Each session is listed below twice - the first is about interest and the second is about usefulness. You may have found a session(s) useful without it being interesting, and vice versa. The first dimension is Interest. How interesting did you find the session? The second dimension is usefulness. How useful did you find the sessions?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Not At All	Not Very	Somewhat	Very	Response Count
National Student Clearinghouse (Richard Reeves) - How useful?	0 0%	1 3%	9 29%	21 68%	31
Institutional Effectiveness and Middle States (Michael Middaugh) - How useful?	0 0%	6 15%	14 35%	20 50%	40
SUNY System Update (John Porter) - How useful?	0 0%	2 5%	15 38%	23 58%	40
Oracle Business Intelligence Tool (Helen Ernst) - How useful?	2 5%	8 21%	20 51%	9 23%	39
Best Practices in Institutional Effectiveness (Rita Ward Slater) - How useful?	0 0%	7 23%	15 48%	9 29%	31
CTEA (James Donsbach and Margaret Watrous) - How useful?	2 10%	2 10%	8 38%	9 43%	21
Assessing IR Offices (Jackie Andrews) - How useful?	0 0%	2 13%	6 40%	7 47%	15
Banner FAUG (Carol Runge) - How useful?	0 0%	1 7%	7 47%	7 47%	15
Communicating Institutional Effectiveness Results (Tom Wright, Eric Kimmelman, Pete Partell, Laurel Garrick Duhaney) - How useful?	0 0%	0 0%	7 47%	8 53%	15

4. Was the June, 2008, AIRPO conference worth your time and money?

Yes	40	98%
No	1	2%
Total	41	100%

Number	Response Text
1	Box lunch was no where to be found at 11:30!
2	Definitely worth the time and money. Something to nibble on and perhaps juice at the morning break would have been helpful.
3	The hard work that went into planning and executing this conference is very appreciated! The BBQ was a very nice addition(food was ok [stale rolls?], music was wonderful.)
4	Thank you to you all for the job well done! The music at BBQ was the hightlight!
5	One of the best in a while. I've already put to use much of the information I learned from this conference. Having Michael Middaugh was such a treat. Location and signage was wonderful, thanks to our hosts!
6	Wish John Porter gave more time to Helen as the crunch in time made her rush through the OBIEE portion.
7	Since this is my first attendance, I can't comment well, but I was happy to see many expert person there. I'm looking forward to see you again. I wish if i could learn more about IR till the next conference. Thank you.
8	Breakfast -- hot food wasn't hot. Fruit wasn't fresh. Barbeque - rolls were stale. Hot food not too hot. Michael Middaugh's presentation was very interesting, but I thought it was geared for the President's level. We already know how important this is.
9	John Porter's presentation was too much material, too fast and without a lot of detail. Helen Ernst's presentation was over my head. The Student tracker information was outstanding and I have submitted my first file and I am waiting for the results.
10	The sessions from Friday were short of time.

AIRPO - 2009 Conferences

5. How interested are you in the topics listed below for the conferences in 2009?

Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.	Not Interested At All	Not Very Interested	Interested	Very interested	Response Count
Course evaluations	4 10%	14 36%	15 38%	6 15%	39
Strategic planning	0 0%	2 5%	12 31%	25 64%	39
Institutional effectiveness	0 0%	2 5%	12 31%	25 64%	39
Survey research and using survey results	1 3%	3 8%	16 43%	17 46%	37
Software - SPSS, SAS, Argos, etc.	4 11%	5 13%	14 37%	15 39%	38
Community college-specific	2 6%	5 15%	6 18%	20 61%	33
State operated-specific	4 14%	7 25%	11 39%	6 21%	28

6. Other comments about topics you'd like to see covered at the January and June, 2009, conferences.

Number	Response Text
1	Keep going with getting more from SUNY IR!
2	Being new to IR, I'll be glad to learn about anything that's offered.
3	Maybe SIRIS training sessions
4	IR role in Strategic Planning. Supporting administrative department assessment.
5	How institutions submit using PeopleSoft to the new SDF system ... downloads, format, etc.
6	Some skill tech "how to" for say logistic regression using spss would be neat.
7	Managing the IR Office - who does what, when, how, and with whom? Information Dissemination - IR websites, newsletters, reports, etc.
8	Closing the loop without worrying about offending faculty or other staff!
9	Banner/ODS reporting

7. What would attract you to the January and/or June, 2009, conferences?

Number	Response Text
1	Being new to IR, I'll be glad to learn about anything that's offered.
2	See # 6
3	Internet connectivity, nice/clean rooms, outside of SUNY speakers.
4	Update from Gary Blose/CTEA workgroup that is just now being formed by SUNY
5	Winter conferences need to be near the train and or airport. I think they should also be located so one did not need a car to go from the hotel to the meetings since many come on public transportation and are then stranded.
6	Wild horses couldn't keep me away
7	Beer
8	See answer to #6. An easy to reach location near public transportation (air or rail) is important - particularly in the winter! Prefer to have conference and hotel accommodations in the same place.
9	Different location than has been used in the past.

AIRPO - General Questions

8. Which of the following describes your method of keeping track of requests to your IR office?		
Request database in Access	6	16%
Specific request tracking software	2	5%
Request list in Excel	5	13%
Paper/pencil means of keeping track	9	24%
In my head	3	8%
Other, please specify	13	34%
Total	38	100%

Other, please specify	
Number	Response Text
1	Outlook calendar system
2	I keep a work order file in my OUTLOOK folder
3	Folders- electronic or and paper
4	Will be building an Access DB in near future
5	White board on the wall that everybody can see
6	Archiving in email and paper files
7	I'm not in an IR office
8	Tasks in Microsoft Outlook
9	Both Access and Excel, has to start to use new
10	E-mail/outlook
11	Task in outlook and most requests are e-mail
12	Calender
13	Form used; when done is entered in Access dbase.

9. Are you willing to volunteer to work on a peer review system to evaluate Institutional Research offices?		
Yes	12	33%
No	24	67%
Total	36	100%

Additional Comments	
Number	Response Text
1	I am interested and willing, but not quite seasoned enough to feel suitable at the peer review level.
2	Not this coming year.
3	I don't have enough experience yet to be able to evaluate another office.
4	I answered no to question 9 because I don't feel qualified to evaluate others, but am certainly interested in hearing how other offices operate.
5	Sorry, I have no idea now.
6	Only because of lack of time to be out of office
7	Maybe
8	In a few years
9	Maybe