Australian Council of Deans of Information and Communications Technology

Annual Council Meeting, 7–8 July 2014

UNSW, Sydney

Evaluation Compiled

In the table below, the following abbreviations are used: SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; N = Neutral; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree – please pick one

	SD	D	N	A	SA
1. This meeting has met my expectations and outcomes				13	9
2. The Speed Update on Day 1 was useful			2	9	11
3. Speakers on promoting ICT Courses and Careers (Day 1) were informative			3	14	5
4. WIL discussions (Day 1 and 2) were useful			3	11	7
5. Speakers and discussions on Regulation and Accreditation (Day 2) were useful			3	8	12
6. Speakers and discussions on the Demand Driven System (Day 2) were useful			1	5	16
7. Speakers and discussions on furthering ICT research (Day 2) were useful			4	8	7
8. Overall, I am now better informed				10	12
9. The meeting facilities and catering were good			3	11	9
10. Dinner was good			1	9	11

Sessions that were good, were so because:
Networking and breadth of topics
Quality of speakers; interaction with participants; stimulating topics
 Gave me a good idea of how others are doing and highlights on the importance of some issues
Was made aware of new items/issues/activities
Informative and engaging
Speakers presented from first hand experiences; provided high level analysis; clear focus
Valuable information was conveyed – particularly things that had direct practical application; interactivity through discussion was good
Good (short and informative) presentations with enough time (in most sessions) for discussion/questions
Quality of speakers
People were open; outsiders added a lot

Sessions that were not so good, were so because:
Discussion dominated by a couple of speakers
The information was not that new or relevant
Not relevant to my [situation] or I already knew it
This is more of a hypothesis: "Did proxy presenter provide the depth of the planned presenter?"
Either details were sparse or information not new.

Not applicable to my university structure or state
Non-attendance of speakers

The next ACM would be better if:
Invite a few speakers from key industries where our graduates are employed
Some concrete actions were started on the suggestions that came up during the two days
Consider how you might showcase something related to host university, e.g., teaching spaces; ideally take people out of sitting in one room for 2 days
Stick to proposed format of the speed update; get the deans present (perhaps and incentive?); get speed updates prior to the meeting (if possible); presence from other related disciplines, in particular DESIGN.
A high level University (e.g., VC) or government person (senior public servant/politician) could be invited to speak on topical and important issues.
It could manage not to over-cater – I hate seeing all that good food wasted
It was warmer
The Deans attended; there was break each day for exercise/fresh air

Any other comments
Maybe a little on AQF and impacts; employment trends
Great effort; excellent host
Consider possible fun (competition, presentation) for the dinner
Overall very enjoyable
More informative than last year – thanks!
Timing is good
It really needs the Deans to be here not just Heads or Dep Deans

Name (optional) _____

carry on over page if necessary