# Conference Evaluation

* **Conference Overall**

**Rating:** Very Good 4 33%

Good 4 33%

Okay 3 26%

Not very good 1 08%

**No Responded:** 12

**Comments:**

Should allow organisations to register ad send different people on different days

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Need more younger people attending and presenting | |
| promotion of conference to mainstream community | |
| Have less sessions so we can go to more and listen to each topic | |
| DARU is putting (together) a better conference and (it gets) better each time : | | |
| Catered for many different interests.  Break out sessions all good & at the same time then ones that I didn't want to go to  Not enough information in the conference program  Need to celebrate our successes more | |
| Great crowd, size just right.  A very good informative and well run day.  You have done a great job  Generally very good  Great conference  Too many good options at the same time  All very interesting and informative. Lots of interaction and opportunities for people to contribute and have their views and issues heard  No other suggestions. Just do it again  Good range of presenters  Typos in the Red bee was distracting but concept was good  Highly polished professional event  Full marks on all accounts  All presenters knowledgeable - presented in accessible formats |

* **Conference Cost**

**Rating:** Very Cheap 3 28%

Cheap -

Okay 6 54%

Expensive 2 18%

Very Expensive -

**No Responded:** 11

**Comments:**

There was no cost for me

By keeping the cost down for non-advocacy bodies or organisations so that people with a passion for advocacy can attend

* **Conference Organisation (lead up)**

**Rating:** Very Good 3 25%

Good 5 42%

Okay 4 33%

Not very good -

**No Responded:** 12

**Comments:**

It was good to know transport and accommodation as I'm from out of town.

* **Conference (on the day)**

**Rating:** Very Good 2 17%

Good 6 50%

Okay 3 25%

Not very good 1 8%

**No Responded:** 12

**Comments:**

|  |
| --- |
| * Website difficult to navigate * Acronyms - many missing * Some sessions were hard & tedious when presenters don't display a presentation plan * Day 2 really enjoyable interactive sessions * For those sitting at the back of the blue room, the noise from the registration area was far too loud. Door shut in future.   Timing   * Lunch was too late * Poor time management * Sessions rushed but still ran late * Timing of sessions was a problem - didn't get to see all I wanted as I needed to leave on time. * Would have like to know about other advocacy programs, access and success stories. * Try to run on time o/wise people have to leave before session/day ends. * Maybe more time for sessions * More time for group discussion * Clearer explanation of when to move to other rooms * Conference closing didn't include everyone Some sessions were still going |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Venue

**Rating:** Very Good 4 33%

Good 5 42%

Okay 3 25%

Not very good -

**No Responded:** 12

**Comments:**

* Good venue
* Staff were friendly and professional
* A few more seats outside
* Disabled parking was blocked and witches hats early morning
* Signage should have been displayed earlier
* Map - poor signage
* Lower tables for wheelchair users
* Level of food and drinks etc was not easily available for wheelchair users
* Needed better management of microphones
* Change) table and hoist was inappropriately placed. - should be assumed there is a need for this at every conference

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Catering   * Food and drinks excellent * Catered for all dietary requirements * Catering was fantastic * Vegan food inappropriate - rabbit? Lettuce and tomato for 2 days was a poor effort. * Day 1 Eating a salad standing up was very difficult. Alternate food should be as close to what everyone else has. I was very upset about the food. I have an allergy and while 98% of the food was good mine was unacceptable. Day 2 No improvement even after lodging a complaint   **Conference Promotion**   |  | | --- | | SARU 2 17% | | Word of mouth (work) 3 25% | | DARU Update 6 50% | | Direct Email 1 8% | |  |   **No Responded:** 12  **Comments:** There was no cost |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **Ideas for next conference**   * Peer support workshop * Would have liked more practical ways of advocating and discussing the issue * more interactive sessions * Sessions with Actions * More stuff around sexuality |
| * More time needed for networking * Need networking time. Missed a couple of sessions because on interesting conversations outside the room * More people without disabilities to make it more even sided |
| * Some sessions didn't go into enough data |
| * Needed a bigger team to keep things going (on track) |
| * Opportunities for peer support & successful models of this |
| * Better event managing with conference facilities allow 10 minutes between sessions |
| * 1 day conference easier to attend. Breakout into discussion groups |