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Executive Summary

Introduction

This report presents the procedures, findings, and recommendations from the evaluation of the 15th Biennial Conference of the Society for Community Research and Action. It also includes an evaluation of the pre- and post-conference Summer Institutes. The evaluation presents data on the participant characteristics and perceptions of conference activities related to registration, costs, accommodations, meals, sessions, topics, and respondents’ general satisfaction with these areas.

Procedures

Two surveys were developed (one survey for the Biennial conference, and one for the Summer Institutes). The surveys were based largely on surveys used in past evaluations, with new questions added by the evaluators and at the request of planning committee members. This year, for the first time, all surveys were completed online. The Biennial survey was made available to participants on the last day of the conference through individualized email links. The Summer Institute survey was made available after the pre-conference sessions. Responses were tracked via Qualtrics, and reminders were subsequently sent to non-responders after 1 week, 2 weeks, and 1 month.

Findings

Survey Participants

The 656 registered attendees at the 2015 SCRA Biennial Conference was the 2nd most in its history (exceeded only by the 700 attendees at the 2011 Chicago Conference). The response rate to the online conference evaluation survey was also the 2nd highest at 54%, and exceeded our goal of a 50% response rate. Although roughly half of the registrants were female (53%) and White (47%), these groups were overrepresented among those completing the evaluation survey (72% each). The racial identity of the remaining respondents were less than 10% for African American/Black, Asian American/Pacific Islander, Latino American/ Hispanic and Mixed/Multiracial. Only 6% of the respondents were from outside of the United States and 56% were either professional (32%) or student (24%) members of SCRA. Three-quarters of the participants had earned either a Masters (25%) or Doctorate (50%) degree and 54% were at academic institutions as either students (15%) or faculty engaged primarily in teaching (17%) or research (22%).

Arrangements

The survey respondents rated the costs and the preconference arrangements (i.e., registration, website, onsite check-in) very positively. Although the ratings were a bit more mixed, the conference location and the city of Lowell also received positive reviews. The least positive ratings were given to the quality, condition, and service at the ICC hotel and dormitories; the cost, convenience and accessibility of transportation to and from the conference site and hotels; the organization of the on-site registration process; and the quality and availability of the meals, particularly the box lunches and limited availability of water and coffee.
Sessions and Activities

Overall, the content and quality of the major conference events and individual sessions were rated positively. Respondents were generally pleased with the variety of topics covered, the interactivity of many of the sessions, and the overall number of sessions scheduled. Participants were asked to rate, on a 4-point Likert scale, their assessment of the plenary sessions, special events, and activities. Participants were also asked to provide open-ended feedback and recommendations for the plenaries, sessions, and special events and activities. Responses to these questions were coded and are presented by theme.

Summer Institutes

According to the registration database, 55 people were registered for one or more Summer Institutes. Of these, 29 (52%) completed an online evaluation. Over half (55%) of these respondents were graduate students and the majority were connected to an academic institution as either a student (60%), teacher/faculty (33%) and/or researcher (50%). Other participants were connected to community-based activities including nonprofit agencies (30%), and/or were community (30%) and clinical (17%) practitioners.

Over 89% of the participants rated the Summer Institutes as either excellent or good. The majority of respondents believed the institutes provided them with new and practical knowledge and skills and connected them to beneficial professional networks. The institute facilitators were also rated highly in all areas.

Respondents provided suggestions on improving the institutes, though these tended to be specific to the specific institute they attended. In general, however, respondents stated facilitators should ensure that the goals of the institute be clearly stated and that sufficient time be allotted to accomplish those goals. Finally, when asked how the institutes could attract more people, many stated that the costs were a bit prohibitive for students, and that perhaps ways should be found to better incorporate the institutes into the overall conference.

Recommendations for Future Evaluations

Future conference hosts can review the data summaries across each of the categories provided above to determine how the organization and execution of the conference can be improved. As our contribution to the evaluation process for future Biennials, we would like to make the following recommendations regarding the structure and implementation of the evaluation. We believe these steps will be helpful in easing the evaluation process for conference organizers and future evaluators:

1. **Make evaluation tools (guides) available from year to year**: The majority of evaluation topics and questions are applicable to every Biennial, with little or no adjustment needed. As such, we recommend that the evaluation guides be made available, in multiple formats, to evaluators from one year to the next. This will reduce the time burden or creating or reformatting the guides. To facilitate this, we have included both evaluation guides here in Appendix A, and will make the guides available in Word and Qualtrics format. To facilitate this, we have included both evaluation guides here as Appendices, and with access to them in MS Word and Qualtrics formats via these links:
2. **Add an evaluation section to the Biennial planning handbook:** Currently, the Biennial planning handbook provides very little guidance on evaluating the Biennial. We recommend adding a section to the handbook that outlines the purpose and expectations of the evaluation. In addition, we recommend developing guidelines for implementing findings from previous evaluations into the planning process for future evaluations.

3. **Make evaluation reports from each Biennial available to SCRA members on the website:** We feel that there is value in making the evaluation reports from each year’s Biennial available to SCRA members on a members-only section of the website (such as the Biennial conference page). This will help ensure that the reports are accessible for conference planners and evaluators from year to year, and may help facilitate more fruitful and productive discussions around ways in which the Biennial can be improved.
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Method

Overview of the evaluation

This report details the findings of the evaluation of the 15th Biennial Conference of the Society for Community Research and Action, held at the University of Massachusetts Lowell in June 2015. In addition to the main conference, this evaluation included assessments of the Summer Institutes.

One of our goals for this report was to make it as accessible and reader friendly as possible. To that end, we have relied heavily on graphic representations of the data where possible.

A note to readers: In the results of Likert scale questions reported here, lower values represent more positive assessments. For example, for Likert scale questions with response options ranging from excellent to fair, 1=excellent, 2=very good, 3=good, and 4=fair.

Evaluation team and procedures

The evaluation team included Dr. Sherri Brokopp Binder (BrokoppBinder Consulting, LLC and Ripple Community Inc.) and Dr. Kwesi Craig C. Brookins, North Carolina State University. Upon selection by the SCRA Executive Committee to conduct the evaluation, the team consulted with members of the conference planning committee. This group was also consulted in the piloting of the final surveys.

Two surveys were developed (one for the overall conference, and one for the Summer Institutes) using Qualtrics online survey software (Qualtrics, Provo, UT)\(^1\). The surveys were based largely on surveys used in past evaluations, with new questions added by the evaluators and at the request of planning committee members. This year, for the first time, all surveys were completed online. The Biennial survey was made available to participants on the last day of the conference through individualized email links. The Summer Institute survey was made available after the pre-conference sessions. Responses were tracked via Qualtrics, and reminders were sent to non-responders after 1 week, 2 weeks, and 1 month.

Survey instruments

The survey instruments are included as appendices in this document. The Biennial survey instrument included 26 questions designed to collect data on methods of participation in the conference, conference arrangements, use of social media, conference greening efforts, individual sessions, special activities and speakers (e.g., the mentoring program, plenaries, banquet, etc.), suggestions for future Biennials, and demographics. The Summer Institutes survey included a total of 14 questions designed to collect data on the professional status and activities of the participant, overall assessments of the institute(s), the effectiveness of the institute(s) in meeting the individual’s goals, the facilitator, and suggestions for improving and increasing participation in future institutes.

---

\(^1\) The data for this evaluation was collected using Qualtrics software site licensed to North Carolina State University, Version 1.184s, © 2015. Qualtrics and all other Qualtrics product or service names are registered trademarks or trademarks of Qualtrics, Provo, UT, USA, [http://www.qualtrics.com](http://www.qualtrics.com).
Findings Related to the 2015 Biennial Conference Evaluation

Attendance and Response rate

Email addresses were obtained from the conference organizers. In total, 656 emails were sent to Biennial conference participants. Of these, 491 (75%) were opened, 364 (74%) were started, and 351 (88%) were completed. The overall rate of surveys completed in 2015 was 53.5%. As indicated in Figure 1 below, attendance (656) was the second highest of any Biennial (approximately 700 people attended the Chicago Biennial in 2011), as was the evaluation completion rate (exceeded only the 72% response rate in 1989).

![Figure 1: Biennial Attendance and Number of Surveys completed since 1987](image)

Note: Complete data was unavailable for 2003 and 2007.

Registrant and Respondent Characteristics

Table 1 provides the demographic characteristics of the respondents, and where applicable, compares them to the overall conference participants.\(^2\) The mean age of survey respondents was 39 years, the median was 35 years, and the range was 20 to 74. In both the registration and survey sample, females were overrepresented although a quarter (22.7) of the conference registrants did not report on

\(^2\) Data for the overall conference participants was collected from registration database provided by the conference organizers.
gender. With regard to race, 47% of the conference participants self-identified as White, as opposed to 72% of survey respondents. This difference, however, may have been due to the number of registrants who chose the “other” category or simply chose not to answer this question (30%). The only other demographic question included in both the registration and survey databases was country of origin. Not surprisingly, the overwhelming majority of participants were from the United States (86.5% of conference registrants and 94% of survey respondents). The two countries with the largest number of non-US registrants were Canada (38 or 5.8%) and Italy (12 or 1.8%). With the exception of Chile, Germany and Portugal, all other countries were represented in those who completed the evaluation survey.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Conference Participants and Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Conference Participants</th>
<th>Survey Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Rather Not Say</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American/ Black</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American/Hispanic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/Multi-Racial</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Rather Not Say</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia, Canada, Chile, Egypt, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Peru, Portugal, Puerto Rico and the United Kingdom.³</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Cont’d

³ The actual numbers of registrants and respondents from each country are withheld to protect the anonymity of those from countries with very few representatives in either database.
### Professional Status (Check All That Apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APA Professional</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA Student</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRA Professional</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRA Student</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Professional</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Practitioner</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Nonmember</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma/Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather Not Say</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment/Livelihood (Check All That Apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment/Livelihood</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Practice</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Work</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Agency</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Practitioner</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Teaching</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Research</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The evaluation survey included additional demographic questions on professional status related to the APA and SCRA, level of education completed, and type of employment. Over half (55%) of the respondents were either professional (148 or 32%) or student (111 or 24%) members of SCRA, and 25% (116) were members of APA. Twenty-nine respondents (6.2%) were international professionals or students, and 36 (8%) identified as community practitioners. Exactly half of the respondents (50%) had earned a Ph.D. and another quarter (25%) a Master’s degree. Thirty-Nine percent (39%) reported working in an academic institution in either teaching and/or research. The next largest categories of work reported were clinical practitioners (111 or 15%), students (117 or 15%), and researchers (76 or 10%).

**Participation in the 15th SCRA Biennial**

Two questions were asked in the evaluation survey related to past and current participation in the conference. A little over a third (127 or 37%) of the respondents were attending the conference for the 1st time, 151 (44%) had attended between 1 and 5 conferences, 61 (18%) had attended between 6 and 13 conferences, and seven (2%) of the survey respondents indicated they had attended all 14 Biennials since 1987 (See Figure 2).

![Figure 2. Number of times survey respondents reported attending previous SCRA Biennials](image)

In addition, as indicated in Figure 3, the overwhelming majority of respondents had some “official” role beyond being an attendee, including serving as a panelist (41%), presenting a paper (40%), and/or presenting a poster (27%). Eighteen percent (18%) identified as session organizers and 60 people reported participating in the mentoring program as either a mentor (7%) or mentee (10%).
Conference Arrangements

Respondents were asked to rate conference arrangements on a scale from Excellent to Fair. Figures 4, 5, and 6 graphically display the responses across the categories of Registration, Cost and Online Access; Accommodations and Transportation; and Meals or Food Options. In general, the registration experience for respondents was positive with over 90% rating them either Excellent, Very Good, or Good. The least favorable rating was given to the cost of the conference, although only 23% rated this item fair.

Ratings in the areas of Accommodations and Transportation were more mixed. Parking at the conference site was most positively rated at 90%. Over three-quarters of the respondents rated the hotels (ICC and others) as positive, although transportation from the hotels to the conference site or from the hotels/conference site to/from the airport was less favorably rated at 68% and 59% positive, respectively. The lowest ratings were reflected in the ICC Dorm Rooms with 66% of the respondents rating these accommodations as fair.

With regards to meals and food, less than a half of the respondents (42%) rated the conference meals as positive. This was in contrast to the 84% who had more positive non-conference dining experiences. These less than positive responses regarding the conference meals were also the most commented upon part of the conference experience, which is discussed later in this report.
Figure 4: Ratings of conference arrangements: Registration, cost and online access

Figure 5: Ratings of conference arrangements: Accommodations and transportation
Finally, slightly over half (178 or 51%) of the respondents provided additional comments regarding the arrangements and logistics of the conference. In general, the written comments paralleled the ratings reported above (both positive and negative) although the greater number of responses appeared to be given by those who had specific poor experiences or were generally dissatisfied. The content and quality of the topics and sessions and the opportunities to interact with colleagues received the most positive comments. The dormitory, hotel, transportation, and meals/food options received the most negative feedback. These additional comments are summarized below, and displayed in a word cloud in Figure 6.

- **Dormitory and hotel**: Although it was not a universal problem, several people mentioned having poor experiences with the ICC hotel and dorm staff, and many stated several of the staff were rude and generally unaccommodating. Respondents also reported that the rooms were not well supplied (e.g., linen, garbage bin, hand soap), or were unclean, bug-ridden, or poorly lit. Respondents also stated that getting prompt responses from the staff was a problem. Many thought that the cost of the rooms did not match the expectations of service, cleanliness, comfort, and security.

- **Location and Transportation**: The greatest number of written comments had to do with getting to and from the conference site. Several people were disappointed with the cost of the airport shuttle service; unreliability of the hotel shuttle service; availability and convenience of local transportation options; and distance of many of hotels from the conference site.

- **Conference Meals**: Many people were dissatisfied with options, portions, and quality of the box lunches. Vegetarian and vegan options were limited and disappeared quickly. Several people chose not to eat or were simply not satisfied with the meal. Respondents were less dissatisfied with the food available at the banquet, although in some cases the desired food choices ran out quickly as well. One of the biggest complaints had to do with water and coffee: either it was unavailable at critical points during the conference, or available at a cost. Many were disappointed that water was not included along with the box lunches. On the positive side, many were pleased with the provision of the water bottles available at the registration table.

- **Registration Table**: Several people commented on what they observed to be a disorganization of the on-site registration and check in process. Several volunteers did not know the correct procedures for checking people in. For example, conference booklets and banquet tickets were given to people who had not requested or paid for them.

- **Sessions**: Most written comments expressed pleasure with the content and quality of the topics and presenters. Many also thought that the sessions were sufficiently interactive and engaging. The negative comments about the sessions generally centered on the failure of or difficulty in using the technology. While most were pleased with the proximity of the conference buildings, some would have preferred they be closer together, to make it easier for people to get from one session to another in a timely manner. More specific evaluative comments on the roundtable sessions are provided below.

- **Mobile App**: For those who used the Guidebook app, most were very pleased and thought it was more than sufficient for navigating conference activities. Many thought, however, that it would have been even better if it provided the room number (as was the case in the written program). Apparently this was a problem for mobile devices with smaller screens.
Comments on Roundtable Session format

The 15th Biennial conference introduced a new session format in which several sessions were held in one large room and occurred around tables or separate spaces. An open-ended question on the survey allowed participants to comment on this format, and more than two-thirds (77%) responded. As indicated by the word cloud in Figure 7, it appeared that many people generally liked the idea of the roundtable format and thought it provided an opportunity for more intimate and interactive discussion. The problem with the format, however, was in the execution. The overwhelming response was that there were too many tables/session in one room, sessions were too close to each other, many sessions did not have enough space to accommodate all the participants, and participants could not hear what others were saying in their group. If the format is to be used in future conferences, these logistical challenges will need to be taken into account.
Use of Social Media

Relatively few respondents reported using any of the various social media options to access or distribute information about the conference as it was occurring. The most frequently used social media sites were Facebook (25%) and Twitter (18%).

Being Green

A large majority of respondents (89%) rated the conference organizers efforts at keeping it Green as Good to Excellent (see Figure 8). In addition, a majority of the respondents reported participating in efforts to keep the conference green including not requesting a printed program (61%), limiting use of plastic bottles (86%), and limiting use of printed materials for sessions (73%). Of those who refused the printed program booklet, a majority reported accessing conference information primarily through the Guidebook App (63%), followed by the PDF version of the conference program (18%), and the Web app (16%).

With regard to recommendations for future green conference initiatives, the majority of respondents stated the need to ensure sufficient opportunities to recycle or compost waste. The reduced paper burden provided by the availability of the mobile app and other electronic options was praised. The box lunches, however, were generally thought to be a waste of paper, and participants suggested that alternative packaging or delivery methods should be strongly considered. The unavailability of water, specifically during the banquet, reemerged in response to this question. Some respondents reported not receiving a reusable water bottle at the registration desk. A few people indicated that in addition to a choice of receiving a printed program, registrants should also be able to choose whether they wanted a tote bag and water bottle.

Figure 8: Survey respondents' suggestions for future green initiatives

Plenaries and posters

Participants were asked to rate each plenary and poster session that they attended on a 4-point Likert scale (excellent = 1; very good =2; good = 3; fair = 4). On average, all plenaries were rated between very good and excellent, with the plenary on marriage equality receiving the highest average
score (1.45, between excellent and very good), and the opening plenary receiving the lowest score (2.14, between very good and good). Interestingly, the opening plenary had the best attendance of any plenary (112 respondents reported not attending, of 321 who responded to the question), while the plenary with the lowest reported attendance was the plenary on marriage equality (203 respondents reported not attending, of 307 who responded to the question). There were three poster sessions (Thursday, Friday, and Saturday), which received positive ratings overall (1.98, 2.06, and 2.14 respectively). The best attended poster session was the Friday session, with 168 of 309 respondents reporting that they did not attend. See Figure 9 for more information.

Figure 9: Respondent ratings of conference plenary and poster sessions

Favorite session

In an open-ended question, participants were asked to report their favorite session from the conference. A total of 229 participants responded to this question. Of the sessions listed, the plenaries on immigration reform and marriage equality received the highest number of mentions (9 each), with the opening plenary receiving 4 mentions, and the awards plenaries 2 mentions. Participants also mentioned special events and activities, most notably the practice council visioning session (3) and the
tribute to Ed Trickett (3). Respondents listed over 30 individual sessions by name, including sessions related to social justice (12), youth and education (6), methods (5), civic and political engagement (4), gender issues (4), the environment (3), and intervention science and practice (3).

**Mentoring program**

Sixty (60) respondents reported having participated in the mentoring program, either as a mentor (24) or mentee (36). Interestingly, 73 respondents provided a rating for the mentoring program, with the disparity in numbers presumably representing individuals who were familiar with, but not directly involved in, the program. Of these, 52 rated the program as excellent or very good, with 14 rating the program as good, and 7 rating it as fair (mean = 2.01, very good). The 60 respondents who participated in the program were asked to comment on how the mentoring program could be improved at future Biennials. Responses to this question were analyzed and organized into four themes, which are presented in Appendix B.

**Reception, banquet, walking tours, etc.**

Respondents were asked to assess special events and activities on a 4-point Likert scale (excellent = 1; very good = 2; good = 3; fair = 4). Figure 10 shows the responses for each special event and activity listed. The means for each activity were as follows: opening reception: 2.14; Banquet: 2.37; council, committee, and interest group meetings: 2.26; informal social opportunities: 2.05; Friday walking tour, immigration: 1.40; Friday walking tour, arts and culture: 1.33; Mill City mill-about: 2.31; Saturday walking tour, immigration: 1.67; Saturday walking tour, culture: 1.33; dance at the ICC: 1.67.

![Figure 10. Respondent ratings of major conference activities](image-url)
Overall conference assessments

Participants were asked to rate how well the conference met their needs in areas such as policy, research, teaching, practice, and networking. Responses for the individual questions are displayed in Figure 11.

![Bar Chart](image)

Figure 11. Respondent ratings of how well the conference served their needs

In two separate open-ended questions, participants were asked to share their thoughts on the Biennial sessions and speakers, and to provide additional feedback to the conference organizers. The responses to these questions were many and varied, and there was considerable overlap between the two. Here, we include a word cloud representing those responses that fell into a theme we labeled “kudos,” in which participants express their general, positive experiences with the conference and their thanks to conference organizers (see Figure 12).
Other responses to these two open-ended questions are presented in Appendix C, and are organized by the following themes:

- **Planning and scheduling:** Participants commented on several aspects of conference scheduling, including the time between sessions (suggesting more time for transitions and informal interactions), the placement of plenaries in the schedule, and density of the schedule.

- **Guidebook app and conference materials:** Participants described the guidebook app as being helpful in some respects, but also having some bugs related to finding session locations.

- **Diversity and participants:** A few participants commented on the diversity of awardees and participants.

- **General sessions:** Participants made several positive comments about the Biennial sessions, while also making some specific suggestions about the time allotted for sessions and discussion.

- **Speakers:** Participants made several specific comments - positive and negative - about speakers at the Biennial. Common suggestions involved limiting the number of presentations by a single speaker and encouraging speakers to be more prepared and engaging.

- **Plenaries:** Overall, comments about the plenary sessions were very positive, though several participants commented on the appropriateness of having performers during networking sessions.

- **Special events and activities:** There were several positive comments about the availability and quality of special events and activities, though participants commented on issues related to the availability of food and beverages during the special events. Other participants suggested greater involvement from and with the local community.

- **Posters:** Participants commented on the scheduling, location, and general accessibility of the poster sessions.

- **Accommodations and location:** Accommodations and location were popular topics among participants, drawing both positive and negative comments about the availability and location of hotel options, the quality of accommodations, the location of the Biennial, and the conference rooms.
• **Food and other amenities**: Food was another popular topic among participants, who commented on both the availability and quality of food offerings.

**Respondent recommendations for future Biennials**

Participants were asked to share their recommendations and suggestions for future Biennials. Responses to this question were sorted by theme, and condensed to (1) reduce replication with previous responses, and (2) distill specific recommendations from general comments. The final list of recommendations was organized into five themes (Venue & Accommodations; Food & Drink; Conference Content; Conference Structure, Scheduling, & Design, and; Conference Greening) and is presented in Appendix D.
Findings Related to the Summer Institutes

Characteristics of Summer Institute attendees (survey respondents only)

According to the registration data, 55 people attended the SCRA Pre-Conference Summer Institutes. Of these, 29 (or 52%) completed the post-institute online survey. The majority (17 or 68%) of respondents reported this was their first time attending a pre-conference workshop or Summer Institute. As indicated in Tables 2 and 3, the largest category of attendees were graduate students (16 or 55%), followed by Doctoral-level faculty (5 or 17%) and those with doctorates working outside the academy (5 or 10%). The types of employment were fairly diverse (respondents could check all that applied), with most participants connected to an academic institution as students (18 or 60%) researchers (15 or 50%) and/or instructors/faculty (10 or 33%). Non-academic respondents included community practitioners and those working for nonprofit agencies (9 or 30% each); researchers (5 or 17%), clinical practitioners (5 or 17%) and individuals engaged in policy work (4 or 13%).

Table 2: Professional status of Survey Respondents who attended Summer Institutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Non-Faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters-Level Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters-Level Non-Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Employment/Livelihood of survey respondents attending Summer Institutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Institution/Research</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Institution/Teaching</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community practice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Agency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Practitioner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Summer Institutes did survey respondents attend?

As indicated in Table 4, among the respondents the greatest number attended the Community psychology in the policy arena workshop (7 participants), followed by the Coalition development and evaluation and strategic planning and Organizational development workshops, each at 4 participants (18%). An overwhelming majority of the respondents (89%) rated the institute they attended either good or excellent (Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer Institute</th>
<th>Number Attending</th>
<th>% of Overall Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coalition development and evaluation (June 24)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community psychology in the policy arena (June 24)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural competence (June 24)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leadership: Working with citizen groups (June 24)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning and organizational development (June 28)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting and building a solo consulting practice (June 28)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant writing for community psychologists (June 28)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building strong community organizations (June 28)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Survey respondents overall rating of Summer Institute they attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What did participants gain from Summer Institutes?

Although the responses varied somewhat based on category (see Figure 13), respondents generally assessed the institutes as having benefited them in providing knowledge, skills, and opportunities to network with others with similar interests. In addition, the ratings of the facilitators were generally positive, particularly in their knowledge of the subject matter covered (see Figure 14). Moreover, although the responses varied depending on the workshop attended, the institutes that
received the most positive rating were those that were interactive, had a clear set of objectives, and were organized to effectively cover all of the proposed objectives (see Table 6).
Table 6. Respondents’ recommendations for improving the workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide better/more information before the workshop.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify the key objectives of the workshop.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the workshop more engaging or interactive.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow the pace of the workshop.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the pace of the workshop.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease the length of the workshop.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the length of the workshop.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the organization of the workshop.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the visual aids or handouts used in the workshop.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What was most useful for you in the Summer Institute?

Respondents were asked to respond to an open-ended question about which aspects of the Summer Institutes they found to be most useful. Responses to this question were specific to the institute attended but included:

- Having multiple presenters who also participated along with us and gave us real-world, engaging insights into the challenges of working on policy matters.
- Hearing all the different examples of community psychologists affecting policy.
- Reviewing the dos and don’ts of grant-writing and contacting funding agencies and program officers.
- Hearing from someone who clearly had experience on both the grant making and grant seeking sides.
- That my presenter provided handouts, hands-on activities where we applied the concepts we learned, and fielded questions well from all levels of participants. I appreciated that my presenter took time to respond thoroughly to my basic questions.
- I feel that I now know a lot about what community psychologists can do in policy as well as about careers in policy, but less about how to get started at the beginning of your career.
- The wealth of material provided and opportunities to discuss it.
- Networking opportunities with people interested in and actually doing the work I want to do.
- The ability to see case studies presented and then ask questions about them.
- Being provided with a workbook and working step-by-step through a case vignette to apply those skills.
- The new skills and knowledge gained.
- Incorporating attendees' knowledge in the discussion and analyzing our experience.
What was least useful for you in the Summer Institute?

Similarly, respondents were asked to respond to an open-ended question about which aspects of the Summer Institutes they found the least useful. Responses to this question but centered primarily around the need to insure that there is adequate time and organization given to cover the content and that sufficient networking time be provided.

How can the Summer Institutes participation be increased?

Respondents were asked to provide recommendations on how participation in the Summer Institutes could be increased. These recommendations included:

- Continue word-of-mouth advertisement since that seemed to be the way many current attendees learned about the institutes.
- Increase advertising directly to graduate programs beyond community psychology.
- Provide more detailed information on the content of the workshops.
- Since the institutes are great opportunities for students, ways should be made to make them less expensive if not free since most participants are already absorbing the costs of hotels for at least an additional conference night.
- Schedule institutes so that they occur during the conference (e.g., a couple of hours per day).
- Consider adding a practicum component.
- Provide opportunities to receive formal certification.
- Increase outreach and content that engages local community practitioners, residents and agencies.
- Survey SCRA members for topics.
Recommendations for Future Biennial Evaluations

As our contribution to the evaluation process for future Biennials, we would like to make the following recommendations regarding the structure and implementation of the evaluation. We believe these steps will be helpful in easing the evaluation process for conference organizers and future evaluators:

1. **Make evaluation tools (guides) available from year to year:** The majority of evaluation topics and questions are applicable to every Biennial, with little or no adjustment needed. As such, we recommend that the evaluation guides be made available, in multiple formats, to evaluators from one year to the next. This will reduce the time burden or creating or reformatting the guides. To facilitate this, we have included both evaluation guides here as Appendices, and with access to them in MS Word and Qualtrics formats via these links:

   a. [2015 Conference Evaluation](#) (MS Word, Version 2013)
   b. [2015 Conference Evaluation](#) (Qualtrics)
   c. [2015 Summer Institute Evaluation](#) (MS Word, Version 2013)
   d. [2015 Summer Institute Evaluation](#) (Qualtrics)

2. **Add an evaluation section to the Biennial planning handbook:** Currently, the Biennial planning handbook provides very little guidance on evaluating the Biennial. We recommend adding a section to the handbook that outlines the purpose and expectations of the evaluation. In addition, we recommend developing guidelines for implementing findings from previous evaluations into the planning process for future evaluations.

3. **Make evaluation reports from each available to SCRA members on the website:** We feel that there is value in making the evaluation reports from each year’s Biennial available to SCRA members on a members-only section of the website (such as the Biennial conference page). This will help ensure that the reports are accessible for conference planners and evaluators from year to year, and may help facilitate more fruitful and productive discussions around ways in which the Biennial can be improved.
Appendix A. Survey Instruments

2015 SCRA Biennial Conference Evaluation

Q1 Thank you for participating in the 2015 SCRA Biennial at the University of Massachusetts - Lowell. Your responses on this survey are greatly appreciated and will be reported back to the SCRA membership and used in the planning of future conferences. The survey should take between 5-10 minutes to complete. You may email any questions or comments you may have on the survey to the 2015 evaluation team: Sherri Brokopp Binder or Kwesi Brookins. Please click below to continue.

Q2 How did you participate in the 2015 SCRA Biennial? (Check All That Apply)

- Summer Institute Facilitator (1)
- Summer Institute Participant (2)
- Paper Presenter (3)
- Session Panelist (4)
- Session Moderator (5)
- Session Organizer (e.g., you put a call out on the SCRA listserve for participants on a particular topic?) (6)
- Poster Presenter (7)
- MENTOR in conference Mentoring Program (8)
- MENTEE in conference Mentoring Program (9)
- Other (10) ____________________

Q3 Approximately how many previous SCRA Biennials have you attended?

- This is my 1st Biennial (1)
- 1 (2)
- 2 (3)
- 3 (4)
- 4 (5)
- 5 (6)
- 6 (7)
- 7 (8)
- 8 (9)
- 9 (10)
- 10 (11)
- 11 (12)
- 12 (13)
- 13 (14)
- 14 or ALL of the previous biennials (15)
- I have NO Idea (16)
Q4 As a participant in the conference mentoring program, what are your recommendations for improving the mentoring program?

Q5 You indicated you did not participate in a Summer Institute (formerly pre-conference workshops). What do you think would motivate you or others to participate in a summer institute in the future?

Q6 Please rate the following conference arrangements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Excellent (1)</th>
<th>Very Good (2)</th>
<th>Good (3)</th>
<th>Fair (4)</th>
<th>Not Applicable (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Registration (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site Registration (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Abstract Submission (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Costs (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC Hotel Rooms (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC Dorm Rooms (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Hotels (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Meals (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Conference Dining Options (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Shuttles (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport from Airport (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking at Conference Site (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Rooms Technology/Equipment (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility at Conference Site (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Website (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Mobile App (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7 The 2015 Biennial used a session format with multiple roundtable discussions in a single room. What did you think of that format?

Q8 Please share any additional comments you may have about the conference arrangements.

Q9 How often did you use any of the following social media sites during the conference to access or post information about the conference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Media Site</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>Once or twice a day (2)</th>
<th>3-5 Times A Day (3)</th>
<th>More than 5 Times a Day (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google+ (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vine (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10 In which ways did you participate in keeping the conference GREEN? Check All That Apply.

- Did not request printed/paper program (1)
- Limited my use of plastic bottles (2)
- Limited my use of printed materials for my session (3)
- Other (4) ____________________

Q11 How would you rate the conference in its GREEN efforts?

- Excellent (1)
- Very Good (2)
- Good (3)
- Fair (4)

Q12 What are your suggestions for GREEN initiatives at future SCRA Biennial Conferences?

Answer If In which ways did you participate in keeping the conference GREEN? Check All That Apply. Did not request printed/paper program Is Selected

Q13 Which of the following did you use most often to access conference information (e.g., program schedule, session information, transportation, etc)?

- Guidebook App (1)
- Web application (2)
- PDF Download (3)
- None of the above (4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Excellent (1)</th>
<th>Very Good (2)</th>
<th>Good (3)</th>
<th>Fair (4)</th>
<th>Did Not Attend (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Plenary: Reflections on the Swampscott Conference (Thursday)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary: Daring to Dream: Prospects for Immigration Reform in a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Political Landscape (Friday) (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary: Awards for Distinguished Contribution I (Saturday) (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary: Awards for Distinguished Contribution II (Saturday) (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plenary: Marriage Equality, LGBT Rights &amp; Social Justice: Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activists Lead the Way (Saturday) (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Sessions 1 - Thursday (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Session 2 - Friday (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Session 3 - Saturday (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15 What was your FAVORITE conference session? Consider ALL of the sessions, not just the plenaries.
Q16 How would you rate the following conference activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Excellent (1)</th>
<th>Very Good (2)</th>
<th>Good (3)</th>
<th>Fair (4)</th>
<th>Did Not Attend (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Reception ~ the ICC (Thursday) (1)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banquet &amp; Awards Presentation (Saturday) (2)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Program (3)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council, Committee and Interest Group Meetings (4)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Social Opportunities (5)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday Walking Tour: Lowell, Immigration and Identities (6)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday Walking Tour: Lowell: How Arts and Culture are Building the Lowell Community (7)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill City Mill-About (Friday) (8)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Walking Tour: Lowell, Immigration and Identities (9)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Walking Tour: Lowell: How Arts and Culture are Building the Lowell Community (10)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance at the ICC (Saturday) (11)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q17 Please provide additional comments on any of the Biennial activities or speakers?

Q18 How well did the conference serve your needs in the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Great! (5)</th>
<th>Very Well (1)</th>
<th>Well (2)</th>
<th>Not So Well (3)</th>
<th>Not Applicable (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy-related issues</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based practice</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Networking</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting New Colleagues</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catching up with friends and colleagues</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q19 What comments would you like to leave for the conference planners/organizers at the University of Massachusetts Lowell?

Q20 Any additional comments or suggestions for future biennials?

Q21 What is your professional status (Check All That Apply)

- APA professional member (1)
- APA student member (2)
- SCRA professional member (3)
- SCRA student member (4)
- International Professional (5)
- International student (6)
- Community practitioner (7)
- Student nonmember (8)
- Other (9) _________________

Q22 What is your highest educational degree?

- High School Diploma (1)
- Associates Degree (2)
- Bachelors Degree (3)
- Masters Degree (4)
- Doctoral Degree (5)
- Other (6) _________________

Q23 What type of work do you do? (Check All That Apply)

- Community practice (1)
- Student (2)
- Government (3)
- Policy Work (4)
- Non-Profit Agency (5)
- Clinical Practitioner (6)
- Academic Institution/Teaching (7)
- Academic Institution/Research (8)
- Research (9)
- Other (10) _________________

Q24 Please enter your four (4) digit year of birth
Q25 What is your race?

- Caucasian/ White (1)
- African American/ Black (2)
- Latin American/ Hispanic (3)
- Asian American/ Pacific Islander (4)
- Native American (5)
- Mixed or Multi-Ethnic (6)
- Other (please list) (7) ____________________
Q26 How do you currently self-identify?

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Other (3) ____________________
- I’d Rather Not Say (4)

Answer If What is your professional status (Check All That Apply) International Professional Is Selected
Or What is your professional status (Check All That Apply) International student Is Selected

Q27 What is your current country of residence?

- Afghanistan (1)
- Albania (2)
- Algeria (3)
- Andorra (4)
- Angola (5)
- Antigua and Barbuda (6)
- Argentina (7)
- Armenia (8)
- Australia (9)
- Austria (10)
- Azerbaijan (11)
- Bahamas (12)
- Bahrain (13)
- Bangladesh (14)
- Barbados (15)
- Belarus (16)
- Belgium (17)
- Belize (18)
- Benin (19)
- Bhutan (20)
- Bolivia (21)
- Bosnia and Herzegovina (22)
- Botswana (23)
- Brazil (24)
- Brunei Darussalam (25)
- Bulgaria (26)
- Burkina Faso (27)
- Burundi (28)
- Cambodia (29)
- Cameroon (30)
- Canada (31)
- Cape Verde (32)
- Central African Republic (33)
- Chad (34)
- Chile (35)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People's Republic</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong (S.A.R.)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Islamic Republic of...</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Iraq (81)
Ireland (82)
Israel (83)
Italy (84)
Jamaica (85)
Japan (86)
Jordan (87)
Kazakhstan (88)
Kenya (89)
Kiribati (90)
Kuwait (91)
Kyrgyzstan (92)
Lao People's Democratic Republic (93)
Latvia (94)
Lebanon (95)
Lesotho (96)
Liberia (97)
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (98)
Liechtenstein (99)
Lithuania (100)
Luxembourg (101)
Madagascar (102)
Malawi (103)
Malaysia (104)
Maldives (105)
Mali (106)
Malta (107)
Marshall Islands (108)
Mauritania (109)
Mauritius (110)
Mexico (111)
Micronesia, Federated States of... (112)
Monaco (113)
Mongolia (114)
Montenegro (115)
Morocco (116)
Mozambique (117)
Myanmar (118)
Namibia (119)
Nauru (120)
Nepal (121)
Netherlands (122)
New Zealand (123)
Nicaragua (124)
Niger (125)
Nigeria (126)
North Korea (127)
Norway (128)
Oman (129)
Pakistan (130)
Palau (131)
Panama (132)
Papua New Guinea (133)
Paraguay (134)
Peru (135)
Philippines (136)
Poland (137)
Portugal (138)
Puerto Rico (196)
Qatar (139)
Republic of Korea (140)
Republic of Moldova (141)
Romania (142)
Russian Federation (143)
Rwanda (144)
Saint Kitts and Nevis (145)
Saint Lucia (146)
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (147)
Samoa (148)
San Marino (149)
Sao Tome and Principe (150)
Saudi Arabia (151)
Senegal (152)
Serbia (153)
Seychelles (154)
Sierra Leone (155)
Singapore (156)
Slovakia (157)
Slovenia (158)
Solomon Islands (159)
Somalia (160)
South Africa (161)
South Korea (162)
Spain (163)
Sri Lanka (164)
Sudan (165)
Suriname (166)
Swaziland (167)
Sweden (168)
Switzerland (169)
- Syrian Arab Republic (170)
- Tajikistan (171)
- Thailand (172)
- The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (173)
- Timor-Leste (174)
- Togo (175)
- Tonga (176)
- Trinidad and Tobago (177)
- Tunisia (178)
- Turkey (179)
- Turkmenistan (180)
- Tuvalu (181)
- Uganda (182)
- Ukraine (183)
- United Arab Emirates (184)
- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (185)
- United Republic of Tanzania (186)
- United States of America (187)
- Uruguay (188)
- Uzbekistan (189)
- Vanuatu (190)
- Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of... (191)
- Viet Nam (192)
- Yemen (193)
- Zambia (580)
- Zimbabwe (1357)
SCRA 2015 Summer Institute Evaluation (Click HERE for link to Qualtrics Template)

Q1 Thank you for participating in a 2015 SCRA Summer Institute. Your feedback on this survey will benefit the facilitators and provide useful information for future institutes. Note that you will need to complete an evaluation for each of the institutes you attended so, upon completion, you will be directed back to this survey page. Feel free to contact the 2015 Biennial Evaluation team if you have questions (Sherri Brokopp Binder and Kwesi Brookins). Please click below to continue.

Q2 What is your professional status

- Undergraduate Student (1)
- Graduate Student (2)
- Ph.D. Faculty (3)
- Ph.D. Non-Faculty (4)
- Masters-Level Faculty (5)
- Masters-Level Non-Faculty (6)
- Other (7) ____________________

Q3 What type of work do you do? (Check All That Apply)

- Community practice (1)
- Student (2)
- Government (3)
- Policy Work (4)
- Non-Profit Agency (5)
- Clinical Practitioner (6)
- Academic Institution/Teaching (7)
- Academic Institution/Research (8)
- Research (9)
- Other (10) ____________________

Q4 Choose the Summer Institute you attended from the pull down menu below.

- Coalition development and evaluation (June 24) (1)
- Community psychology in the policy arena (June 24) (2)
- Sociocultural competence (June 24) (3)
- Community leadership: Working with citizen groups (June 24) (4)
- Strategic planning and organizational development (June 28) (5)
- Starting and building a solo consulting practice (June 28) (6)
- Grant writing for community psychologists (June 28) (7)
- Building strong community organizations (June 28) (8)
Q5 Overall, how would you rate the Summer Institute you attended?

- Excellent (1)
- Good (2)
- Fair (3)
- Poor (4)

Q6 How well did the Summer Institute meet the following goals? Please rate all the goals that apply to you. If any of these goals do not apply to you, mark N/A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Very Well (1)</th>
<th>Well (2)</th>
<th>Okay (3)</th>
<th>Not At All (4)</th>
<th>N/A (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gained practical knowledge that can be applied in my work. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained new skills that can be applied in my work. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained new knowledge/awareness about a topic of interest to me. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewed or expanded my existing knowledge on the topic. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networked with others who have similar interests or who are engaged in similar work. (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7 Did you have any goals for the Institute that were not listed in the question above? If so, please describe the goal(s) and let us know how well that goal(s) was met.

Q8 Please rate the speaker/facilitator of this summer institute on the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was well prepared (1)</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was well organized (2)</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td></td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was engaging (3)</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td></td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was knowledgeable of the subject matter (4)</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td></td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was professional (5)</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td></td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded well to questions (6)</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td></td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9 What suggestions do you have for improving this Institute? (Check all that apply)

- Provide better/more information before the workshop. (1)
- Clarify the key objectives of the workshop. (2)
- Make the workshop more engaging or interactive. (6)
- Slow the pace of the workshop. (7)
- Increase the pace of the workshop. (8)
- Decrease the length of the workshop. (9)
- Increase the length of the workshop. (10)
- Improve the organization of the workshop. (11)
- Improve the visual aids or handouts used in the workshop. (12)

Q10 What was the most useful aspect of the Institute for you?

Q11 What was the least useful aspect of the Institute for you?

Q12 Was this the first time you had attended a pre-conference workshop or summer institute?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q13 Please answer the following questions about Summer Institutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Absolutely (1)</th>
<th>Probably (2)</th>
<th>Not Sure (3)</th>
<th>Probably Not (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would you attend another Summer Institute at a future biennial? (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you attend another Summer Institute in a non-biennial year? (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you recommend pre-conference workshops or summer institutes to your colleagues? (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14 Do you have any suggestions for increasing participation in SCRA workshops or institutes?

Q15 Please provide any feedback about the Summer Institute that was not covered in the earlier questions.

Q18 Please click below to submit your survey. Remember, you will automatically be taken back to the beginning of the summer institute evaluation page. Please feel free to close that window if you do not need to submit another evaluation. Thank you!
### Appendix B. Comments on the Mentoring Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicity and outreach</td>
<td>- Don’t depend so heavily on the listserv for publicity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Make short mentor bios available before the conference and/or at the registration table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Describe the mentoring program and allow people to register for the mentoring program when they register for the conference. For those who indicate interest during the registration process, email a list of all mentors with bios before the conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have faculty encourage their students to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and structure</td>
<td>- Allow more structured time for mentoring activities (it is difficult to meet mentors around other sessions/activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Schedule 1 on 1 meetings with mentors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have mentors with a wider variety of specializations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clarify the value of the program for students versus early career professionals. As it is, the program is more geared toward students. Perhaps there should be separate tracks for students and early career professionals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mentoring program seems to be the &quot;same folks&quot; every year - a committee approach to this would help bring in new and diverse individuals as mentors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>- Have a separate time for signups, so that it does not conflict with the plenary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Post session descriptions and availability on the app.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stagger the timing of sessions, so that they are not all over lunch (which conflicts with business meetings, for example).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Shorten the orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Allow more time for dialog/questions from mentees during the sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have more informal opportunities for mentors and mentees to interact and network, such as a mixer, breakfast, or “speed mentoring” session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>- Consider extending the program beyond the Biennial, by recording and posting discussions on the SCRA website, or presenting professional development topics on the website for students/members to access.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C. Comments on the conference, sessions, and speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Planning & Scheduling**    | • Too many pre-conference communications. Emails about all sessions are not necessary. I began deleting messages related to SCRA since there were too many to keep up with that weren’t relevant.  
  • Short gaps between sessions with such long distances to walk meant that it was difficult not to be late. It also limited the chance to speak to presenters afterward, which is important for networking.  
  • Congratulations in coordinating so many schedules with so many sessions!  
  • Thank you to all the organizers -- nice work! I enjoyed the weekly e-mails leading up to the conference; they were engaging and fun.  
  • Overall, this Biennial was great! It would be nice to distribute the sessions a bit differently as it seems sessions on one topic were clustered, making it impossible to attend many sessions in your interest area.  
  • As it was my first Biennial and I was a volunteer - I wasn't able to attend many of the sessions I would have liked to attend.  
  • The conference this year was extremely packed. It was difficult to attend everything, including the plenary sessions. It would be nice to have plenary sessions at different times, including in the evenings.  
  • In addition, with just 10 minutes in between sessions, previous presenters ran over, causing us to cut down our sessions drastically so we didn't run over into the next.  
  • Finally, because SCRA is such a "family" conference, more time built in to greet people and meet new people would be very helpful (mixers, longer breaks, etc...).  
  • Conferences should be run on central or mountain time so that west coasters are not rising at 4:30 am their time to get to a session at 8 am conference time. Choosing a 9 am to 7 pm schedule on the east coast and a 7 am to 5 pm on the west coast will encourage more participation and mean that everyone is more alert  
  • We also had some technical difficulties with av equipment and nobody around to help. That delayed us further. Perhaps have technical volunteers available in all areas of the presentation locations at the beginning of each session block.  
  • I feel that the Biennial needed some group bonding activities. It seemed like participants, especially students, were not mingling or trying to get to know others. This was not my feeling in my previous Biennials. I think that we need to keep the friend and inclusive culture and may need some activities that would encourage this culture.  
  • Personally, I would like to see (1) some bigger-name speakers, but also (2) more wide-open, provocative, full-group discussions |
<p>| <strong>Guidebook App &amp; Conference Materials</strong> | • The guidebook app was not helpful when things were near the Grand Ballroom. Sometimes the location would get cut off on the screen and it was |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| General Sessions         | - I enjoyed the town hall on Mass Incarceration with hopes that there will be some follow thru  
- The conference’s content was amazing! There was a great variety for anyone having interests in community psychology to be satisfied.  
- Great work. I really liked how the conference was organized. I felt that every symposium I attended was well-attended, and heard similar comments from my students.  
- please consider including participatory and interactive workshops in future conferences  
- Lots of great options to choose from this year, however, there didn’t seem to be enough time to delve into topic and allow for group participation. I would suggest (2) 1.5 hour session before lunch and (2) 1.5 hour sessions after lunch.  
- Also, many of the sessions were focused on the U.S. context and did not apply very well to those working in other contexts.  
- Too many discussions; not enough results in papers. |
| Speakers                 | - I loved Carlos and Reneta and the discussion of the founders of scra  
- Some speakers weren't very engaging - felt distanced from the audience  
- Many speakers could use some help with presentations (powerpoint tips, engaging involving audience).  
- Encourage the academics to be a bit more engaging when they read written remarks in the plenaries.  
- I was really disappointed that the "meet the executive committee" meeting ended up being like 47 minutes of them talking about themselves instead of actually meeting them and discussing important issues relating to our organization. I'm not really sure anyone actually cares about their research interests when the point is talking about SCRA and its organizational principles. I'm also disappointed that we didn't get to meet any students involved with the executive committee. Why not highlight our student representative? Students are just as important. A lot of the EC just came |
| Diversity & Participants | - More diverse awardees! The ones on Saturday morning were all white.  
- Unsettling that the opening plenary video made no reference to any influential minorities  
- We should consider inviting more community members. |
|                         | hard to find which of the several rooms in that back area that the session was in.  
- The Guidebook App was fantastic, I really liked all the features, especially building a personal schedule and it warning you if you double-booked yourself. However, the app frequently cut off the room location so I constantly had to borrow someone’s paper version to figure out where I was going.  
- Release the Guidebook version at least a month in advance, even earlier if possible.  
- The green efforts were overdone at the expense of ease finding sessions |
across as kind of self-important, which probably wasn't intentional but was kind of off-putting.

- I wonder if there is a way to have some guidelines/requirements to follow for PowerPoints for speakers?
- Some speakers had too many symposium sessions. Not only did it likely prevent others from presenting their work and seeing a wider range of work (important for growing the field) but, for some speakers, there was a noticeable gap in the quality of the work they were presenting. Some speakers' additional work may have been better suited for posters.
- I attended sessions by the same speaker three times in one day. The presentations had great overlap and I did not feel it was necessary. Limiting the number of presentations an individual can serve as first author on will allow for a greater breadth of topics to be included.
- Many sessions felt dry and robotic. Many people did not talk about the communities with whom they work or wish to impact, but rather talked up their methods and analyses. The meat of the research should be the findings and implications. It didn't feel like a lot of the sessions kept that in mind.
- Open discussions with participants are often the most productive as opposed to just hearing others talk about effect sizes or extremely specific methods that aren't relevant to most of us. Encouraging audience participation by offering recommended presentation formats would help attendees get the most out of conference.
- I was disappointed by all of the award speakers on Saturday with the exception of Jack. The presentations went over time and felt disorganized. The speakers did not seem well prepared (once again with the exception of Jack who I thought did an excellent job.)
- Compared to other conferences I attend, the quality of the presentations need work. Most were too short given the amount of speakers/content and offered very little practical ideas I could use in my work.
- Restrict multiple presentations by the same authors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plenaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a member of the LGBT community, I really enjoyed the last plenary on marriage equality and the opportunity to meet members involved in this historic movement!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thought the Swampscott plenary left me wanting much more - unfortunately, kinda boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I truly felt bad for the spoken word performer during the reception. It was not a good space and we were not a captive audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish the slam poet on Friday couldn't have performed at the banquet rather than during a time when people wanted to socialize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All plenary were excellent. But Plenary on immigration and LGBT were special. Sharing their experiences gave a human touch to community work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The final plenary on LGBT rights was absolutely wonderful! I actually cried because it was so moving, at the same time it was informative. It was such an honor to meet people who have given up so much of their time and effort as well as put their own personal privacy aside to fight the good fight. I honestly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
can't say more about how much that session meant to me. I get chills just thinking about it.

- We need to stop booking artists that require attention at social networking events where the crowd expects to talk to each other. On the first night, we ignored an African-American poet who was speaking about racism, violence, and oppression. It was awful.
- Thank you for an excellent tutorial and state of research foci within community psychology!

**Special Events & Activities**

- Very disappointed that the video award was not included in Saturday night awards.
- Make water and non-alcoholic beverages free at the banquet
- Water should be free at banquet
- It is absolutely (and pardon the language) bullshit that I had to pay for WATER at the banquet, on top of the $25 fee I had already paid. More so, I am pregnant, and the fact that I had to pay for water is a disgrace.
- Stagger the time of walking tours.
- Opening reception: have wine and more food available
- Mill About was well planned out with lots of ideas. Excellent city to do this in. The Angkor dance Troupe was excellent and a nice slice of Lowell. The setting with sessions in the several buildings close by was excellent and very historical and pretty.
- The dance on Saturday night was really fun, but the DJ could not read a crowd at all. He could not seem to play two songs in a row that kept people dancing. But even with that it seemed like people really enjoyed themselves!
- Great to have local activists as keynote - we had activists participating in poster of our PAR work but other local projects did not seem to have them there - maybe due to costs - would recommend next SCRA's make clear/ensure that there are ways to waive fees for local activists and/or participatory co-researchers to attend and present.
- I was actually unaware of the dance on Saturday night until I saw that it was happening, and I would have liked to know about it before my trip to be able to plan to attend.
- Dance was great, but DJ was pretty bad.
- I thought the Banquet was great. However, a huge problem was the lack of free water. It is a very basic need and many of us thought that not providing a source of free water was a major issue/overlooked detail. Additionally, the drinks throughout the conference were very expensive so that should have been disclosed before. I often don't carry a wallet at conferences so a heads up would have been nice. I just assumed that water would be provided at the banquet.
- The planning team set up so many great activities (walking tours, etc) that one couldn't participate in all the offerings. The staff and students at the conference table facilitating things were exceptional - knowledgeable, helpful, etc. Really, I sincerely appreciate how well conference worked - thanks to all involved.
Thank you - fantastic effort! I appreciated the thoughtful approach to the conference - for instance, even though I was not able to go on any of the walking tours, it was an asset to offer them.

Walking around the city, I happened across a food distribution and join in - volunteered. It would be nice if SCRA could partner with a local organization to offer volunteer time (in whatever capacity).

**Posters**

- I was really disappointed in the location of the poster sessions. It discouraged people from viewing posters during off-hours
- I usually like the poster sessions but did not make my way over to any because they were removed from where most of the sessions were being held. I usually stroll through in between at other conferences.
- Poster sessions need to be longer or perhaps held before or after dinner so that there is time for discussion and to see more of them
- The first poster presentation was offered during the lunch hour, which created a conundrum where people had to pass by the room to pick up their lunches but massively opted to pass through the posters without taking note...
- No one came by our posters, not did I see many people other than poster presenters. Is there a better idea out there for this? Not sure
- I felt that the conference as a whole was focused too much on history and was too conceptual/theoretical and less applied than I expected.
- Poster session attendance could have been strengthened with better placement in the program

**Accommodations & Location**

- There was a lot of confusion about where events were being held around the the three buildings. Having events (e.g. receptions) in several different rooms was confusing and difficult for attendees. More signs were needed as well better coordination of the larger group events
- I liked the Inn because it was compact enough that I pretty much ran into everyone I know.
- Good to have the shared space in the lobby of the ICC
- As much as I wanted to participate me with other activities, it was difficult with being at another hotel 4 miles away - since the ICC filed quickly. Also as a first timer I did not know anyone else and meeting new people to discuss things was not so easy. Many people came with colleagues and stuck together. It’s always hard as a new comer to feel welcomed and to really get to know others when so many people already have those connections. Staying at a different location did not help in this either.
- The university site seemed to work well for meetings/presentations, etc. and very grateful for easy and free parking and access to other spaces in Lowell for walking around and visiting. Wonder if there were other ways to highlight the local work - the tables with literature and/or books seemed a bit disorganized and not well staffed. Only other issue was that there were very few spots for sitting to have lunch.
- The way the hotel rooms were designated was frustrating, because I called a few days after the acceptances were announced, and the woman I called said
all the rooms were booked. Then I got an email a few days later that there was at least one room open. You should probably have a system to keep people on a waiting list if there are people signing up and then dropping, or a non-refundable deposit or something because when the conference is far removed from other reasonably priced accommodations, it's frustrating to be told that there is nowhere to stay and then to hear otherwise.

- The dorm rooms were awful! Ants and spiders, cold and I ever got linens. I had to borrow linens from a friend in one of the hotel rooms
- Accommodations at ICC were unpleasant.
- The conference was terrible which I think impacted the quality of the conference. I do appreciate how affordable it was but would have rather paid a little more to get a better quality venue.
- However, there were glitches along the way in the manner it was organized, e.g. I was never able in two days to have a cup of coffee and the ICC bathrooms had no toilet paper or hand paper at 10h20 on Friday morning...
- Overall, excellent work! I felt the conference was well organized and definitely worth the trip! I had some issues with the venue - poor food, overly air conditioned everywhere inside, and the rooms were not that comfortable (but I did stay in the dorms), but with a pricey linen charge, we didn't even get a comforter, just a thin sheet. But the actual conference itself was incredible!
- I appreciate the enthusiasm and commitment our UMass Lowell colleagues demonstrated during the planning time and throughout the conference. They were excellent, caring, gracious hosts. That said, on a scale of 1-10, I would have to rate the convenience of the conference and the offerings of the venue a 2. Lowell is too isolated (too expensive and inconvenient to get back and forth from the airport(s) and has little to offer for those coming for a short stay. Simply stated, it wasn't comfortable being there - everything connected with logistics took effort, which I've never felt at a SCRA conference. People were staying at so many hotels/motels in the surrounding area with added challenges getting to and from the ICC. Perhaps the choice of venue was connected with "recreating" Swampscott, which wouldn't be possible...and would also possibly be deemed inappropriate by our international colleagues. There was a definite strain on the staff at the ICC, who were working very hard, and there were ongoing issues taking care of the visitors.
- Great work overall! Thank you for helping us engage with Lowell locally, learning about local activists, making walking tours and other things in the community available. Sometimes essentials were neglected (trash cans in dorm rooms, water during the banquet, chaos during food service of banquet - should have called tables).
- The set up of the rooms (minus the roundtables) as well as the choice of the building locations was excellent. It was really easy to navigate. Also, they all seemed to run smoothly I didn't see any with any major problems. Also, I met
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food &amp; Other Amenities</th>
<th>some of the organizers and they were really helpful, nice, and open to feedback.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I thought the space for the conference was excellent. It was easy to navigate and well organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I appreciated how all of the sessions were located so close to where we were staying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Great job. UMass Lowell was a great location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Should have had the conference in Boston. The fact that you tried to tie the conference in with Swampscott was lost on many people who I spoke with. The large cost of transportation to travel nearly an hour outside of Boston, to a town with very little to do, was simply not worth the money spent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Great venue and terrific organization!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loved the bag and water bottle. Great location. Great town - very diverse. Affordable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• box lunches were very light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The city of Lowell seemed largely unprepared for the size of our conference. Perhaps more communication with local restaurants would ensure they were prepared for us. More clear recommendations and information about restaurants to visit would have been helpful. As an example: one of the recommended restaurants (Ward8) only had 1 cook and 1 server. That information may have deterred us from the 2.5 hour wait for dinner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The amount and quality of the food provided was problematic. I appreciate that there was likely a catering contract that went with the site, but lunches provided were not good. Individuals with special diets had trouble getting their food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Also - restaurants in the local area weren't prepared to handle large parties - Practice council had an event at a restaurant that other groups also went to (unrelated to the practice council) and the restaurant could not keep up and it was a negative experience for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good job. I wish I’d gotten to meet more of you. By the way, you live in a beautiful town of very friendly people who dealt with the onslaught of at least two simultaneous conferences pretty well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• would have liked alternative breakfast options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1) Less waste during the lunches; 2); 2) Banquet food service was mildly chaotic; 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thanks for the hospitality. There were some aspects that I wasn’t overly satisfied with (food, dorm rooms) but, overall, the conference was a very positive experience and I will be attending future SCRA Biennials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• great job, except for the meals and coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Please also provide better vegetarian and vegan options, and more of them as many people eat vegetarian meals by preference even though they do not have dietary restrictions. If 1/3 (or more) of the options were vegetarian/vegan, it would be easier to accommodate people (and less expensive, more environmentally friendly, healthier, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, it was an excellent conference. I was pleasantly surprised and impressed, since this was my first SCRA Biennial conference. In the future, I think the only change I would appreciate is better planning regarding meals. As someone with food allergies, I understand how and why it’s easier to combine all dietary restrictions with one meal, but that just further limits food options for anyone with one food allergy. For example, gluten-free people are used to eating meat, and vegans are used to eating real bread/normal carbs. A lot of their calories come from those foods they can eat, so I think most vegans and gluten-free people were simply very hungry every day since their diets were limited more than usual. Also, fruit (apples, bananas, oranges, grapes, berries, etc.) would have been nice for both groups during breakfast and lunch. The gluten-free muffins and bread were just terrible. A salad with protein (i.e. chicken), lots of vegetables and a real piece of fruit would have been a far better lunch option. If better meals are too expensive then maybe just charge people with food allergies less to attend the conference and have them buy their own food externally during the next conference. That’s what I ended up doing anyway, so I essentially paid double for my food.
### Appendix D. Recommendations for future Biennials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Recommendations for Future Biennials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Venue & Accommodations**    | - More easily accessible town/city  
- It is critical to keep the hotel on the conference site—otherwise people are wasting time and transportation traveling between hotel and conference site. It certainly is not green to be driving busses and cars between hotels and conference site.  
- When picking a conference site, please make sure to pick a place where lodging is adequate and transportation is easy  
- While I understand the interest in hosting Biennials at the universities, I think we may have outgrown that option as an association. The time required of the organizers is immense, and the accommodations are always challenging. I think SCRA should consider switching to traditional conference centers, which would ease the planning, lodging, transportation, and food challenges.  
- Please ensure that adequate lodging options are available for conference participants  
- Take early arrivals into consideration.  
- Maybe host it in a hotel a bit more used to large events? I get the feeling people here weren’t that prepared.  
- Host in a city with better public transportation.  
- It would be helpful to have conferences closer to an airport to help with transportation costs  
- No more dorm room housing.  
- The location of the Federal Building being away from the Conference center decreased participation due to the walking distance. It would be great to have the presentations in one centralized location for maximum attendance. |
| **Food & Drink**              | - Have adequate amounts of coffee available all day  
- Ensure there vegetarian meal options are available and provided in a way that does not single-out or marginalized vegetarian conference participants.  
- Meals should be planned so that all attendees feel welcome (including vegetarians!).  
- Consider inviting individuals with dietary restrictions to help inform food planning  
- Better food options for gluten-free participants.  
- Have a list of restaurants for people to choose from  
- More breakfast choices  
- Include and open bar as part of the banquet fee. Avoid cash bars.  
- Water should always be available and free  
- Please provide lunches with adequate portions and with plenty of protein. Or consider not providing food and lower the conference registration fee. |
| **Conference Content**        | - Push for greater diversity of topics, presenters, and content  
- Add an activity to welcome first-time conference attendees  
- Retain all the social activities  
- Model UMASS’s efforts to connect conference participants with the local community  
- Increase the number of large group activities, including fun activities.  
- Bonding and networking activities for participants to get to know each other and to foster a sense of community and the friendly inclusive culture of SCRA.  
- Consider not having a performance at the banquet -- the spectating really seems to distance us from the local community and position them as others
Separate roundtables and provide an option for semi-structured discussion with audio visual.
Consider offering a few additional practice-oriented sessions; the conference was heavy on research and academia.
Increase participation from non-academics, including advocates, policy makers, and practitioners.
The policy should be to have presenters only present one first authored paper to provide opportunity for more presenters.
Highlight more student involvement.
Have posters in a central location where they can be viewed later in the day if you miss the session.
I would have loved to hear more presentations by some of the key individuals in the field. Not necessarily research but more thought-provoking, food-for-thought commentary.
I attended quite a few sessions that were straight research presentations. My understanding was that SCRA was moving away from this format to more innovative programming.
Put the poster session in the lunch room.

### Conference Structure, Scheduling, & Design
- Shorten overall length of conference.
- The proximity to conference site and $89 per night rate are very important especially for those who are not financed by their institutions which are continually cutting back in reimbursements.
- Having a central space where people naturally congregated (the lobby) was very important for keeping people connected in their non-session time.
- Maybe set aside more open spaces to gather. Things felt a little compartmentalized here.
- Take more care in scheduling sessions that address similar issues at different times, or organize separate tracks.
- Have some way we might give back to the community that we visit. For example, I saw at least one non-local SCRA member who took it on herself to be part of a group handing out free food to needy people in downtown Lowell.
- Have technical assistance available for sessions, and longer set-up times between sessions.
- Vary scheduling of important events and plenaries.
- Replicate the (proximal) geographic layout of events from this Biennial in the future.
- Please consider childcare arrangements early in the planning process. I appreciated the organizers’ coming up with childcare options, but I needed to decide on airplane tickets 6 weeks in advance of the conference, so by the time the childcare options were announced it was too late to affect my plans.
- Avoid scheduling presenters in back-to-back presentations.
- Also, it might be helpful to have 20 minutes between sessions instead of just 15 because sometimes sessions go over and also some are further apart from each other so less people walk in late.
- Some people from outside the US may need letters from the organizers to show at their respective embassies in order to apply for the visa into Canada. It may be difficult for some people.
- It would be great for committee meetings to be a part of the schedule and incorporated into the App.
- Consider providing more opportunities to early career community psychologists, including funding opportunities.
- Create a Biennial fee category for people whose earnings are constituted primarily by adjunct teaching.
- Maps with the rooms/building at the registration table would have been helpful. It took some time to get used to the layout— and this is why I was glad that I had my printed book.
- Invite members of the local community to attend the conference.
- Continue to work to be as accessible as possible by involving SCRA members with disabilities in the planning of the conference.

**Conference Greening**
- Incentivize the use of green technology.
- Also, if you decide that some people are going to have printed conference books and some people are going to opt out, you should keep some sort of track of the people who did not opt out, so that books are actually there for them when they get to the conference. I do not have a smartphone, so I couldn’t use the app to look at the descriptions of the talks, and the yellow handout did not have information about the individual presenters, or a map, or information about lunch, etc. It was very frustrating because I specifically said that I wanted a paper copy of the book and when I got there I was told they were all gone. Either save the books for specific people, or print enough that everyone who comes can have one.
- If you are trying to be green, a different way of serving lunch would reduce the waste from the cardboard boxes.
- Have alternatives for people who don’t use apps, such as thumb drives or paper agendas.