

2011 Campus Town Summit Evaluation Summary Report

Statistical Analysis and Report Compiled and Written By:

Eric Davidson, M.A., C.S.A.D.P.,

Project Director

Illinois Higher Education Center for Alcohol, Other Drug, and Violence Prevention

November 2011



2011 Campus Town Summit Evaluation Summary Report

November 2011

Introduction

On Wednesday, October 19, 2011, the Third College Town Summit, sponsored by the Illinois Liquor Control Commission, was held at the Illinois State University Bone Student Center. Approximately 175 attendees gathered to hear the Bloomington/Normal Campus Community Coalition (BNCCC) and Illinois State University members describe its efforts to address the celebratory drinking situation known as “Fool’s Fest” and form groups based on profession and geographic location to discuss how to address such events. The day concluded with a strategy review.

To evaluate the day, a survey was developed and distributed to the attendees. At the end of the day, 67 surveys were returned for submission (39.4%). An additional two surveys were returned by mail/fax. A link to an on-line survey was then sent by e-mail to all attendees. According to on-line diagnostics, 17 individuals viewed the survey, 9 individuals started; however, none of these 9 completed the surveys, making them unusable.

The focus of this survey was to assess the perceptions and opinions of the individuals who participated in the 2011 Campus Town Summit. Topical Areas within the survey include:

- Publicity and Registration
- Conference Planning and Promotion
- BNCCC/ISU Panel Discussion
- Discipline/Work Area Roundtable Discussion
- College Town/Regional Roundtable Discussion
- Strategy Review
- Demographics

Demographics

- 58% of respondents indicated being employed by a university or college; 42% of respondents indicated that they were not employed by a university or college.
- Of those employed by a university, the greatest classification segment appeared to be represented by health educators (17.9%), department directors (15.4%), Deans of Students (10.3%), counselors (7.7%), judicial affairs (7.7%), and medical staff (5.1%).
- Over 1/3 of university personnel indicated that they held other job classifications with residence life being the most common open ended answer.
- Of those not employed by a university, the greatest classification segment appeared to be represented by non-profit preventionists (25.8%), government administrators/elected officials (19.4%), police/law enforcement (16.1%), and statewide professional agency staff (12.9%).

- Of the 69 respondents, 69.6% indicated that their position involved addressing alcohol use/abuse.
- Almost half (49.3%) of the respondents had attended a previous campus town summit.

Publicity and Registration

- 42.0% strongly agreed that the summit was well advertised and promoted.
- 63.8 strongly agreed that the registration process was efficient.
- 56.5% strongly agreed that the registration confirmation was timely and informative.

Mean Scores of Individual Items

Aggregate mean scores and mean scores of those affiliated with university and those not affiliated with universities for each individual item are noted below. There were no statistically significant differences noted between the mean scores of university staff and non-university staff.

Item	Aggregate Mean	University Mean	Non-University Mean
Scale used for scoring : 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree			
The summit was well advertised and promoted	3.33	3.25	3.45
The registration process was efficient	3.58	3.55	3.62
The registration confirmation was timely and informative	3.52	3.43	3.66

Marketing Channels

Various communication methods were used to promote the event. As easily seen, university affiliated participants were more likely to be notified of the event through IHEC communication channels, while non-university participants were more likely notified through ILCC communication channels. In terms of statistical differences, significant differences in the proportion of university affiliated individuals vs. non-university affiliated individuals hearing about the event were found regarding the IHEC List Serve, IHEC Newsletter, and IHEC Quarterly Newsletter.

Marketing Channel	Yes - University Only	Yes - Non-University	Yes- Aggregate
ILCC Website	7.5%	13.8%	10.1%
ILCC Newsletter	7.5%	17.2%	11.6%
ILCC Mailing	34.5%	17.5%	24.6%
IHEC List Serve/E-Mail*	35.0%	10.3%	24.6%
IHEC Newsletter*	25.0%	3.4%	15.9%
IHEC Quarterly Newsletter*	17.5%	0%	10.1%
Supervisor/Administrator	32.5%	41.4%	36.2%

Conference Planning

- 58.0% strongly agreed that the summit date was well scheduled and did not conflict with other major events.
- 58.0% strongly agreed that the summit location was centrally located and easily accessible from their point of origin.
- 64.7% strongly agreed that summit parking was easily available.
- 68.1% strongly agreed that summit meeting facilities were spacious.
- 68.1% strongly agreed that meeting facilities adequately met the needs of event purpose.
- 39.1% strongly agreed that summit lunch meal offerings were satisfying.

Mean Scores of Individual Items

Aggregate mean scores and mean scores of those affiliated with university and those not affiliated with universities for each individual item are noted below. There were no statistically significant differences noted between the mean scores of university staff and non-university staff.

Item Scale used for scoring : 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree	Aggregate Mean	University Mean	Non- University Mean
The summit date was well scheduled and did not conflict with other major events.	3.58	3.58	3.59
The summit location was centrally located and easily accessible from their point of origin.	3.56	3.55	3.55
Summit parking was easily available.	3.62	3.64	3.59
Summit meeting facilities were spacious.	3.68	3.70	3.66
Meeting facilities adequately met the needs of event purpose.	3.68	3.75	3.59
Summit lunch meal offerings were satisfying.	3.25	3.30	3.17

BNCCC/ISU Panel Discussion

- 39.1% strongly agreed that the ISU/BNCCC Session was relevant to them/their organization.
- 55.1% strongly agreed that the ISU/BNCCC Session provided stimulus for further discussion.
- 50.0% strongly agreed that the ISU/BNCCC Session content was useful in identifying potential issues that could occur in their campus-community.
- 47.8% strongly agreed that the ISU/BNCCC Session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to prevent celebratory drinking.
- 40.6% strongly agreed that the ISU/BNCCC Session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to intervene in celebratory drinking.
- 53.6% strongly agreed that the ISU/BNCCC Session kept their interest.

Mean Scores of Individual Items

Aggregate mean scores and mean scores of those affiliated with university and those not affiliated with universities for each individual item are noted below. There were no statistically significant differences noted between the mean scores of university staff and non-university staff.

Mean Scores of Individual Items - BNCCC/ISU Panel Discussion

Aggregate mean scores and mean scores of those affiliated with university and those not affiliated with universities for each individual item are noted below. There were no statistically significant differences noted between the mean scores of university staff and non-university staff.

Item Scale used for scoring : 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree	Aggregate Mean	University Mean	Non-University Mean
The ISU/BNCCC Session was relevant to them/their organization.	3.32	3.28	3.38
The ISU/BNCCC Session provided stimulus for further discussion.	3.49	3.38	3.66
The ISU/BNCCC Session content was useful in identifying potential issues that could occur in their campus-community.	3.46	3.38	3.57
The ISU/BNCCC Session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to prevent celebratory drinking.	3.45	3.38	3.55
The ISU/BNCCC Session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to intervene in celebratory drinking.	3.38	3.27	3.52
The ISU/BNCCC Session kept their interest.	3.49	3.43	3.59

Discipline/Work Area Roundtable Discussion

- 40.6% strongly agreed that the discipline roundtable session was relevant to them/their organization.
- 42.2% strongly agreed that the discipline roundtable session provided stimulus for further discussion.
- 39.7% strongly agreed that the discipline roundtable session content was useful in identifying potential issues that could occur in their campus-community.
- 31.3% strongly agreed that the discipline roundtable session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to prevent celebratory drinking.
- 32.8% strongly agreed that the discipline roundtable session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to intervene in celebratory drinking.
- 40.6% strongly agreed that the discipline roundtable session kept their interest.

Mean Scores of Individual Items- Discipline/Work Area Roundtable Discussion

Aggregate mean scores and mean scores of those affiliated with university and those not affiliated with universities for each individual item are noted below. There were no statistically significant differences noted between the mean scores of university staff and non-university staff.

Item	Aggregate Mean	University Mean	Non-University Mean
Scale used for scoring : 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree			
The discipline roundtable session was relevant to them/their organization.	3.30	3.22	3.39
The discipline roundtable session provided stimulus for further discussion.	3.30	3.25	3.36
The discipline roundtable session content was useful in identifying potential issues that could occur in their campus-community.	3.27	3.22	3.33
The discipline roundtable session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to prevent celebratory drinking.	3.11	2.97	3.29
The discipline roundtable session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to intervene in celebratory drinking.	3.11	2.97	3.29
The discipline roundtable session kept their interest.	3.28	3.17	3.43

College Town/Regional Roundtable Discussion

- 54.4% strongly agreed that the college town/regional roundtable session was relevant to them/their organization.
- 55.2% strongly agreed that the college town/regional roundtable session provided stimulus for further discussion.
- 47.8% strongly agreed that the college town/regional roundtable session content was useful in identifying potential issues that could occur in their campus-community.
- 50.0% strongly agreed that the college town/regional roundtable session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to prevent celebratory drinking.
- 42.6% strongly agreed that the college town/regional roundtable session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to intervene in celebratory drinking.
- 60.3% strongly agreed that the college town/regional roundtable session kept their interest.

Mean Scores of Individual Items - College Town/Regional Roundtable Discussion

Aggregate mean scores and mean scores of those affiliated with university and those not affiliated with universities for each individual item are noted below. There were no statistically significant differences noted between the mean scores of university staff and non-university staff.

Item	Aggregate Mean	University Mean	Non-University Mean
Scale used for scoring : 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree			
The college town/regional roundtable session was relevant to them/their organization.	3.47	3.40	3.57
The college town/regional roundtable session provided stimulus for further discussion.	3.49	3.46	3.54
The college town/regional roundtable session content was useful in identifying potential issues that could occur in their campus-community.	3.42	3.36	3.50
The college town/regional roundtable session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to prevent celebratory drinking.	3.40	3.30	3.52
The college town/regional roundtable session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to intervene in celebratory drinking.	3.32	3.21	3.48
The college town/regional roundtable session kept their interest.	3.54	3.48	3.62

Strategy Review Discussion

- 37.3% strongly agreed that the strategy review discussion was relevant to them/their organization.
- 37.3% strongly agreed that the strategy review discussion provided stimulus for further discussion.
- 32.8% strongly agreed that strategy review discussion content was useful in identifying potential issues that could occur in their campus-community.
- 31.0% strongly agreed that strategy review discussion content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to prevent celebratory drinking.
- 34.5% strongly agreed that the strategy review discussion content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to intervene in celebratory drinking.
- 39.0% strongly agreed that the strategy review discussion kept their interest.

Mean Scores of Individual Items - Strategy Review Discussion

Aggregate mean scores and mean scores of those affiliated with university and those not affiliated with universities for each individual item are noted below. There were no statistically significant differences noted between the mean scores of university staff and non-university staff.

Item	Aggregate Mean	University Mean	Non-University Mean
Scale used for scoring : 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree			
The strategy review session was relevant to them/their organization	3.20	3.11	3.34
The strategy review session provided stimulus for further discussion.	3.17	3.08	3.30
The strategy review session content was useful in identifying potential issues that could occur in their campus-community	3.16	3.06	3.32
The strategy review session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to prevent celebratory drinking	3.12	3.03	3.27
The strategy review session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to intervene in celebratory drinking	3.14	3.06	3.27
The strategy review session kept their interest	3.03	2.89	3.26

Reasons for Attending the Campus Summit

Reason	Yes - University Only	Yes - Non-University	Yes- Aggregate
Interest in topic	70.0%	58.6%	65.2
Summit Presenter	0.0%	3.4%	1.4
Summit Group Facilitator	5.0%	13.8%	8.7
Summit Planning Committee	10.0%	3.4%	7.2
University/College Rep	70.0%	3.4%	42.0
Municipal Gov't Rep	0.0%	41.4%	17.4
Request by Supervisor/Admin	20.0	20.7%	20.3

Plan to Attend Next Year

	Yes - University Only	Yes - Non-University	Yes- Aggregate
Yes	65.5%	55.0%	59.4%
No/Maybe	34.5%	45.0%	40.6%

No statistically significant differences were found between university and non-university attendees regarding plans to attend next year's event.

When comparing individual survey questions, some differences within the mean scores between those planning to attend and those who indicated maybe or no were found. Only those questions whose means had a statistically significant difference are noted below. Such examination of these differences may allow program planners to focus on areas which separate those who plan to return from those whose attendance is in question.

Item Scale used for scoring : 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree	Aggregate Mean	Yes-Attend Next Year Mean	No/Maybe Attend Next Year Mean
The ISU/BNCCC Session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to prevent celebratory drinking.	3.45	3.59	3.25
The ISU/BNCCC Session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to intervene in celebratory drinking.	3.38	3.51	3.17
The discipline roundtable session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to prevent celebratory drinking.	3.11	3.31	2.80
The discipline roundtable session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to intervene in celebratory drinking.	3.11	3.36	2.72
The discipline roundtable session kept their interest.	3.28	3.49	2.96
The college town/regional roundtable session was relevant to them/their organization.	3.47	3.63	3.22
The college town/regional roundtable session provided stimulus for further discussion.	3.49	3.70	3.19
The college town/regional roundtable session kept their interest.	3.54	3.75	3.25
The strategy review session was relevant to them/their organization.	3.20	3.44	2.83
The strategy review session provided stimulus for further discussion.	3.17	3.39	2.83
The strategy review session content was useful in identifying potential issues that could occur in their campus-community.	3.16	3.39	2.77
The strategy review session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to prevent celebratory drinking.	3.12	3.31	2.82
The strategy review session content was useful in identifying potential strategies which could be used to intervene in celebratory drinking.	3.14	3.39	2.73
The strategy review session kept their interest.	3.03	3.28	2.65

Segments of the Program that Were of Greatest Value

Survey respondents were asked to complete an open-ended question asking what segments of the program were of greatest value. The top three choices by both university and non-university:

- ISU/BNCCCC Breakout
- Campus/Community/Regional Roundtable
- Sgt Friedlein – Social Media

Segments of the Program that Were of the Least Value

Survey respondents were asked to complete an open-ended question asking what segments of the program were of least value. The top three choices by both university and non-university:

- Lunch
- Strategy review
- Group discussions

Suggestions for Next Summit Topics

Survey respondents were asked to complete an open-ended question asking what themes or topics should be addressed in a future campus summit. Unlike the previous two open ended questions; top choices did differ between university and non-university attendees.

The top three choices by university affiliated attendees were:

- Campus-community coalition building/development – best practices
- Primary prevention and evidence-based efforts to address collegiate alcohol use
- Environmental strategies (responsible beverage service, alcohol free activities)

The top three choices by non-university affiliated attendees were:

- Addressing off-campus parties/housing
- Environmental strategies (law enforcement)
- Coalition building

Thoughts and Discussion

- Strongly considering specific topics to address and the specific populations to target appear to lead to greater summit success. This year's summit took a more specific approach, and from these results, as well as anecdotal comments made by participants, there was greater satisfaction and value.
- Multiple marketing channels targeting specific sub-audiences are needed to boost participant attendance. Those used seem to work, however other channels may currently be overlooked.
- When considering specific topics, the planning committee should also discuss who from the community and campus should be targeted as potential participants.
- Almost a third of participants indicated that they had been made aware of the event by their supervisors. While communicating and marketing to higher level administrators is important for buy-in and commitment, attempting to communicate and market to those more directly involved with substance abuse prevention efforts may prove more beneficial.
- October seems like a good time to have the event, especially if the Department of Education is not holding their annual meeting.
- Parking seemed to be less of an issue than in past years.
- Despite a free lunch, the lunch meal was one of the lowest rated areas of the day. Perhaps, a small registration fee should be implemented to off-set luncheon costs.
- Diversity of audience and striving to meet the needs of the specific audience members continues to be a challenge, particularly when trying to establish work or discussion groups.
- While efforts to respect audience member's time have always been an item of consideration in planning the schedule for the day, a theme regarding work groups was that there was not enough time to adequately facilitate them. Should 3 groups be considered, perhaps the day's schedule needs to be lengthened.
- While few respondents indicated that they would not be returning next year, there were a number of maybes. Finding relevant themes and topics, as well as making sure that audience members understand the purpose and learning outcomes of the day, are critical in having a good fit between audience participants and expectations.
- The continuum of care (prevention, intervention, treatment) needs to be strongly considered. Some preventionists felt that a more comprehensive view outside of enforcement, focusing on primary prevention is needed.