

NCPA Conference Survey Summary

21st Annual Psychology Undergraduate Conference – November 15, 2014

The following brief report is a summary of the responses from 106 conference attendees that agreed to complete the post conference survey. While no demographic information was requested, respondents included 8 freshman, 7 sophomores, 34 juniors, 53 seniors, and 4 students that did not indicate class level.

Application and Needs

Respondents were asked to rate the degree in which this conference met their needs and was applicable to them. The rating scale was from 1 to 5 with a rating of 1 indicating they strongly disagreed with a statement of conference utility and a rating of 5 indicating they strongly agreed with a statement of conference utility. The average scores and statements are listed below.

Table 1: Need and Application Ratings

Statement	N	Avg.	Notes
The Undergraduate Conference met my needs	106	4.5	No ratings of 1; no ratings of 2; mode was 5
The Graduate school Representatives met my needs	106	4.25	18 ratings of 3 or below; mode was 5
Graduate School presentation was applicable to me.	105	4.5	12 ratings of 3 or below; mode was 5

Small Group Sessions

Based on the handwritten titles provided by students, there were 20 small group sessions as represented in Table 2 below. The ratings below are based on the same scale as referenced above (1 = strongly disagree/5= strongly agree). The per group statement that respondents are rating is; *I found this Small Group Session Helpful.*

Table 2: Small Group Session Ratings

Group	N	Avg. Rating
Getting into Grad School	24	4.7
Counseling Psychology	35	4.3
Social/Personality	19	4.5
Military	9	4.6
Health/SA	14	4.5
Forensic	20	4.1
Neuropsychology	11	3.8
Industrial-organizational Psychology	10	4.6
Psychology Hospital	8	4.5
School Psychology	20	4.5
Graduate Record Examination	25	4.52
Adult/Private Practice	3	4.3
Behavioral Analysis	20	4.1
Child and Adolescent Psychology	25	4.8
Sport Psychology	9	4.7
Community Mental Health	13	4.2

Academic	5	4.6
Multicultural	4	4
University	7	4.5
VA Hospitals	4	4.6

Respondents were asked to provide open ended comments or remarks regarding the small group sessions. There were approximately 44 respondents that added “open ended” responses. Of these responses, 65% were responses emphasizing the positive experiences in each group and the utility of the group sessions for personal careers. For example, one respondent offered, “These sessions were incredibly helpful. I learned so much, and they made me feel more confident about the profession I hope to have”. Of the remaining 15 open ended comments, the main thoughts expressed were as follows: 1) suggestions that respondents need more than just three small group sessions, and more small group options; 2) requests that hand-outs and power-points be utilized by presenters ; 3) requests for summaries about what groups will be about beforehand to assist in choosing which groups to attend; 4) suggestions for future small group options [ex. history of psychology, marriage and family therapy, etc.]; 5) one complaint that no presenter showed up for the Industrial Psychology small group; and 6) one complaint about the content of certain groups being “too depressing and discouraging.”

Other information that should be noted is that some of the respondents felt that there was overlap in the “Getting into Grad School” presentation and the material offered in some of the small groups. They felt that took up time that could have been spent on information that was not covered.

General

The following data is related to general questions about the conference. When asked, *how did you find out about this conference*, a majority indicated they found out about this conference from their professor (69.8%). Six respondents found out about the conference via a web based search. Nine respondents heard about the conference via email. Five respondents chose not to answer where they had found out about the conference. Finally, 13 respondents reported other sources. Of those 13 respondents, 5 heard of the conference through their Psi Chi chapter, 3 saw flyers on campus, and 5 heard about it from a friend or colleague. Ninety respondents (84.9%) indicated this was the first time they had attended this conference. Nine respondents had attended this conference before and seven respondents left this item blank. Despite this low re-attendance rate, 93% of respondents indicated they would recommend this conference to other people. Every respondent that answered said they would recommend the conference to others. Seven respondents did not respond. When asked, *would you like to receive information about the next conference*, 53% of the respondents indicated they would not like to receive information about the next conference.

When asked if there was enough time for questions and discussion in the small group session and during breakout sessions with graduate students, 91.5% of respondents indicated there was enough time in the small groups and 86.9% of respondents indicated there was enough time with graduate student representatives. 51.8% of respondents indicated that the Poster Sessions were helpful in planning a future in psychology. Of note, 18.8% of all respondents left this item blank (poster session utility).

The questionnaire also required respondents to comment on the things they liked “best” and “least” about the undergraduate conference. They could comment on program content or general information about the conference. Many of the concerns expressed in this report section correlated with the

concerns expressed about the small group sessions. The thing that most respondents liked “least” about the conference was that there was not enough time for small group sessions. The other dislike related to a lack of food options and consideration of special diets like gluten-free and kosher diets. By far, there were more positive remarks than complaints. The majority of responses about what respondents liked the “best” was the utility of the small group sessions and being able to speak with representatives from graduate programs.

Summary and Recommendations

In general, the response to the 21st Annual Undergraduate Conference was positive and encouraging. The positive remarks exceeded the negative remarks. Any complaints seemed to be about wanting more information and time for information, rather than about any problems with the information that was presented. The feedback about the quality of the conference was extremely positive and the improvements that can be made are minor. Based on the ratings and open ended feedback from respondents regarding the small group sessions, the SASA will work to accomplish the following:

- Provide summaries of small group classes to assist in choosing
- Investigate possibility of securing e-based presentation technology (e.g., Powerpoint)
- Ask all presenters to prepare handouts for those attending their small group session
- Consider the possibility of allowing time for more group sessions

In regard to the general operations of the next conference, based on respondent ratings and the open ended feedback received, the SASA will work to accomplish the following:

- Reduce the length of morning session and increase small group session time
- Provide microphones for presenters and panels in large group sessions