Evaluation

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This meeting has met my expectations and outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Speed Update on Day 1 was useful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Speakers on the Higher Education Environment (Day 1) were informative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The round-table discussions about the Higher Education Environment were useful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Speakers about ICT Research (Day 2) were informative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The round-table discussions about ICT Research were useful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Overall, I am now better informed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The meeting venue was good</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Catering was good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dinner was good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sessions that were good, were so because:
Informative and not too long
Relevant and informative speakers
Key challenges for Australian ICT Research
ARC analysis & skills – Australian gov insights not readily available
They were relevant and speakers were knowledgeable
Very informative and some definitive actions for improvement
They gave an insight into external developments relevant to ICT
Gained additional insights from speakers
Good opportunity for questions (would have been useful for a longer TEQSA session.
It was informative to listen to people like TEQSA [Commissioner] and UA VC.
High quality invited speakers
As a newcomer to the community I gained a lot of community context about common issues and objectives across the sector.
Very good invited speakers
Information is rich
Generally excellent vibe
Round-table discussions

Sessions that were not so good, were so because:
Round table discussions are always a bit of a [problem] but the aggregated list of issues was very useful.
They did not lend to any suggestions or recommendations.
Too many speakers – need fewer with longer

The next ACM would be better if:
Bigger room, better coffee
More discussions with group activities
Actions coming out of discussions and assigned to participants
It was held at a hotel or independent venue

Any other comments
Well organised by Tony, Peter/SCU
Generally this was the best ACM so far. Well done to Tony Koppi for an excellent job.