

1. Is this the first NDSPE Annual Meeting you have attended? (22 answered, 0 skipped)

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	45.5%	10
No	54.5%	12

2. If no, how many previous meetings have you attended? (14 answered, 8 skipped)

	Response Percent	Response Count
1-4	50.0%	7
5-9	14.3%	2
10 or more	35.7%	5

3. Rate the quality of the facilities (14 answered, 8 skipped)

	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Sleeping Rooms	7.7% 1	7.7% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	84.6% 11	4.5	13
Meals	28.6% 4	28.6% 4	21.4% 3	0	0	21.4% 3	4.09	14
General Meeting Area	28.6% 4	50.0% 7	14.3% 2	0	0	7.1% 1	4.15	14
Educational Rooms	21.4% 3	35.7% 5	21.4% 3	14.3% 2	0	7.1% 1	3.69	14

Comments:

- 1 Educational Room for the technical sessions needed larger tables to spread out handouts and write notes during the session.
- 2 I did not attend the banquet so my meal scores were based on the breakfast and lunch items.

3. Rate the overall conference (20 answered, 2 skipped)

	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	N/A	Response Count
Meeting Format	35.0% 7	55.0% 11	10.0% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	20
Schedule (date/times)	30.0% 6	65.0% 13	5.0% 1	0	0	0	20
Educational Topics	35.0% 7	35.0% 7	25.0% 5	0	0	5.0% 1	20
Overall Meeting	35.0% 7	60.0% 12	0	5.0% 1	0	0	20
Board & Prof. Topics	35.0% 7	40.0% 8	15.0% 3	0	0	10.0% 2	20

Comments:

- 1 Was unable to participate in the meetings due to a back injury
- 2 I really like the inclusion of non-civil related topics. I'm a mechanical engineer so I appreciate the variety and I liked the project management training since it seemed to be more universal than some of the highly technical topics.
- 3 Abreviated business meeting was nice. Extended educational sessions were necessary.
- 4 A little lengthy
- 5 Great work...

4. Rank the General Meeting (19 answered, 3 skipped)

	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	Response Count
Was it well run?	47.4% 9	47.4% 9	0	5.3% 1	0.0% 0	19
Adequate Length	33.3% 6	55.6% 10	5.6% 1	5.6% 1	0	18
Topics covered	26.3% 5	52.6% 10	21.1% 4	0	0	19

Suggestions for Improvements:

- 1 Still need a little more time for business meeting. 90 minutes was a little too brief.

5. Rank the Speakers (19 answered, 3 skipped)

	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor	N/A	Response Count
Brad Aldrich	52.6% 10	31.6% 6	5.3% 1	0	0	10.5% 2	19
Dr. T. Lahdhiri	16.7% 3	38.9% 7	16.7% 3	5.6% 1	0	22.2% 4	18
Wayne Reitz	5.9% 1	29.4% 5	0	0	0	64.7% 11	17
Robert Dettman	17.6% 3	11.8% 2	0	0	0	70.6% 12	17
David Sethre	6.3% 1	12.5% 2	6.3% 1	0	0	75.0% 12	16
Robert Pieri	5.6% 1	33.3% 6	11.1% 2	0	5.6% 1	44.4% 8	18
Terry Dullum	0	22.2% 4	33.3% 6	0	5.6% 1	38.9% 7	18

Comments:

- 2 I thought the 2 speakers from Canada could have a shorter speech. Their topics seem to overlap each other's topics and alot of the information was not relevant to the purpose of the annual meeting.
- 3 The IEEE session on project management was definitely presented from an industry standpoint, not a private practice one.

Suggestions For Improvements:

- 1 Meeting was well organized and well run - it went smoothly. I appreciate the difficulty in getting people to attend but that is the key. Perhaps some new topics and cont. ed. options would help boost attendance?
- 2 I wouldn't change much about the actual event, I liked this year's event. Improvements: 1) I would put a little more time into the web site content. It was pretty weak and I was not aware of Friday's session topic until I arrived and saw the agenda; 2) I would like to have received a registration confirmation via email to let me know I was signed up.
- 3 The meeting during lunch on Thursday could have been run more professionally and organized better.
- 4 I thought it was very well done
- 5 More selections on seminars
- 6 Hold it in Bismarck

Courses or Topics for Future Meetings

- 1 Have someone to discuss a topic that is hot in the news at the time - for example this year it might have been the I35W bridge collapse. Something to draw interest from members who might not otherwise attend.
- 2 2 or more choices of technical tracks - one for the civil people and one for people in other disciplines. Again, the project management course was a good way to offer something of interest to more than just the civil engineers. I am a mechanical engineer involved in product development and apparently I am in the minority, but if the content is there I think you might get a few new members coming on board.
- 3 I enjoyed the wide variety of technical type cont. education seminars. Please continue to provide technical sessions in future annual meetings.
- 4 I think it is important that the topics cover a wide range of engineering since NSPE covers all types of engineering. However, this does not provide any depth into one specific area and the topics are more general to all types of engineering.
- 5 More technical seminars for Civil Eng, Elect. Eng, Mech. Eng, etc
- 6 Renewable Energy

Additional Comments:

- 1 Continuing ed. was very good overall. Having choices was a good idea. More choices would be even better although tough due to number of different disciplines of engineers.
- 2 Good job on the meeting, I thought it was run really well. Maybe you put some thought into it, but I know quite a few people who are not NSPE members who were unaware of the event and who may have been interested in attending. Next year I will most likely post a flyer on our bulletin board. When you send out the meeting notice it might be good to include a one-page flyer and encourage people to post in their workplace.