

**EAUC BOARD PAPER**  
**Title: Conference Report**  
**Paper No: 22.07.14**



**For Information**

**Purpose**

To inform the Board of the outcomes of the 2010 Annual Conference

**Main Report**

**Finances**

	<b>Income</b>	<b>Budget</b>
Delegate income	£65,976	£64,530
Exhibitor & Sponsor income	£65,340	£57,215
Total income	£131,316	£121,745
	<b>Expenditure</b>	
Expenditure	£54,655.07	£48,610.43
Surplus	£77,320.93	£78,703.57

We made a **£77,320.93 surplus** on the 2010 Conference which is £1,382.64 less than budgeted (This does not include staff time.), but does in show a positive variance of £20,123 from 2009. Investment into additional marketing undertaken this year was not budgeted for and accounted for £6,366. This included a logo and editorial above the usual channels.

This year we saw a greater number of sponsors than in 2009 and this allowed us to exceed income this year by £9,571.

2009 surplus was £57,198  
 2008 surplus was £68,500  
 2007 surplus was £52,588

£	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Variance from 09
Delegate Income	34,473	53,855	61,562	76,510	65,976	-10,534
Exhibitor & Sponsorship	11,200	33,810	54,173	38,375	65,340	26,965
Expenditure	25,500	35,077	47,208	57,687	54,655	-3,032
Surplus	20,173	52,588	68,526	57,198	77,321	20,123

**Delegate Breakdown**

2010 - 310 delegates (+ 12 staff) a decrease of 24 delegates compared to 2009.  
 2009 - 334 delegates (+ 8 staff) a increase of 54 delegates compared to 2008.  
 2008 - 280 delegates (+ staff) a increase of 33 delegates compared to 2007.

We had 94 different FHE institutions: HE 72 (77%) & FE 22 (23%). It was felt due to the economic climate that the FE institutions were unable to find resources (both time and money) to send staff along. There was also a conception by many that Bangor University was too remote and it would take too long to travel to.

- 2009 was 134 (HE 84 / FE 50)
- 2008 was 95 (HE 67 / FE 28)
- 2007 was 98 (HE 70 / FE 28)

	07	07	08	08	09	09	10	10
All	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
FHE Business Support	122	49	113	40	163	50	126	41
Academic	15	6	11	4	21	6	12	4
Senior Management	17	7	24	9	5	2	27	9
FHE Support Orgs	29	12	28	10	46	14	28	9
Commercial	54	22	89	32	84	26	107	34
Other	10	4	8	3	3	1	2	1
Student	n/a	n/a	7	3	2	1	8	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>100</b>

FHE Business Support	07	07	08	08	09	09	10	10
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Manager	56	46	60	53	89	55	82	39
Energy	4	3	2	2	1	1	8	4
Waste	1	1	1	1	3	2	3	1
H, S&E	8	7	4	4	1	1	4	2
Policy	n/a	n/a	1	1	1	1	5	2
Purchasing	3	2	n/a	n/a	2	1	0	0
Transport	6	5	6	5	8	5	9	4
Sus/Env	26	21	27	24	48	29	42	20
Estates/Facilities	4	3	2	2	3	2	1	1
Other Business Support	14	11	10	9	7	4	57	27
<b>Total</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>100</b>

### **Evaluation Summary**

Compared to previous years' evaluation summaries:

#### **Delegates**

Overall Event %	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Fair	4	2	5	8	2
Good	62	54	55	34	61
Very Good	35	44	40	58	37

#### **Exhibitors**

Overall Event %	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Fair					0
Good					56
Very Good					44

### **Issues to Consider for Future Conferences**

After thorough analysis of the delegate and exhibitor evaluations, we have identified the following as key issues and ideas for future conferences:

#### **General Comments**

- Another fantastic conference!
- Catering excellent although not enough water available and buffet dinner was too slow in coming out.
- Some of the rooms particularly the lecture theatre was very warm.
- Communication needs to be improved for next year to exclude people who have already booked.
- Speed networking event was a bit of a disaster this year. Too noisy due to the amount of hard surfaces in the venue. This was deceptive, as venue looked ideal.
- There was too much networking and not enough breaks/breakout time.
- A few issues with the online booking system for pre registration and it was a little complicated. Some found the web forms still a bit clunky, this needs to be streamlined.
- First year for the early bird offers seemed to work well, although hard to assess if the take up was from the people who book early anyway or because of the offer. However, it did provide additional revenue to the EAUC for the those booking late.

#### **Programme & Speakers**

- Speakers need to be more engaging. Some of the senior management people where not inspiring, need more people on the ground. As with ASHEE Conference (US), would be good to put out a call for interest managed through the website for speakers and workshops.
- More time is needed for the discussion in the plenary.
- The international element of the conference was very well received – need to retain this for next year. While this is likely to have the cost implications, it is well worth it. Options could be to get a video address to play or live VC link.
- It worked well having IP and AC as alternative Chairs. There could be facilitators assigned to 1 day (or a ½) day to pry more out of the speakers and the audience, some felt the multi-question format didn't really work and was better when interactive discussion of whole room when video crashed.
- Gala Dinner and band were well received, retain for previous years.
- Some felt there was too much FE focus this year. Think it is worth splitting out FE and HE for some sessions to focus more on individual requirements and it is clear to both sectors.
- Announcing the GG nominees at the conference dinner was again well received
- Has the speed networking session run its course? Possibly some other networking/fun event could be run like a quiz night or world café sessions?
- More 'free time' needed to network without pressure and allow for side meetings.
- The walking tour to the Environment Centre was well received.
- People enjoyed the poet.
- There were a number of people who questioned E.ON as sponsors as well as other sponsor involvement in the programme.
- From comments received by delegates, we could reduce the plenary sessions.

#### **Workshops**

- VC facility options for workshops – this could be a minimal charge for people to join in from external venues?
- Workshops need to be structured to give the attendee more of a direction whether beginners/intermediate/advanced and possibly signed up before hand.
- Far more interaction needed. Although people delivering workshops were briefed, some still delivered a presentation.
- It was felt that it was good to finish the workshops before a tea/lunch break.

- An hour is a good length for the workshops, although could possibly be longer.

### **Exhibition and Sponsors**

- This year the EAUC had a stand in the exhibition hall. This was great for the exhibitors as a point of contact but the space was compromised a little to make space for others due to Bangor not measuring the space properly. It would have been useful to have another large stand in a more prominent position to highlight EAUC's presence. 2 staff were required during the conference in the exhibition hall but more are needed to help set up and dismantle.
- Due to some late exhibitors committing their attendance this year, the exhibition hall was stretched to capacity. The space was a bit tight for the number of stands and the catering stations in the hall as well. There needs to be a clearly defined cut off date to ensure that the programme can be planned properly with less stress on staff and deadlines.
- Charging exhibitors for the gala dinner worked well and meant that there were less 'no shows' at tables.
- Some delegates felt there was too much of a commercial feel to the exhibition and that they need more hands on advice. Rather than stands, we could try to encourage more 'info booths' for people to set up meeting times.
- It was reported that the use of the projector in the hall was just a waste of electricity.
- While some delegates felt the exhibition could finish after lunch on day 2 some of the exhibitors would like it to be longer.
- For returning exhibitors we should circulate the location of their stands to allow for more interaction and possibly better positions.
- There was too much pressure to breakdown the exhibition in time for set up of the Gala dinner and this posed a risk if not ready in time. While it worked out ok, it would not be advisable to do so in the future.
- Sponsor sessions for Platinum, Gold and Silver need to be re-thought, as it was not overly well received by delegates. Also, need to readdress the sponsorship package options.
- If delegates signed up to sessions ahead of time, they could utilise the exhibition more, or for longer periods, but less frequent.

### **Venue**

- The venue itself was lovely and in lovely settings, however the halls were too far away for many delegates.
- Many felt that this venue was too far to travel to. We need to make more of a case that we need to choose venues in England, Wales and Scotland (and possibly NI!) to ensure we are addressing **all** of our members.
- Due to a change in Conference Manager (Bangor) and Organiser (EAUC) part way through the planning process it seemed confusing as to who at Bangor was the correct person to contact, as there were often different responses to the same query?
- The staff at Bangor were accommodating in changes and requests although we had to work hard to get some of our requirements across.
- It was often difficult to get hold of the necessary staff at Bangor.
- The venue needs to have open space for people to meet up in informally and for the option to sit during lunch if wanted.
- Several comments that the accommodation was poor, we need to offer other alternatives.

### **Staff**

**EAUC BOARD PAPER**  
**Title: Conference Report**  
**Paper No: 22.07.14**



- The 3 area leads (registration/workshops, plenary, exhibition) worked well and meant that 1 person wasn't relied on for everything.
- There were 2 members of staff down for the conference this year - 1 staff member was ill and didn't attend, 1 left early evening of day 1 and 1 arrived for the evening of day 1.

**Food**

- Larger amounts of vegetarian food is needed.
- The Locally sourced foods were well received, particularly the cakes!
- A special area for those with dietary requirements was used again this year and seemed to work quite well
- Evening vegetarian food was poor.

**Suggested future content from delegates. More on:**

- Procurement (Scope 3 emissions)
- Waste
- Energy (resource depletion)
- Transport
- CSR
- ESD (sustainable education, not 'should' but 'how', curriculum planners / academics)
- Leadership
- Legislation (legal Update workshop)
- More FE (Psychology: with strengthen input from FE)
- Practical knowledge and transfer sharing
- Behaviour Change/engagement
- Communications (How to inspire, comms toolkit, examples from campaigning NGO's out with the sector)
- Community & Student perspective

**AGM**

- The AGM had mixed views in it's structure and content but it was mainly reported as poor.
- There was confusion about the voting system for the new trustees and AGM procedures. We could do with better explanations of procedures before/at the AGM.
- Missed opportunity to promote the 'new' Board much more effectively and discussed what they envisage emerging as a structure to support members.

**Appendices for further information: (excel sheet containing)** – please contact Fiona Goodwin if you would like a copy

Delegate Evaluation Summary  
Exhibitor Evaluation Summary

Sarah Lee, Conference Organiser, June 2010