

ERAPPA 2007

Session Feedback Summary

TOTAL SUMMARY for ERAPPA 2007 Ottawa		Average Score
1	The speaker(s) was/were able to hold my interest	4.11
2	The speaker(s) encouraged audience interaction	3.75
3	The speaker(s) demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the topic	4.33
4	The speaker(s) was/were professional	4.37
5	The presentation materials were very applicable to the presentation	4.18
6	The presentation materials were professional	4.19
7	The presentation was not proprietary	4.09
9	I would like to hear more about this topic	4.01
9	I would recommend this speaker for ERAPPA/APPA events	4.03

Scoring Key: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree Average

	Average Score
All Speakers for Conference	3.50
Presentation materials	3.67

Scoring Key: 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Outstanding

CI - track	ID - track	RM - track	ST - track	SU - track
4.04	4.25	4.19	4.21	3.96
3.62	4.29	3.88	3.81	3.61
4.19	4.50	4.46	4.31	4.17
4.33	4.57	4.46	4.35	4.25
4.06	4.31	4.24	4.18	4.10
4.06	4.38	4.27	4.22	4.13
3.92	4.12	4.24	3.95	4.11
3.86	4.26	4.00	4.09	3.99
3.88	4.55	4.07	4.13	3.81
4.00	4.36	4.20	4.14	4.01
3.59	3.93	3.82	3.49	3.47
3.64	4.12	3.80	3.68	3.44

# of responses

Date

		CI-X	SU-X	CI-X	CI-X	SU-X	CI-X	SU-X	SU-X	RM-X	ST-X	ST-X	CI-X	RM-X	SU-X	CI-X	RM-X		Total Score
		34	33	0	22	9	17	15	34	19	17	17	37	31	59	35	35		414
1	The speaker(s) was/were able to hold my interest	4.1	3.9		3	3.78	4.18	4.4	4.12	4.53	4.12	4.47	4.51	4.48	4.34	4.4	3.31		4.1
		32.0	33.0		19	9	17	14	31	19	16	16	37	31	56	35	32		397.0
2	The speaker(s) encouraged audience interaction	3.5	4.0		2.84	3	4	4.14	3.48	3.84	3.38	4.06	4.08	4.77	3.75	4	2.94		3.7
		33.0	33.0		22	8	17	15	34	19	17	17	36	31	59	35	35		411.0
3	The speaker(s) demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the topic	4.3	4.1		3.57	3.94	4.59	4.93	4.5	4.79	4.24	4.35	4.64	4.55	4.64	4.34	3.89		4.4
		34.0	33.0		22	9	17	15	34	19	17	17	37	31	59	35	35		414.0
4	The speaker(s) was/were professional	4.3	4.1		3.77	3.89	4.47	4.87	4.21	4.79	4.18	4.59	4.59	4.61	4.61	4.49	3.91		4.4
		34.0	33.0		22	9	17	15	34	19	17	17	36	30	58	35	35		411.0
5	The presentation materials were very applicable to the presentation	3.9	4.0		3.75	4.22	4.41	4.73	3.85	4.53	4	4.24	4.25	4.4	4.32	4.31	4.01		4.2
		34.0	33.0		22	9	17	15	34	19	17	17	37	31	58	35	35		413.0
6	The presentation materials were professional	4.0	4.1		3.68	3.89	4.35	4.7	3.76	4.53	4.18	4.41	4.24	4.42	4.26	4.17	3.9		4.2
		33.0	32.0		20	9	17	15	34	18	17	16	35	29	57	35	34		401.0
7	The presentation was not proprietary	4.1	4.1		3.6	4.22	4.53	4.47	3.88	4.33	3.88	4.38	4.29	3.97	4.21	3.86	4.03		4.1
		34.0	33.0		22	9	17	15	34	19	16	17	35	31	58	35	35		410.0
8	I would like to hear more about this topic	3.9	3.9		3.18	3.44	4.47	4.17	3.94	4.37	3.94	4.41	4.17	4.42	4.22	4.34	3.34		4.0
		32.0	32.0		21	9	16	14	34	19	17	17	36	31	58	35	33		404.0
9	I would recommend this speaker for ERAPPA/APPA events	3.9	3.7		2.86	3.33	4.31	4.57	3.91	4.58	4.06	4.41	4.33	4.39	4.29	4.31	3.18		4.0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>		<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>3.6</b>		<b>4.1</b>

Scoring Key: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly

<b>Speaker #X</b>	29	30		21	8	15	15	31	18	16	16	32	28	53	30	32	374	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Score</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.7</b>		<b>2.52</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>4.33</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>4.18</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>3.7</b>
<b>Speaker #X</b>	29	29		20	8					16		35		53	29		219	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Score</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.0</b>		<b>3.13</b>	<b>3.13</b>					<b>3.91</b>		<b>4.0</b>		<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.1</b>			<b>3.6</b>
<b>Speaker #X</b>	28.0				8												36	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Score</b>	<b>3.3</b>				<b>3.13</b>													<b>3.2</b>
<b>Speaker #X</b>					8												8	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Score</b>	<b>3.5</b>				<b>3.13</b>													<b>3.3</b>
<b>Speaker Total</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.4</b>		<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>		<b>3.5</b>
<b>Presentation Materials</b>	20	23		15	7	12	13	28	16	13	14	22	26	49	22	29	309	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Score</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.6</b>		<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.0</b>		<b>3.6</b>

# of responses

Date

		RM-X	SU-X	ID 4-X	RM-X	ST-X	RM-X	ST-X	ST-X	ST-X	CI-X	RM-X	CI-X	ID 1-X	SU-X	ST-X		Total Score
		41	40	16	32	17	20	34	20	27	21	23	40	12	50	25		418
1	The speaker(s) was/were able to hold my interest	4.0	3.8	4.5	4.41	3.76	4.2	4.12	3.85	4.44	4.1	4.39	4.1	4	3.84	4.24		4.1
		42	39	16	31	16	20	34	20	25	20	23	39	13	48	25		411.0
2	The speaker(s) encouraged audience interaction	3.4	3.36	4.81	4.35	3.19	3.8	3.59	4.15	3.84	3.6	4.04	3.72	3.77	3.38	3.84		3.8
		42	40	16	32	17	20	34	20	27	21	23	38	13	50	25		418.0
3	The speaker(s) demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the topic	4.4	3.85	4.63	4.69	4.18	4.5	4.21	4.05	4.59	4.14	4.43	4.16	4.38	4.06	4.4		4.3
		42	40	16	32	17	20	34	20	27	21	22	39	13	50	25		418.0
4	The speaker(s) was/were professional	4.2	4.08	4.75	4.66	4.12	4.5	4.24	4.25	4.63	4.48	4.55	4.33	4.38	4.24	4.24		4.4
		40	40	16	31	17	20	34	19	27	21	23	39	13	50	24		414.0
5	The presentation materials were very applicable to the presentation	3.9	4.03	4.69	4.29	3.94	4.4	4.12	4.11	4.44	3.95	4.17	4.15	3.92	4.04	4.17		4.2
		41	40	16	31	17	20	34	20	27	21	23	37	13	50	23		413.0
6	The presentation materials were professional	4.0	4.05	4.75	4.45	4.06	4.45	4.12	4.15	4.38	4.05	4.17	4.22	4	4.16	4.09		4.2
		40	40	13	30	17	20	34	20	26	21	23	38	13	49	24		408.0
7	The presentation was not proprietary	4.2	3.95	3.85	4.4	4.06	4.4	4	3.5	4.08	3.43	4.32	4.26	4.38	4.14	3.88		4.1
		40	40	16	30	17	20	34	20	26	21	23	38	12	48	23		408.0
8	I would like to hear more about this topic	3.9	4	4.44	4.17	4	4.05	3.88	4	4.15	3.76	3.78	3.84	4.08	3.83	4.16		4.0
		39	40	16	30	17	20	33	20	26	20	23	39	13	49	23		408.0
9	I would recommend this speaker for ERAPPA/APPA events	3.9	3.63	4.88	4.35	3.71	4.1	3.91	3.95	4.33	4.05	4	3.79	4.23	3.61	4.12		4.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>		<b>4.1</b>

Scoring Key: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly

<b>Speaker #X</b>	40	40	16	32	15	18	30	18	24	19	21	34	10	45	22	384	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Score</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>4.38</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4.29</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.82</b>		<b>3.7</b>
<b>Speaker #X</b>	26	33	13	4	14	13	25	15	19	19	1	26	9	41	1	259	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Score</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>4.38</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>4.21</b>	<b>3.58</b>		<b>3.58</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>2</b>		<b>3.4</b>
<b>Speaker Total</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>2.9</b>		<b>3.6</b>
<b>Presentation Materials</b>	35	25	13	27	11	12	23	14	20	19	19	24	10	29	20	301	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Score</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>4.46</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>4.21</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>3.95</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>3.8</b>		<b>3.7</b>

Scoring Key: 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=Very Good, 5=Outstanding

Comments
3 people sitting at a table in front of a room full of people does not make a presentation. They should be standing at the podium or by the projection screen so people could see them. You couldn't see them, you j
Good interacting presentation
Thank you! It was a very good presentation. Could use more often type of presentation on relationships. Use of parl was a good idea; would ... of given opportunities.
1
More focus on presentation like this tha address design and construction.
More about the process.
1st speaker was excellent, 2nd speaker was erratic. I was never sure what exactly he was speaking about. Scores above are for the 1st speaker only
2nd speaker should talk slower
Would like speaker just on Green Globes rating system
Presenter seemed to get lost in his ow graphs. Attendee's example was a helpful compariso+use in benchmarking.
Presentation very complex, trying to fit too much minutia into the delivery.
Maybe this presentation is not what I expected, but it would appear the material presented was very elementary: Mechanics of benchmarking as opposed to how benchmarking will help and apply to our institutions. In other words, it was probably too elementary for the audience, at least speakers (both) were not very good. Tried hard but sentences were broken, and seemed to be all over the place.
Was a sell pitch for UFA products
Presenter has a-a-a problem while talking which distracts audience. Too much theory. Not practical approach
Not enough context.
Main presenter and others really should have used microphone. Hugh was loud. Could have elaborated about sustainability elements more.
Scale of room and of course AHU distractions. Andy came to lipo at end...
Tell speakers that the microhones are there for a reason! Couldn't hear them!
Very good presentation
No cushing/ swearing!
Could reduce the number of examples
Could have made the info more accessible to the average novice listener
Personally, I would like to have heard more about how the methane collection and use actually works, but I completely understand-with this audience-the focus being on how to implement this sort of thing and th
The speaker was obviously passionate about the topic and genuinely cares about others needs + how this could help them.
Obviously understands his business but presentation is a little too cursary for me.
I thought the topic was on sustainability that topic was not hit upon.
Many (incomprehensing word!) were way too deep. More emphasic perhaps could have been placed on the "how-to" part. He spent way too much time on mocking the of construction process, the players, etc.
From his experience, level, etc. perhaps more case studies of where and why problems arose (with ponctual conformation) would have been more interesting. Too much lecturing.
No opportunity to interact during the presentation
Presentation went over time. Had to cut short. A litle too much details. Good presentation overall.
Very informative, thanks!

Good presentation of the problematic. Nice to see some links on ERAPPA was sike.  
Handouts too dark+ printing too . Scheduling very tight today.  
Can't read most of it. It's too dark.  
More time for longer session  
Pet too much time on owner/architect/constructor relationships when comissioning agent should have been more prevolan. A little too much of proprietary information rather than generic

Excellent presenter  
Great presentation  
APPA misterise!  
Excellent technical presentation.

Some overlap between speakers. Could have been coordinated better.  
minute... Positive change has to happen now.

Great presentation  
excellent presentation!

Very well presented and very interesting. Thanks!  
I enjoyed this program very much. Nice interaction between the speakers and good pace through the presentation.  
Outstanding!  
Intersting story... not too seemingly reproducibile though. It would have perhaps been more appreciable to APPA attendees if the school wasn't quite so unique. Though I understand that most schools have the same issues in a slightly different format, it's always nice to have a more "relatable" take-away.  
Good play off each other. Complimenting what each other was saying.

One of the best presentations of this conference. Real stuff to take back with me. Eye-opening.  
This presetation was of no value if you wanted to apply it to unionized staff.  
Bought the book. What more can I say! Excellent!  
Don't hawk your book so blatently in the midst of the presentation. Try to have presenters tailer presentation to an audience. Most of us have union shops and the ideas presented were not relevant.  
Pitched his book in the middle of his presentation. He was knowledge about his subject. Not sure his expertise was hourly or unionized employees

Hand out before sessions would be beneficial fr making notes rather than writing continiously.  
Interesting session. Showed us what we can d to reduce energy consumption. Shows you various options, pros and cons+ explained why they went with specific options  
Interesting presentation. Over the discussion of the dilled bean technology that isn't yet a "catalog item". Raise the bar, push the envelope...  
Several slides were impossible to read from audience.  
The fact that they never spoke about the environmental advantages of the systems they described was a huge detracton from the presentation  
Handout would have been helpful

Handouts before presentation would facilitate note taking  
Well done!  
Conversation, as always, makes the presentation better, rich, more valuable and enjoyable.... Need to constantly work to make sessions more interactive this way...

Perhaps a little more indepth information on the business case itself
Doesn't answer questions
Presenter didn't seem to talk as much about the actual approach of Balances Scorecard as much as he discussed the processes he went through in response to improvements. I thought the aspects of BS would be more interesting.
Too basic
Started off slowly got better with time.
Good presentation relating to topic. I was able to relate to that the speaker was saying. Down to earth. Good examples
Would've liked to have seen more on actual PDA implementation
Not much info on PDAs, mostly CMMS, with minor reference to actual PDAs
Speakers not convincing that they were as succesful at implementation as they say. They did not present any negative experiences in the PDAs
Speaker told us a lot of things we already knew, had expected more real examples of actual use of the PDA.
Data (what little was presented) was not substantiated. Little info and facts to show improvement other than "this really works"
Good info, 2 thoughts: for all presentations should either have slideshow printed off for participants or put on site for sharing; Explanation of how geothermal works was too quick and graphics on this area would have been helpful.
Working in groups helped to make the process seem a little easier. I now have a little understanding of this survey
Presentation Material was too small to see
Good technology but maybe we aren't totally there yet
Good presentation, good to see what others are thinking about the future of BIM. Not sold on the idea but interesting to see how a BIM firm sees the software and its impact on their business. Wish more info was presented.
Not generally my area of facilities, but should be important to all of us. Good to be aware of.
Very informative, presentation was well organized
Good presentation
Print outs would've been extremely helpful
Should have handouts of slides to take home and take notes
Powerpoint handout for taking notes would've been helpful
Very good, would like to see more of this topic
Would like more detail
Good learning opportunity
Oudstanding presentation
Wasn't focused enough
Some slides with white font were difficult to read
The depth/level of info seemed pretty shallow, I know most of the info presented

First speaker was more knowledgeable than the second speaker. Overall topic was interesting and speakers were both informative

Detailed examples would be more helpful - proper consideration to implementation was not demonstrated - would like to hear about "real life" examples - there is much opportunity here

Could not see half of the screen because of where is was placed

I would much prefer the sessions to be set with table and chairs as this increases the comfort level at the session. Meagan spoke to fast, was nervous, needs to relax as she really knows her material. She needs

Excellent job

Liked it best when presenter didn't read the ppt presentation - he knows his material, and it's good material - that's his next step to speaking improvement