4. What are the areas for improvement?

None- Fantastic!

Perhaps a bit more flexibility on the comment card procedures. I liked moving between the two rooms and sometimes didn't get a chance to turn in my comments to the "correct" room before leaving.

Allow non-speakers to attend. Make sure presentations were really linked to ethics and teaching more specifically- some were not as relevant. Longer round-table discussions of issues would be fun too.

More time for discussion rather than just presentations.

It seemed like the first (intro) session either could have been shorter or could have used more content.

N/A

I'm not sure my feedback here would be very useful, since I don't think I was in the target audience of conference attendees (I am not a business educator). It might be worth noting that some of the presentations were a bit unengaging - the speaker talking through the content on the slides, as opposed to using the slides to create a narrative or visualize what the speaker is talking about.

N/A

I felt some of the presentations did not deal directly with ethics or teaching ethics but dealt more with what the instructor or administrator's was researching or doing in their position or field and ethics was secondary or "boot strapped" in.

I can't think of any right now.

Perhaps reminding the audience to address questions related to the presentation and try to limit questions not pertaining to the presentation to discussion times during breaks.

N/A

Nothing I can think of for now.

I don't know how you would actually improve this, but I found many times there were two talks I wanted to hear simultaneous. Again, that would be difficult to avoid.

More content.

Given enough time and resources, organizing coherent panels from the ground up may be good.

None.

A few minutes scheduled between talks would help, so that the audience could write down their comments. Perhaps a sharper division between the official end of the talk and the time for questions would help too, since almost all speakers used their full time (20 minutes) and didn't allow time for the audience to raise their questions.

More time for discussion.

I would have found it helpful if it were more clearly communicated whether or not we, as audience members, were expected to stay in one classroom for an entire session or if it was allowable for us to move from one classroom to the other if we wanted to hear a specific presentation.

I would have liked a little more information on how the Daniels Fund fit into the origins of the conference.

I found that I was interested in one or two panelists from each session, and it was challenging to move during the sessions. It would be nice to have shorter sessions and more opportunity to go to different speakers, rather than have to commit to a group of 3 who may not share similar topics/interests, if that makes sense.

None I can think of at the moment. I really enjoyed it.

It would have been good to have more people present who actually have experience and expertise in teaching ethics.   It's an actual academic discipline with an associated body of literature that was largely ignored by the participants who have no familiarity with that literature. That's a bummer! As great as the conversations were with my colleagues, there was an opportunity that was missed to add some depth to our skill sets in teaching ethics.

While most of the presentations that I attended were great, there were a few that I didn't find valuable, so it would be helpful to try to improve the overall quality/rigor of the contributions in the future.

It would be a good idea to have a final activity in which we discuss what we learned during the day.

I think having IT there to load PowerPoints to make sure that the transition between speakers was a really good idea. Adding a couple of minutes between speakers so people could go to the other room to hear a different speaker would be helpful. When I wanted to go hear a different speaker it felt like I was being rude because there was so little time between presentations.

Perhaps a panel or a workshop style session to allow the audience to participate more.   Some sessions seemed to provoke a strong response from the audience but we had to move quickly on to the next topic.

I think the overall conference was great. Perhaps next time we can differentiate between proposals that have results and those that are just starting vs. in development. Some of the presentations were very general while others were more research-oriented. I would allot more time to these and maybe less time to the general ones. Perhaps these could be collected and shared in a more apropos proceedings.

None that I can think of at the moment.

None.

I really can't think of anything that stands out. I think Dr. Takano and her crew did a great job. Oh, maybe offer paper pads and pens to the participants (I suggest that only because I forgot mine)!!

None, perhaps broaden the participation to greater number of other institutions.

The only concern I had was the short duration of each session.

A bit more time. Not much, adding 5 or 10 minutes to each presentation. I also wanted to be able to sit in on more of the presentations that were scheduled at the same time. That will always be an unavoidable problem and is a sign of a good conference.