

Report on ICED/HELTASA 2016

Cape Peninsula University of Technology, Stellenbosch University, the University of Cape Town and the University of the Western Cape

CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA

December 6, 2016

Authored by: Chris Winberg, Vivienne Bozalek, James Garraway, Cecilia Jacobs and Jeff Jawitz

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	3
2. LOGISTICS.....	3
2.1 CONFERENCE VENUES.....	3
2.1.1 RECOMMENDATION: VENUES	4
2.2 PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOP VENUES	4
2.3 ACCOMMODATION	4
2.3.1 RECOMMENDATION	5
2.4 TRANSPORT	5
2.4.1 RECOMMENDATION: TRANSPORT	5
2.5 REGISTRATION	5
TABLE 1: DELEGATES BY COUNTRY	5
2.5.1 RECOMMENDATIONS: REGISTRATION	7
2.6 MARKETING AND COMMUNICATION	7
2.6.1 RECOMMENDATIONS: MARKETING AND COMMUNICATION	7
2.7 TWITTER	8
2.7.1 RECOMMENDATION: TWITTER	8
2.8 WEBSITE	8
2.8.1 RECOMMENDATIONS: WEBSITE	8
2.9 PROGRAMME LOGISTICS	8
2.9.1 RECOMMENDATIONS: PROGRAMME LOGISTICS	9
2.10 CONFERENCE PACKS.....	9
2.11 CATERING	9
2.12 WIFI AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT	9
2.12.1 RECOMMENDATIONS: WIFI AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT	9
2.13 PROGRAMME 'APP'	9
2.14 BUDGET AND FINANCES	10
3. THE ACADEMIC PROGRAMME	10
3.1 CONFERENCE THEME.....	10
3.2 THE REVIEWING PROCESS	11
3.2.1 RECOMMENDATIONS: REVIEWING	11
3.3 PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOPS	12
3.3.1 RECOMMENDATIONS: PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOPS	12
3.4 KEYNOTE SPEAKERS	12
3.4.1 RECOMMENDATIONS: KEYNOTE SPEAKERS	12
3.5 PAPERS	12
3.5.1 RECOMMENDATION: PAPERS	13
3.6 POSTERS.....	13
3.6.1 RECOMMENDATIONS: POSTERS.....	13
3.7 PANEL PRESENTATIONS	14
3.7.1 RECOMMENDATIONS: PANELS	14
3.8 BOOK OF ABSTRACTS	14
3.8.1 RECOMMENDATIONS: BOOK OF ABSTRACTS.....	14
2.9 CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS.....	14

2.9.1 RECOMMENDATIONS: CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS	14
2.10 BOOK EXHIBITION.....	15
2.10.1 RECOMMENDATAION: BOOK EXHIBITIONS	15
2.11 SPECIAL ISSUES	15
4. SOCIAL EVENTS.....	15
5. EVALUATION	16
TABLE 2: GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE CONFERENCE.....	16

Report on ICED/HELTASA 2016

Cape Peninsula University of Technology, Stellenbosch University, the University of Cape Town and the University of the Western Cape

1. Introduction: background and context

Several years of planning went into the ICED/HELTASA 2016 conference. The first ICED committee meeting took place in 2012; the committee then comprised Brenda Leibowitz, Vivienne Bozalek, James Garraway, Cecilia Jacobs and Jeff Jawitz. Brenda Leibowitz was the original convener, when she left Stellenbosch University to take up a research chair at the University of Johannesburg she handed over the convenorship to Chris Winberg. At a meeting in 2013 the committee decided on the conference date (23 – 25 November 2016) and theme: Ethics, Care and Quality in Educational Development. The committee prepared a conference video to welcome delegates to Cape Town, which Chris Winberg introduced at ICED 2014 in June 2014 in Stockholm. During 2014 – 2015 the committee met quarterly, in 2016 monthly and then bi-monthly meetings were held. In 2015 UCT's Conference Management Committee (CMC) – with key staff members Roxanne Adams, Ange Bukasa, Belinda Chapman, Cindy Maree, Janet Sirmongpong and Deidre Raubenheimer – was appointed as the conference management team. The final meeting will be held on 12 December 2016.

It was felt that (short) monthly meetings (April, May, June, June and August) might be necessary – with bi-weekly and then weekly meetings in September and October.

2. Logistics

A/Prof Jeff Jawitz carried the Conference Logistics portfolio, which included the conference venues, transport and a range of general planning issues. This portfolio became increasingly complex as the conference date got closer and involved a huge amount of work, often on a daily basis.

2.1 Conference venues

The original conference venues were: the UCT Graduate School of Business for the pre-conference workshops, the Baxter Theatre for keynotes and plenaries, and venues in Kramer Building, the new Economic Sciences Building and the College of Music for paper and poster presentations and panels. As a result of student protests and the delaying of examinations, UCT cancelled the Kramer, New Economics Sciences and College of Music bookings. There was thus an urgent need to find alternative venues at quite short notice. The CMC staff worked extremely hard under very difficult conditions to find alternative venues, resulting in two proposals. One option was the Lagoon Beach Hotel, but as there were only 9 breakaway rooms available this was a challenge for the programme. The underground parking area would be converted (at a cost of R180,000.00) for the poster exhibition and lunches. This was an expensive option that would not provide ICED or HELTASA with much needed funds from conference fees and would inconvenience delegates who had already made bookings in the Southern Suburbs. Option 2 was to use the Baxter Theatre for plenaries and two back-to-back Southern Suburb hotels for the presentation venues, which although more complex in terms of logistics, was proposed as less expensive and as more convenient for delegates. It was decided to move the conference presentations to the two Southern Suburb hotels (as many delegates had already made hotel bookings in the area). Much of the work done by the committee on the programme, the allocation of

venues, the catering, etc. had to be re-done due to the changed venues. It was proposed to use the Baxter Theatre for registration, early morning tea, mid-morning tea, all plenaries and the poster exhibition. Start time was proposed to move to 08h30 – and the morning would be centred on the Baxter. Following mid-morning tea, delegates would be transported to the Newlands Southern Sun Hotel and the next door Radison Park Inn. The paper presentations would start at 11am. The Newlands South Sun has seven breakaway venues, the Park Inn has 4 venues, making a total of 11 venues (which could accommodate the programme). Both hotels would provide free WiFi. Starting at 11h00 meant that we paid a half-day package, thus we could break even or even make a surplus. The main concern about the Baxter/Hotel combo was the lunches – both hotels could not cater for 600+ delegates at one sitting; therefore two lunch sittings were required. We decided to have an extended lunch break. Another concern was transport between the Baxter and the hotels and the costs involved. The other issue was safety at the Baxter; there was initially concern that as Bremner is right behind the Baxter this might become a central area for the student protests (following further investigation it was decided that the Baxter would be safe venue).

In the evaluation feedback, many delegates indicated that they were satisfied with these arrangements, and were understanding of the reasons for having to move between conference venues, although a few were not happy with this, as below:

Logistics were physically exhausting. Moving [between] three venues was very tiring. Especially having to run around between the 2 hotels.

There were some delegates who were unhappy that the last slots in a session were poorly attended:

Also, by the time the last presentation ended most people had left for various reasons. I felt a bit let down.

This is cause for concern, particularly when this applies to newer members of the associations.

2.1.1 Recommendation: venues

Ideally the conference would have a single venue that could accommodate plenaries and breakaways, with venues as close as possible. With the large numbers involved at the ICED/HELTASA 2016 conference this was not possible (not without considerably higher conference fees such as those required by the CTICC, for example). It is also not possible to predict attendance at the different sessions. While it is not always possible to predict attendance, there should be a clear logic with regard to which presentations need to be accommodated in larger venues. There should be an attempt made to keep attendance up, e.g., by have a social event after the last papers, or by have a plenary address in the last slot. While an additional social event would involve additional costs, it might help to boost attendance and thus be respectful towards the presenters who take the final slots (and who also take on the chairing responsibilities). The conference committee might also try to use their networks to ensure that the final slots have at least some delegates attending. (Some institutions seem to have a practice of supporting one another).

2.2 Pre-conference workshop venues

Because of concerns about safety at the UCT Graduate School of Business, we decided to move the pre-conference workshops to the two Southern Suburb hotels and then transport delegates to the welcome event at the Two Oceans Aquarium. This arrangement seems to have worked well.

2.3 Accommodation

Delegates were spread over more than 50 hotels and guesthouses (excluding private accommodation). Thus a wide variety of accommodation (other than those suggested on the conference website) was chosen. A difficulty was the cancellation of UCT accommodation for approximately 40 delegates who needed to find similar reasonably-priced

accommodation (extremely difficult to find in Cape Town). Trying to do a 'hotel sweep' in order to offer transport to delegates proved challenging, with delegates staying in so many different places.

2.3.1 Recommendation

The conference website should clearly explain to delegates that only the main hotels or those recommended on the conference website would be served by conference transport.

2.4 Transport

Due to the change of venues, additional transport was required. Only 240 delegates completed the transport survey form which made judging transport needs very difficult. Of the delegates who completed the form, approximately 53% did not require transport. It was very difficult to plan ahead due to the low response rate and adjustments to transport requirements had to be made on a daily basis. With regard to airport transfers, delegates made their own arrangements to get from the airport to their hotels; this is a common practice and seemed to suit most delegates as there was considerable variation in arrival times. While many of the hotels and guest houses offer airport transfers they are expensive, thus offered cheaper options were recommended on the conference website, such as City Hopper, My City and Uber. Approximately 83% of the delegates who responded to the transport survey requested a shuttle to the airport after the conference and this provision seems to have been appreciated. One of the comments on the evaluation form pointed out that we had neglected to arrange transport back to the hotels after Day 2 (for those who did not want to do the Kirstenbosch tour) as well as transport from Kirstenbosch to the Hotels for those who wanted to do the Kirstenbosch tour but did not want to attend the conference dinner.

2.4.1 Recommendation: transport

Transport is a fairly major conference expense; thus ensuring that delegates book (and possibly pay for) transport in advance when they register is advisable. It should be made very clear what is offered in the way of transport to enable delegates to make their own arrangements when transport is not provided. The practice of providing transport to the airport at the end of the conference was appreciated, and could be a good strategy for keeping delegates at the conference until the final session.

2.5 Registration

Registration was slow at first (by June 2016 only 6 people had registered for the conference). A surprising number of delegates did not make use of the reduced 'early bird' fee. Approximately 30 delegates were pre-registered via a National Collaborative Teaching Development Grant, which provided some 'start up' capital. At the last registration check a total of 634 delegates had registered for the conference from 34 different countries:

Table 1: Delegates by country

COUNTRY	TOTAL REGISTERED
Australia	12
Belgium	8
Canada	9
China	5
Denmark	7
Eritrea	1
Estonia	2
Finland	7

France	1
Germany	17
Ghana	2
Iceland	1
Ireland	2
Italy	1
Japan	2
Kenya	3
Lesotho	1
Netherlands	8
New Zealand	4
Nigeria	18
Norway	14
Singapore	2
South Africa	412
Swaziland	2
Sweden	35
Switzerland	15
Trinidad and Tobago	1
Turkey	1
Uganda	2
United Arab Emirates	1
United Kingdom	26
United States of America	9
Zambia	1
Zimbabwe	2
TOTAL	634

All presenters were requested to register by 30 September 2016 (in order to allow the academic committee to finalize the conference programme). Many presenters had not yet registered by 30 August (the early bird deadline). They were sent an email reminder requesting them to register by 30 September. The reminder was also posted on the website. We extended the deadline for presenters to register to mid-October (although many only registered by 7 November, after which they were taken off the programme). In early November we were able to circulate the first draft of the programme for feedback. There were several requests by presenters to have the programme finalized earlier, but this was difficult because so many presenters registered late and could only be provisionally placed on the programme until they had registered. Some of the presented who registered after 7 November arrived at the conference without requesting to be including in the programme, causing considerable difficulties. We think that all presenters were accommodated, but not always in an appropriate slot. We were in communication with all the presenters, who all assured us of their intention to registered, but there were quite a few ‘no shows’ who had registered but who had not paid their fees.

2.5.1 Recommendations: registration

In future we would recommend that presenters have a deadline by which to register and to pay their conference fees – and that this deadline is adhered to. Without such deadlines the conference finances can be put in jeopardy because the conference pays for all those who not show up. Late registration delays publication of the conference programme, causes changes to the programme, and can disadvantage presenters who take the trouble to register and pay their fees by the required deadline. Many institutions require confirmation of the delegate’s presentation (e.g., on an official programme) which could cause withdrawals.

2.6 Marketing and Communication

A dedicated Marketing and Communication committee member was proposed to serve on the team (who unfortunately had to withdraw for personal reasons). Chris Winberg and Ange Bukasa took on this portfolio which included communication with ICED and HELTASA as well as conference presenters and delegates. One of the problems identified was that many institutions were blocking emails from the conference website (e.g., around notification of acceptance of the paper or poster presentation). It has become standard practice that conference websites inform presenters of possible difficulties with institutional email filters and ask them to check their ‘junk’ folders; we asked the webmaster to post a notice to this effect clearly on the website (but it was not done).

There was good communication with local delegates through the HELTASA newsletter with regard to the deadline for the submission of abstracts (31 May 2016); HELTASA was also able to inform all ICED affiliates of the various deadlines, etc. The conference committee used their own networks (e.g., institutional teaching and learning conferences) to market the conference.

Email addresses for queries were posted on the website, and from around September there were weekly then daily email queries that were addressed by Janet Sirmongpong, Vivienne Bozalek or Chris Winberg. About 2 weeks before the conference started, a general email was sent to all delegates containing the details of all arrangements, i.e., with regard to shuttle services, transport following events such as the conference dinner, as well as suggestions (e.g., taxi services recommended), information about the weather, etc. The general conference information letter as well as Cape Town visitors’ information was posted on the website.

At the final committee meeting before the conference (Friday 18 November) we set up a What’s App group, which worked extremely well to keep the conference team in touch during the conference.

We did not specifically ask for feedback on the conference communication on the evaluation form, but one delegate was not clearly not happy about the conference communication:

I understand that the organising committee was under severe pressure to find alternate venues and so I trust that my feedback is not seen as diminishing this effort. I feel strongly that the communication with delegates could have been better. Other than an acknowledgement (automated) of my registration there was COMPLETE silence. All other conferences keep in constant contact with a countdown to the conference and also keep one informed about changes in venues. The information about venues was poorly communicated. Furthermore, the fact that a shuttle was not provided for delegates to the first plenary was a very poor reflection and then to be told that delegates should walk or find their own way on the mini-bus taxis – an utter disgrace!

2.6.1 Recommendations: Marketing and Communication

In future it is recommended that a dedicated communication team member serves on the committee to ensure regular contact with all the presenters. Presenters should be requested to confirm that they have received the

acceptance notification and will be attending. Regular communication and updates should be done bi-monthly and then weekly from around three months prior to the conference start. The conference team did not want to bombard the delegates, and felt we were dealing with the daily queries very rapidly, but it seems that more regular mass communication would have been appreciated.

2.7 Twitter

In-conference communication between delegates tended to occur through Twitter. There was initial confusion about the twitter handle, and this should have been set up around a week before the conference to get everyone used to the idea of the twitter feed and to encourage more participation. The twitter feed provides some useful feedback, particularly on the academic content of the conference. See <https://twitter.com/hashtag/icedconf16>

2.7.1 Recommendation: Twitter

It is recommended that the Twitter handle for the conference is set up around a week before the conference start and that delegates should start tweeting about their presentations, events, etc. before the conference start. The twitter handle and link should be prominent on the website. (This was requested, but was not done).

2.8 Website

The ICED/HELTASA 2016 website was not satisfactory with regard to its visual appeal, and did not suit the reviewing processes that we were used to (e.g., where the academic convener can send off abstracts to many different reviewers). While the webmaster was helpful, she did not fully understand our requirements and was not involved with the conference planning. The fact that she was based in Johannesburg and could not train us on the website was an added difficulty. There were many errors on the website that were confusing to delegates and which should have been spotted (e.g., by a dedicated communications team member).

2.8.1 Recommendations: website

The website is an integral part of the conference and of the conference experience for delegates. In future it would be recommended that the webmaster is local and attends all (or as many as possible) of the conference committee meetings. It is also recommended that the conference committee receives 'hands-on' training on the website and that there is a back-up person to update the website when the main web master is not available.

2.9 Programme logistics

The first draft programme was put together by Chris Winberg and Vivienne Bozalek on 1 Sept 2016. The programme went through around 10 iterations to ensure coherence across the themes and to suit delegates' requests for particular dates or times. When the venues were changed there were major programme changes. There were also almost daily requests from around 1 November 2016 for slot changes, as well as around 10 cancellations that involved shifting speakers, etc. (As well as some surprise presenters who did not inform us that they had registered late, but still wished to present their paper). As a result of all these changes a number of errors got into the programme. There were two versions of the programme, the programme-at-a-glance (with only speaker's names) and the full programme with speakers' names and title of paper. The two versions needed to be coordinated, which was done on a daily basis, but some errors were still made. The last presenter in a session was asked to chair the session. Chairs were all individually emailed and asked to chair a session, to which most agreed. Chairs were supposed to have instructions in their packs; but only received instructions via email. Due to changes there were some sessions without a chair. The programme-at-a-glance and the full programme were made available to delegates in hard copy. The Book of Abstracts and conference proceedings were available only on a flash drive.

2.9.1 Recommendations: programme logistics

It would be advisable to complete and publish the programme as early as possible (with the understanding that there would inevitably be requests for changes and cancellations). The programme should be checked and re-checked (by different people) for accuracy. Chairs should be contacted around 1 month in advance and should be provided with a chairing pack in their conference bags. Flash drives are not recommended for documents such as the Book of Abstracts as so few devices can use these.

2.10 Conference packs

For the conference bags it was decided that Sheshwe cloth bags with water bottle holder and a protea key ring would be a meaningful conference souvenir and benefit the NGOs producing these products. It was decided that the conference pack would include a Consol glass bottle (empty) which delegates could fill and water stations outside all the breakaway venues and close to the main food stations. The water arranged appeared on conference tweets and was highly commended.

2.11 Catering

The catering at the Baxter by Villa-on-the-Beach (who had been originally appointed as the conference caterers) was excellent and highly commended in tweets and in the conference evaluation form. Not everyone was satisfied with the lunch arrangements (or the quality of the food), as the following suggests:

Lunch has been a bit of a problem. There were too many people. However, you did do a good job taking into account that there were disruptions and you had to change venues in such a short period of time.

However most evaluations were positive, with comments such as:

The food was fantastic, and the spaces created for people to mingle and chat were appreciated.

There was some dissatisfaction with the quality of the food at Moyo's (conference dinner), but most delegates were generally positive about the catering.

1.12 Wifi and technical support

Several delegates experienced difficulty with getting connected or found the internet very slow (due to the number of delegates needing to be connected). There was adequate technical support, but technical assistants were not always available and chairs had to assist or try to find technical support. This was particularly the case when, for example, video was integrated into a presentation. It is not clear whether such presenters requested additional technical support and whether this was flagged for that session or slot.

2.12.1 Recommendations: Wifi and Technical support

When establishing presenters' needs, it would be useful to include video and internet connectivity (e.g., for prezzi); and to ensure that there is a technical assistant at those sessions.

2.13 Programme 'App'

It was the intention to have a dedicated programme App but this was too costly (rough estimates are for simple App R15,000; comprehensive R27,000.) as a functional App with icon would be preferable. As many Apps can be difficult to use corrected we had intended to allocate space on the programme for training on the App.

2.14 Budget and finances

The main issue with regard to the budget was that we had to move the conference from campus venues to commercial venues, thereby incurring considerable additional expenses. The final statements of income and expenditure for the conference are below:

TOTAL INCOME	3 347 311.18
Less: TOTAL EXPENDITURE	3 259 693.38
Net Surplus/ Deficit	87 617.80
NB****	Surplus to be split 50/50 between Heltasa and ICED

The final income and expenditure for the pre-conference workshops are below:

TOTAL EXPENDITURE	193 507.37
TOTAL INCOME	194 600.00
Less: TOTAL EXPENDITURE	193 507.37
Net Surplus/ Deficit	1 092.63

The final amount that will be transferred to each organisation is calculated as follows:

- a) **ICED** payment will be
R269 950.00 (ICED 10% of fees levy)
R43 808.90 (50% of conference surplus)
R546.31 (50% of workshop surplus)
R314 305.21 TOTAL PAYMENT TO ICED

- b) **HELTASA** payment will be
R124 800.00 (Membership fees for SADC delegates)
R43808.90 (50% of conference surplus)
R546.32 (50% of workshop surplus)
R169155.22 TOTAL PAYMENT TO HELTASA

3. The academic programme

Professor Vivienne Bozalek was the academic programme chair with the role to 'ensure that a well-balanced, high-quality program is organized and presented at the conference' and to manage 'the call for papers through the selection and review of every paper'. As well as to assist 'in the scheduling of session rooms and helping with local arrangements for the program.' Thus the academic chair was responsible for the abstract review process, the conference programme and the conference proceedings.

3.1 Conference theme

While there seemed to be some controversy about the programme theme when it was proposed, the delegates seemed to enjoy it and almost all the papers and presentations 'spoke' to the theme, as one of the delegates commented:

The theme of the conference was very relevant and highlighted the global struggle. It certainly has tabled various challenges and debates about current issues.

3.2 The reviewing process

There were a number of constraints experienced due to the way in which the website had set up the review process. One concern was that all comments made by the reviewers would be seen by the author once the 'submit score' button was pressed (unlike other systems that allow the academic chair to modify or remove certain of the reviewers' comments). Because the author could see all comments, it was decided that only one reviewer per theme should work on the on-line system. The main reviewer was expected to request additional reviews, but these additional reviews had to occur off-line. Only the reviewer in charge of the theme should submit the score. This was quite a laborious process.

The conference website scoring system did not allow the author to see the scores awarded. Only the CMC administrator and webmaster saw the scores. The scoring system thus becomes a 'code'. The code system we adopted was as follows:

- 1 = reject (the reviewer should also click on 'final review')
- 5 = revise and resubmit (i.e., major/fairly considerable changes required; the reviewer should NOT click on 'final review')
- 10 = accept as is (the reviewer should also click on 'final review')
- 10 = accept with minor/editorial changes (in which case the reviewer should NOT click on final review until the requested changes have been made)
- 7 = accept as a poster (the reviewer should also click on final review)
- 7 = accept as a poster, subject to minor changes) (in which case the reviewer should NOT click on final review until the requested changes have been made)

The final review button together with the score communicated to the CMC administrator that a letter of acceptance (either as a paper or as a poster) or that a letter of rejection should be sent to the author. Thus reviewers had to be careful to only click this button when they were satisfied that the abstract needed no further revision and could be published in the Book of Abstracts, or if the abstract was rejected. Unfortunately, it seems that many worthy papers were not accepted, or accepted as posters. This is something any conference would want to avoid.

3.2.1 Recommendations: reviewing

Before the website provided is selected, there should be a demonstration of the reviewing process as this is key to the quality of the presentations and fairness to delegates. A large team of reviewers is required when the conference is as large as ICED. Around 400 abstracts were submitted for review. It should also be possible for the academic committee to, for example, change the status of an abstract (e.g., from rejected to accepted) if they feel that the review was inaccurate or unfair. We understand that many good proposals were turned down (possibly due to the volume of work generated by the amount of abstracts). In a field such as academic development where relationships are very important, it needs to be very clear that the reviewing process is completely fair and transparent, even if it might mean that additional presentation slots are required.

3.3 Pre-conference workshops

There were 14 workshops (considerably more than at other conferences), which meant that they were shorter than normal (1 ½ hours). Most presenters were satisfied with the arrangements, although some asked for extra time. Around 250 delegates attended the workshops; some were well-attended and others less so. One difficulty was that the programme and the changes made it went onto the website rather late, which might have negatively affected registration for the workshops. Some workshops were well attended, but others were quite poorly attended.

3.3.1 Recommendations: pre-conference workshops

It is important that the workshop programme is finalized and posted on the website as soon as the site opens for registration. Registration should include registration for workshops; we understand that many delegates did not register for workshops as they did not know which workshops were offered – and this might have also delayed the registration process as delegates waited for the workshops to be announced. While a wide variety of workshops is desirable, the number of workshops should be limited to ensure better or more even attendance across all workshops.

3.4 Keynote speakers

Those who completed the conference evaluation form were satisfied with the keynote speakers. Joan Tronto's keynote was very appreciated and found to be highly relevant to higher education generally as well as the work of educational developers. Denise Wood's presentation was found by many to be 'inspiring'. There were also some complaints that Dr Wood with regard to repetition in her workshop and her keynote address. Michalinos Zembylas was commended for both the deep theoretical insights and practical examples that his talk provided:

He gave us some theoretical and practical ways of thinking about doing educational development in ethical and caring ways, and the references and ideas were very helpful.

Professor Archille Mbembe's address was particularly appreciated by delegates, although there were some delegates who missed visual accompaniment (and others that appreciated the break from Ppt!). Below is a typical comment:

Inspiring and powerful talk on de-colonizing terms and fields of knowledge. Some AV support would have been appreciated, at times the argument was difficult to follow.

Some delegates made (valid) complaints about the website information about his talk and his actual talk:

I felt he referred to decolonising and in particular the archive only in passing – his talk was interesting but felt the title was a bit misleading.

3.4.1 Recommendations: keynote speakers

If keynote speakers are asked to present workshops as well as a keynote address, the requirements of each should be clarified (e.g., different topics for the workshop and keynote presentation). Keynote speakers should be required to provide an abstract or 'think piece' for their address. (Prof Mbembe was asked (several times) but did not provide this; a general abstract from one of his books was provided to give delegates an idea of his research area and expertise – this was quite different from his talk, which he seemed to be composed as he waited to start, hence the valid complaint).

3.5 Papers

After the review process (see above) 218 papers were accepted. While most of the comments on the quality of the papers were extremely positive, there were some complaints that the time allocation was too short or that too many papers on the same topic had been accepted, with comments such as:

Obviously it was a very large conference and choosing what to listen to was difficult! The international presence and participation due to the ICED enhanced the conference. There did seem to be quite a lot of repetition in the programme (e.g. after hearing a couple of Extended Programme presentations I felt I was hearing the same things) – in some senses this may be unavoidable as it reflects current thinking in practice, however sometimes it felt a bit plodding

It was very full and the sessions seemed very short. I do appreciate this was difficult because of the time you needed to make up in the programme. I felt overwhelmed with choice and as someone who has not been to an ICED conference before it was difficult to decide what to go to. Could there be more work on themes so that the 4 presentations had more coherence? swapping every 20mins felt a bit like speed dating, but this is meant as a "caring" comment on what was all excellent content.

These complaints are well taken; there were obviously time constraints and the coherence issue is a valid criticism – the many changes meant that much of the original coherence of the programme got lost and people changed to slots that were not aligned to their presentation.

One of the difficulties of combined two conferences with slightly different interests were some complaints (presumably from ICED delegates) that:

there was some thoughtful papers here but the focus was far too much on students educational development and not staff or our work.

There were clear themes and sessions on student development, so it should have been possible for ICED delegates to choose streams appropriate to their interests, however, with the number of swops there were some student-centred presentations that ended up in the wrong 'slot'.

3.5.1 Recommendation: papers

There were a number people who uploaded abstracts but were not informed of the outcome. This affected the programme as there were new groups of presenters to accommodate after the programme had been drawn up. There is thus a need to follow up with each accepted presenter. There were also some presenters who thought that their paper had been accepted when it had been rejected or changed to poster acceptance. It would have been prudent for the committee to revise all the acceptances, rejections and poster acceptances.

It might be worth reducing the number of papers on similar topics for future conferences. Programme coherence is very important for delegates' experience of the conference, thus swopping should be limited to having an appropriate slot available.

3.6 Posters

Following the review process 118 posters were accepted. A poster template was available as a guide for the delegates, and many made use of this. This was a large number of posters to display, but was successfully managed by CMC in the Baxter, which provided a good viewing space. There were several tweets about the posters and their high quality commended. As there were so many posters, not everyone was able to see all the posters. Abstracts for the posters were made available in the Book of Abstracts.

3.6.1 Recommendations: posters

A template for the posters is advisable, particularly when there are many posters to exhibit. The posters were of a high quality and in future conference it would be a good idea to take photographs of the posters as a record and to

display on the website for those who were not able to view them during the exhibition. This would also be more respectful to the poster presenters who take a lot of trouble with their posters.

3.7 Panel presentations

Ten panel presentations were accepted (but due to cancellations only 8 were presented). The format for the panel presentations was not clear, so in one case it seemed as if 9 panel proposals were accepted from 1 person (while the panelists had been accepted as conference papers) and in another case it seemed that 1 person was the only speaker (as the other panelists only provided their details the day before the conference). The panels were well attended and received good feedback:

Brilliant - excellent range of work, nice to see increase in theorization/scholarliness.

3.7.1 Recommendations: panels

It is important that panel proposals have a different website template that includes clear instructions (e.g., the names of all panelists and a single panel abstract – as the 9 panelist proposal had a combined abstract of almost 20 pages). Presents should be restricted to one presentation (as the lead presenter) if the conference is large.

3.8 Book of Abstracts

The Book of Abstracts included the keynote ‘think pieces’, the workshop abstracts, the paper abstracts, poster abstracts and panel abstracts. This resulted in a document of around 300 pages. For this reason we did not make hard copies, but made the Book of Abstracts available on flash drives. There were many requests to post this on the website.

3.8.1 Recommendations: book of abstracts

As many devices do not read flash drives, there were requests to upload the book of abstracts on the website. This was not done – and it would be a recommendation that the abstracts be available on the website as soon as possible to ensure that delegates can choose the presentations they wish to attend.

2.9 Conference proceedings

Twenty-six papers were submitted for inclusion in the conference proceedings, representing twelve countries (Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Kenya, Norway, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, The Netherlands and the United Arab Emirates), many different institutional types (research-intensive, teaching-intensive, vocational, professional, general and specialised universities), and many different disciplines (Design, Economics, Engineering, Medicine and Social Work – amongst others). This collection of papers comprised the proceedings were presented in the alphabetical order of the surname of the first author. These proceedings were made available on a flash drive (together with the Book of Abstracts and the full programme). The conference proceedings were loaded onto memory sticks because it was felt that delegates might want to publish their papers elsewhere and that having them on the conference website might create problems in this regard. We requested that the conference proceedings be uploaded onto the website – which still (6 Dec 2016) has a ‘coming soon’ message.

2.9.1 Recommendations: conference proceedings

In future we would recommend publishing them on a closed site as the memory sticks were not used by many of the delegates.

2.10 Book exhibition

Book exhibitions are an important part of any academic conference. We had asked that a selection of the keynote speakers' books, South African books, workshop presenters' books etc. be on display. Below are some of the titles suggested to the relevant publishers (none of which were on display):

- Baume, D. and Popovic, C. eds., 2016. *Advancing practice in academic development*. Routledge.
- Mbembe, Achille (2001/2015) *On the postcolony*. Johannesburg: WITS UP. Paperback EAN: 978 1 86814 691 8
- Tronto, J.C. 2015. *Who Cares?: How to Reshape a Democratic Politics*. Cornell University Press.
- Zembylas, M. (2015). *Emotion and Traumatic Conflict: Reclaiming Healing in Education*. Oxford University Press.

Unfortunately it seems that many publishers wanted an opportunity to showcase publications that were not relevant to the conference or its themes. An exception was Cedric Sissing of Adams Books who did an excellent job of displaying appropriate books. At the conference he explained that his exhibition would have been even better if he had had more time to prepare and to order the books we had suggested.

2.10.1 Recommendation: book exhibitions

Communication with the publishers and book sellers should have taken place at least a year in advance (to enable them to order appropriate books); publishers could have attended a committee meeting to find out more about the delegates and their fields to ensure that the selections on display were relevant.

2.11 Special issues

There are three special issues of South African academic journals dedicated to the ICED/HELTASA 2016 conference, namely:

- 1) A special edition of the *South African Journal of Higher Education* (SAJHE) will be dedicated to 'The ethics of care and academic development'. The proposed publication date is this first edition of 2018.;
- 2) A special edition of *Critical Studies in Teaching and Learning* (Cristal), 2017, dedicated to "Ethics, care and quality in teaching and learning"
- 3) A special edition of the *Journal for Student Affairs in Africa* (JSAA), 2017, dedicated to Tutoring and Mentoring – Key Strategies for Tertiary Educational Development in South Africa

It is expected that the journals will receive a number of both local and international articles, linked to the conference themes. We feel this is an important way of showcasing the work that has been done around ethics, care and quality in higher education nationally and internationally.

4. Social events

Dr Cecilia Jacobs carried the social portfolio. Social events are important for networking and for colleagues from different universities and different countries to converse in an informal way. The social events included: 1) welcome evening at the Two Oceans Aquarium which included a chamber music group, the Conference Dinner at Moyo's Restaurant that included a marimba band and a DJ for dancing after dinner, and an optional tour of the Kirstenbosch Gardens (before the conference dinner). There were also two cultural events: 1) a praise poet who opening the conference and 2) a performance by the poet Diane Ferrus. The social events were well-attended, and while there were some complaints (e.g., the food at Moyo's) most delegates seem to have appreciated the social events.

While we did not specifically request an evaluation of the social events, many respondents commented positively as the comment below explains:

I think you should have asked feedback on the artistic performances as well. Both were moving but Diana Ferrus took my breath away. Cannot remember being this moved by a performance poet. She connected me with the core of the human condition. People around me were in tears...so was I.

5. Evaluation

At the time of writing only 156 responses to the conference evaluation form had been received. The overall assessment was as follows:

Table 2: General assessment of the conference

Best conference ever!	14%
I enjoyed it!	68%
It had a few good moments	12%
It was the same as usual	3.3%
I wish I hadn't attended	0%
Other	2.7%

It thus seems that over 80% of delegates were very satisfied with the ICED/HELTASA 2016 conference. A reminder about the evaluation will be sent to delegates and the site shut down in order to study the evaluation forms in more detail (which might well impact this report).

Thanks to all the conference delegates who provided feedback on the conference; their feedback will be used in the planning of future ICED conferences.