

## TASL Workshop II, May 6, 2005

### Workshop Assessment Analysis

The pre-workshop assessment was a questionnaire compiled by the presenters, Suzanne Morales and Jan Anderson of Central Texas College. The purpose of this questionnaire was to (1) provide information to the presenters and (2) to assess the range of answers and present this report to the workshop participants. A total of 8 questionnaires were completed and returned prior to the workshop. All participants were provided an additional blank questionnaire while Dr. Sharon Pate analyzed the responses and shared the summary with the participants at the workshop. Specific TASL questions indicated that one respondent rated her/his level of QEP knowledge as excellent, 3 as very good, and 4 as average. (Note that in the post workshop assessment, 15 of 16 participants reported that their "beliefs, philosophies or expectations were modified" at the TASL workshop.) About half of these respondents were currently a member of a QEP team. The remaining answers regarding program and institutional information needed in order to prepare for the QEP process were varied. (Please refer to [www.templejc.edu/tasl](http://www.templejc.edu/tasl) for the Power Point slides with all results.) There was also some variation with the responses for examples of program or institutional outcomes. Some respondents reported an administrative outcome such as retention or pass rates, while others gave an example of an actual outcome, and others still reported the results of a targeted outcome. Finally, the questionnaire asked for specific questions from respondents. These specific questions and others were addressed during the workshop presentations.

There were two parts to the post-workshop assessment. One part included narrative descriptions regarding the major characteristics of the workshop. Each characteristic narrative described a level of quality such as "There was much evidence of...", "There was adequate evidence of...", "There was some evidence with suggestions for improvement" and "There was little evidence...". Numerical scores for each narrative were assigned after completion of this portion of the assessment. Since there were no indications of "little evidence" for each category, that narrative was given a score of 0. The remaining scores, from highest to lowest was 3 (much evidence), 2 (adequate evidence), 1 (some evidence with suggestions for improvement). With a total of 16 completed assessment packages, the score

range was 32-48. (There was only one score of "1" for one characteristic-interaction). A numerical average of each characteristic was calculated and is illustrated in the following table.

**Numerical averages for assessment of workshop Characteristics\***

<b>Workshop Characteristics</b>	<b>Numerical Average of Scores*</b>
Evidence of planning	41
Evidence of research	41
Materials	39
Interaction	37
Environment	35 (no answers from four respondents)**
Expectations	33 (no answers from four respondents)**

*\*Scores were assigned according to narrative descriptions of characteristics*

*\*\* These characteristics were on the back of the form.*

If the evaluative terms of excellent, good, and average were assigned to the scores of 3,2 and 1, respectively; the overall assessment of these workshop characteristics indicate that the participants perceived the workshop to be overwhelmingly excellent. (The numerical total for the rank of excellent =48; good=32.)

The second part of the assessment gave participants the opportunity to assess the workshop using Likert scales and declarative answers such as yes, no, some, very much. The first two Likert scales were provided for the rating of the overall value (1=poor to 5=excellent) of the workshop and the suitability (1=not suitable; 5= suitable) of the format of the workshop. Results are presented in the following table.

**Results of Likert Scale Assessments**

<b>Overall value</b>	1 = 0	2 = 0	3 = 1	4 = 2	5 = 13
<b>Format</b>	1= 0	2 = 0	3 = 0	4 = 5	5 = 11

The majority of the ratings of the overall value and the suitability of the workshop were excellent.

The second portion of this part of the assessment provided participants to respond to two questions regarding use of information from the workshop

and recommendation of the workshop to a colleague. All participants indicated that they would use the information from the workshop on their own campuses. Eighty eight percent (14 of 16) participants indicated that they would recommend the workshop to a colleague. There were 0 "no" rankings for this question. Two participants indicated "depends" with additional comments such as ""for those at the institutional level.

The presenters were rated overwhelmingly "excellent". Many participants had the opportunity to speak to the presenters personally and indicated their appreciation.

The final portion of the assessment included questions related to specific goals of the workshop or information regarding information dissemination (newsletter and website). The following table displays the frequency of participant answers for each category of response (no, some, yes, very much)

Responses indicate that specific goals of the workshop were met: Ninety-three per cent of the respondents reported that their beliefs regarding assessment were modified; 100% of the respondents reported that the communications regarding SACS requirements or the QEP were clear; 100% of the respondents reported that workshop information was applicable to their own campuses; 100% reported that there were opportunities to interact with others; and 100% reported that the workshop topics were relevant to their needs at varying degrees. Positive responses to the newsletter and website item were increased by 50%.

	no	some	yes	Very much	comment
Were your beliefs, philosophies or expectations regarding assessment modified by your participation in this workshop?	1	7	5	3	But reinforced Better than expected!
Was communication about assessment, SACS requirements or the QEP process clear?	0		7	9	
Was the information applicable to your campus/program?	0	3	6	7	
Were you given opportunities to discuss your needs regarding assessment or the QEP?	0	0	7	9	
Did you receive a TASL newsletter?	1	na	15	na	
Have you visited the TASL website?	2	na	14	na	
Were the topics presented or discussed relevant to your needs?	0	2	7	7	

Finally, anecdotal remarks were very encouraging and informative:

- Nice touches with food, prizes; facilities, activities conducive to
- learning, high blend of interaction
- I learned a lot.
- Great handouts, reference material
- Many thanks! I truly appreciate your openness and willingness to help.
- Very good workshop for introduction to SACS assessment criteria and processes, however, outside of my area. (learning center staff)
- It may help to offer focus groups for learning centers and other specialty areas.