



The University of New Mexico

**Graduate Resource Center
and Graduate Student
Funding Initiative
Workshop Evaluations
October 2012-September
2013**

Prepared by:

Erin R. Coleman
Institute for Social Research
University of New Mexico

Prepared for:

Graduate Resource Center and Graduate
Student Funding Initiative
University of New Mexico

INTRODUCTION

This report covers the workshop evaluations completed by students who attended the Graduate Resource Center (GRC) and Graduate Student Funding Initiative (GSFI) workshops between October 2012 and September 2013. A total of 1,078 evaluations were completed during this reporting period. This is a 31.7% decrease in evaluations from last year's reporting period. However, during the previous reporting period, there were a total of 203 workshops offered between the GRC and GSFI. For the current reporting period, only 129 workshops were offered. Not all attendees completed an evaluation after their workshop so this report is not intended to analyze actual attendee numbers. The TutorTrac system should have an accurate count of attendees for both the GRC and the GSFI workshops that could be used for further analysis. Records indicate that 1,891 people were entered into TutorTrac as attending either a GRC/GSFI workshop, or the Jump Start Institute offered by the GRC.

Table 1 reports the counts of how many attendees are counted into the TutorTrac system, along with the counts taken directly from the sign-in sheets provided by the GRC. As mentioned earlier, not every workshop attendee completes an evaluation after the workshop, so there is an expected discrepancy between the number of attendees who signed in and the number of evaluations received. However, TutorTrac also enters attendees into the system based on the sign-in sheets provided by the GRC and GSFI. There is a discrepancy between the number of attendees entered into TutorTrac and the number of attendees as indicated by the sign-in sheets. Based on the data available, this discrepancy cannot be accounted for.

| Table 1: Count Source | |
|------------------------|--------|
| | Number |
| Workshop Evaluations | 1,078 |
| Attendee Sign-in Sheet | 1,331 |
| TutorTrac | 1,891 |
| Workshops Offered | 129 |

Table 2 reports the number of evaluations completed by program type. 21.4% of evaluations were filled out for GRC workshops and 78.6% were completed for GSFI workshops.

| Table 2: Program Type | | |
|-----------------------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| GRC | 231 | 21.4 |
| GSFI | 847 | 78.6 |
| Total | 1,078 | 100 |

Table 3 reports the number of evaluations completed from online sessions and face-to-face workshops. Almost all the workshop evaluations were completed for the face-to-face workshops (98.9%). Still, the percent decrease in online evaluations from the previous reporting year to this reporting year is 95%. There were a total of nine workshops offered online from the GRC during the reporting period. There was 1 workshop evaluation completed for the 35 known online workshop attendees.

| Table 3: Workshop Format | | |
|--------------------------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| Face-to-face | 1,065 | 98.8 |
| Online | 13 | 1.2 |
| Total | 1,078 | 100 |

Table 4 reports the number of evaluations received for each semester during the reporting period. The Spring semester had the highest percent of evaluations completed with 42.2%. Next were the Fall semesters with 39.7%. Fewer evaluations were completed in the Summer semester however, summer enrollment is lower than the Spring and Fall semesters and fewer workshops are offered during this time due to the Summer semester being shorter than both Fall and Spring semesters.

| Table 4: Semester | | |
|-------------------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| Fall 2012 | 242 | 22.4 |
| Spring 2013 | 455 | 42.2 |
| Summer 2013 | 194 | 18.0 |
| Fall 2013 | 187 | 17.3 |
| Total | 1,078 | 100 |

Table 5 reports the number of evaluations by month. July saw the largest percentage of evaluations with 15.5%, followed by October (15.3%), and March (13.5%). September accounts for 13.7% of evaluations and February accounts for 13.0% of evaluations. The months with the lowest percentage of completed evaluations are August, accounting for 3.7%, followed by June (2.5%), and lastly December, accounting for only 0.7%, which is in line with previous years.

| | Number | Percent |
|-----------|--------|---------|
| January | 82 | 7.6 |
| February | 140 | 13.0 |
| March | 146 | 13.5 |
| April | 87 | 8.1 |
| June | 27 | 2.5 |
| July | 167 | 15.5 |
| August | 40 | 3.7 |
| September | 148 | 13.7 |
| October | 165 | 15.3 |
| November | 68 | 6.3 |
| December | 8 | 0.7 |
| Total | 1,078 | 100 |

Table 6 reports the number of evaluations by the name of the session and whether it was a GRC or GFSI sponsored workshop.

| GRC or GFSI | Workshop Name | Number | Percent for GRC or GFSI | Total Percent |
|-------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------|-------------------------|---------------|
| GRC | Qualitative analysis | 25 | 10.8 | 2.3 |
| | Literature review | 23 | 10.0 | 2.1 |
| | Building a bibliography with Endnote Web | 20 | 8.7 | 1.9 |
| | Enhancing presentation through technology | 18 | 7.8 | 1.7 |
| | Quantitative analysis for graduate students | 17 | 7.4 | 1.6 |
| | Nuts and bolts of publishing | 15 | 6.5 | 1.4 |
| | Jump Start Institute | 13 | 5.6 | 1.2 |
| | Building a bibliography with Zotero | 13 | 5.6 | 1.2 |
| | Software programs for data analysis | 13 | 5.6 | 1.2 |
| | Thesis/Dissertation 101 | 12 | 5.2 | 1.1 |
| | Networking/Job market/Salary negotiations | 11 | 4.8 | 1.0 |
| | Bringing balance to life as a graduate student | 9 | 3.9 | 0.8 |
| | Theses/Dissertations start to finish - panel | 8 | 3.5 | 0.7 |
| | Endnote Web workshop | 8 | 3.5 | 0.7 |
| | CV/Resume/Letter of intent preparation | 6 | 2.6 | 0.6 |
| | How to present at a conference | 6 | 2.6 | 0.6 |
| | Create and design an academic poster | 5 | 2.2 | 0.5 |
| | Effective reading strategies | 5 | 2.2 | 0.5 |
| | Editing and revision strategies for graduate writing | 4 | 1.7 | 0.4 |
| | GRC Total | | 231 | 100 |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| GSFI | Research and compliance overview | 70 | 8.3 | 6.5 |
| | Financial management of funds awarded | 46 | 5.4 | 4.3 |
| | Introduction to responsible and ethical conduct in research-NSF, NIH training requirements | 46 | 5.4 | 4.3 |
| | Conflicts of interest, intellectual property- what graduate students can encounter or expect | 45 | 5.3 | 4.2 |
| | Literature review for grantwriting | 42 | 5.0 | 3.9 |
| | Writing effective email inquiries and letters of intent | 38 | 4.5 | 3.5 |
| | Data warehousing-keeping records secure | 38 | 4.5 | 3.5 |
| | Mentoring and whistleblowing | 37 | 4.4 | 3.4 |
| | Proposal preparation in general, and goals and objectives | 34 | 4.0 | 3.2 |
| | Authorship, exploring journal ethics, first author guidelines | 30 | 3.5 | 2.8 |
| | PI eligibility: what does it mean to be a PI for financial and compliance issues | 29 | 3.4 | 2.7 |
| | Social responsibility of researchers | 28 | 3.3 | 2.6 |
| | CV/Resume preparation, letters of support for different purposes | 27 | 3.2 | 2.5 |
| | Use of animals in research: ethical issues, implications, requirements | 27 | 3.2 | 2.5 |
| | Timeline, time management and program assessment | 25 | 3.0 | 2.3 |
| | Research collaborations and scholarly research partnerships-how to create and manage them | 22 | 2.6 | 2.0 |
| | Hands-on workshop to identify sources of funding | 20 | 2.4 | 1.9 |
| | Mentoring and whistleblowing part 2 | 20 | 2.4 | 1.9 |
| | Panel: Collaborations in scholarly and laboratory research and impact on methods | 19 | 2.2 | 1.8 |
| | IRB 101: Basics of IRB | 18 | 2.1 | 1.7 |
| | Part 2 of 2: Evaluations plans: writing a strong evaluation plan, use of a logic model | 17 | 2.0 | 1.6 |
| | Data warehousing issues: guidance about how to maintain and secure data | 17 | 2.0 | 1.6 |
| | Step 1: Proposal preparation: how to turn a research idea into a fundable project | 16 | 1.9 | 1.5 |
| | Use of human subjects in research-ethical issues, implications, requirements | 16 | 1.9 | 1.5 |
| | Electronic research administration: Cayuse and beyond | 16 | 1.9 | 1.5 |
| Evaluations plans part 1: writing a strong evaluation plan | 13 | 1.5 | 1.2 | |
| Budget building, budget justification, cost-sharing issues | 12 | 1.4 | 1.1 | |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-----|------|
| | IRB amendments, continuations, and closures | 11 | 1.3 | 1.0 |
| | How to prepare an IRB application: issues that can slow the approval process and how to manage them, and the expected timeframe | 10 | 1.2 | 0.9 |
| | Panel: Discussion of research compliance case studies | 10 | 1.2 | 0.9 |
| | Step 2: Proposal preparation: panel group sessions for specific agencies or programs | 8 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| | Step 3: Grantwriting discussion: focus on subsections of grant proposals | 8 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| | Discussion of CITI human subjects research online training content | 8 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| | Culture of research compliance: how/why follow IRB and IACUC protocols, export control, etc. | 8 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| | Discussion of AALAS animal use protocol and application | 7 | 0.8 | 0.6 |
| | How to prepare an IACUC animal use protocol and application | 5 | 0.6 | 0.5 |
| | Step 4: Proposal preparation: hands-on working group for specific grant opportunities | 2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| | How to read/interpret guidelines of selected programs | 2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| | GSFI Total | 847 | 100 | 78.6 |
| | TOTAL | 1,078 | - | 100 |

The GSFI offers certificates to students in order to help them achieve their research goals. Often there are requirements that need to be met for a student to receive funding from certain sources or for them to be a Principal Investigator (PI) on a project. Through the certificate program offered by the GSFI, students can meet the requirements needed in order for funding and other opportunities. Most of the workshops offered by the GSFI are intended to train students in different research requirements and the students receive a certificate in the area of their choosing after completing the workshops. In the evaluation of the workshops, attendees were asked whether they were interested in a certificate from the GSFI. If they indicated that they were interested in a certificate, they were then asked in what area they wanted a certificate. Table 7 reports the number and percent of students who reported interest in the GSFI certificate program. Of the respondents completing the evaluation, 68.6% reported interest in the certificate program. Although only 8% indicated that they were not interested, the missing cases may also signal lack of interest in the certificate program.

| | Number | Percent |
|---------|--------|---------|
| Yes | 739 | 68.6 |
| No | 86 | 8.0 |
| Missing | 253 | 23.5 |
| Total | 1,078 | 100 |

Table 8 reports the number and percent of attendees who indicated interest in a particular certificate program. The categories are not mutually exclusive and attendees can receive all the certificates offered if they choose. The percentages for the following table are taken from the 739 workshop attendees who reported interest in the certificate program. Many students reported interest in all four areas of certification. The largest percentage of attendees were interested in the Grant-Writing Certificate (79.3%) followed by PI Eligibility (59.5%), Responsible Conduct of Research (51.6%), and Research Compliance (44.5%).

| | Number | Percent |
|---------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Grant-writing | 512 | 79.3 |
| PI Eligibility | 440 | 59.5 |
| Responsible Conduct of Research | 381 | 51.6 |
| Research Compliance | 329 | 44.5 |

Table 9 reports what attendees found most valuable about the workshop they attended. Attendees were invited to comment on various parts of the workshop they attended. These questions asked respondents to comment on what they found most valuable about the workshop, what they found least valuable, and whether they had any comments regarding suggested improvements to the workshop they attended. These comments were then coded by ISR staff for themes. Table 9 reports the most valuable section. For the most part, respondents made comments indicating that the information that was provided in the workshop was the most valuable part. The category in the table that represents that the information was most valuable is 'Information offered/Helpful' and it accounts for 63.2% of the comments.

Of the 1,078 evaluations received, 702 (65.1%) had comments in the most valuable section. Comments were coded into the 'format of the presentation and/or ppt. (Power Point) if the respondent indicated the presentation itself was most valuable. Examples of comments that were coded into this category are: 'Short and to the point' and 'The subject itself and the structure was good and well presented'. Respondents had to write 'N/A' in the most valuable area of the evaluation to have it counted as 'N/A' in Table 7.

| Table 9: Most Valuable | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| Information offered/Helpful | 444 | 63.2 |
| Format of presentation and/or ppt. | 58 | 8.3 |
| Discussion/Q & A | 37 | 5.3 |
| Examples | 34 | 4.8 |
| Presenter(s) | 27 | 3.8 |
| Everything/Thanks | 25 | 3.6 |
| Opinions/Advice offered | 25 | 3.6 |
| Handouts | 20 | 2.8 |
| Hands-on practice | 18 | 2.6 |
| N/A | 7 | 1.0 |
| Support/Networking | 5 | 0.7 |
| Time/Location | 2 | 0.3 |
| Total | 702 | 100 |
| Missing | 376 | 34.9 |
| TOTAL | 1,078 | |

Table 10 reports what attendees found least valuable about the workshop. Along with asking about the most valuable aspects of the workshop, attendees were invited to report what they found least valuable about the workshop. Only 369 (34.2%) of attendees reported anything in this section. Furthermore, of the 369 attendees reporting information in this section, 160 (43.4% of respondents who answered) reported that there was nothing about the workshop that they found least valuable.

The most common issue that attendees cited as least valuable was the information offered in the session. Examples of comments in this section that were coded as 'Information offered not helpful' are as follows: 'There was little information on latest electronic info'; 'Poor content'; 'Didn't need to be present to get this kind of info'.

The next most common comment was: 'Not applicable to discipline'. Many of the students who attended sessions reported that the information covered was not pertinent to their discipline, primarily the sessions regarding use of animals/humans in research. This session is required for attendees to receive a certificate from the GSFI. However, many attendees will not be working with animals or humans in their research.

| Table 10: Least Valuable | | |
|---------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| | Number | Percent |
| N/A or Nothing | 160 | 43.4 |
| Information offered not helpful | 50 | 13.6 |
| Not applicable to discipline | 24 | 6.5 |
| No new information/Irrelevant | 24 | 6.5 |
| Too general | 21 | 5.7 |
| Too short | 20 | 5.4 |
| Examples/Discussion lacked relevance or need more | 13 | 3.5 |
| Time management | 11 | 3.0 |
| Unorganized | 10 | 2.7 |
| Location | 8 | 2.2 |
| Time offered (semester/time of day) | 8 | 2.2 |
| Presenter(s) | 8 | 2.2 |
| Power Point | 6 | 1.6 |
| Too specific | 2 | 0.5 |
| Too long | 1 | 0.3 |
| Distractions | 1 | 0.3 |
| Opinions/Advice offered | 1 | 0.3 |
| No snacks | 1 | 0.3 |
| Total | 369 | 100 |
| Missing | 709 | 65.8 |
| TOTAL | 1,078 | |

Table 11 reports attendees' suggested improvements for the workshops. Attendees were asked whether they had ideas to improve the workshops offered by the GRC/GSFI, especially if they had found something invaluable about the session they attended. Much like the least valuable section of the survey, only 391 (36.3%) attendees had suggested improvements for the workshops, and of those suggested improvements, 75 (19.2% of attendees who reported in this section) said they had no suggested improvements.

The most common comments were in regard to the information offered during the workshops. Attendees' comments that were coded into this category mentioned things like, 'Not enough information regarding STATA', or 'I would like to see a "critical book review" component'.

Attendees reported the sessions being too short for the amount of information presented. These comments pertain to the 'Length (too short)' category. Many claimed they felt rushed and that there was not enough time to adequately cover the topic.

The category labeled: ‘Make available online’ refers both to the workshop itself, but also to the materials covered in the workshop. Some attendees reported wanting to have access to the Power Point online, as well as the handouts and other materials from the workshop.

| | Number | Percent |
|-------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Additional information needed | 92 | 23.5 |
| Good job/No suggestions | 75 | 19.2 |
| Length (too short) | 24 | 6.1 |
| More examples | 20 | 5.1 |
| Expand sessions into 2 | 19 | 4.9 |
| Make available online | 19 | 4.9 |
| Change location | 18 | 4.6 |
| Offer sessions at various times | 17 | 4.3 |
| More hands-on approach | 17 | 4.3 |
| Make content more relevant | 14 | 3.6 |
| Be more specific | 13 | 3.3 |
| Broaden focus to include more disciplines | 13 | 3.3 |
| More discussion | 11 | 2.8 |
| Provide coffee/snacks | 9 | 2.3 |
| Fix technical issues | 7 | 1.8 |
| Better advertising for workshop | 7 | 1.8 |
| Better time management | 6 | 1.5 |
| More handouts | 5 | 1.3 |
| Combine workshops into 1 | 4 | 1.0 |
| Length (too long) | 1 | 0.3 |
| Total | 391 | 100 |
| Missing | 687 | 63.7 |
| TOTAL | 1,078 | |

Respondents were asked to rate the services they received from their respective workshop experiences using a 5-point Likert Scale. A statement was given (e.g., This workshop provided valuable information for my purposes as a graduate/professional student) and each student was asked to agree or disagree to some extent. For this scale, 1 equals ‘Strongly agree’ and 5 equals ‘Strongly disagree’. Table 12 reports the percent of attendees and the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each particular statement and the average for each statement.

The averages for all the statements are quite low, never rising above a 1.6; this indicates that attendees are satisfied with the workshops and often ‘strongly agree’ with the statements they were asked to agree or disagree with.

| Statement | N | Strongly agree % | Agree % | Neither agree nor disagree % | Disagree % | Strongly disagree % | Average |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------------|---------|------------------------------|------------|---------------------|---------|
| Provided valuable information for my purpose as a graduate/professional student | 1,072 | 64.0 | 30.5 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.4 |
| The workshop met my expectations | 1,075 | 57.6 | 32.6 | 7.5 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 1.6 |
| The workshop was well organized and prepared | 1,071 | 65.6 | 28.9 | 4.2 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 1.4 |
| Gave important info about how to address the topic | 1,058 | 65.1 | 31.3 | 3.6 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.4 |
| As a result of attending this workshop, I learned new concepts and I feel prepared to use them | 1,071 | 56.5 | 31.7 | 8.2 | 3.0 | 0.7 | 1.6 |
| The workshop was in an appropriate location | 1,059 | 59.7 | 31.4 | 6.6 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 1.5 |
| The workshop was offered at a convenient time | 1,070 | 57.0 | 34.0 | 6.0 | 3.0 | - | 1.6 |
| I would like to attend other workshops like this | 1,041 | 61.4 | 29.7 | 6.9 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 1.5 |

Table 13 uses the same Likert Scale as Table 12; however, this set of statements was in regard to the presenter(s) of the workshop. Attendees were asked to agree or disagree with statements about the knowledge of the presenter along with some other statements regarding the presenter's performance. Again, attendees generally agreed that the presenter(s) were knowledgeable about the topics covered, used time effectively, answered questions well, and gave a clear and informative presentation.

| Statement | N | Strongly agree % | Agree % | Neither agree nor disagree % | Disagree % | Strongly disagree % | Average |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------|------------------|---------|------------------------------|------------|---------------------|---------|
| The presenter was knowledgeable about the topic | 1,069 | 77.0 | 21.6 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| The presenter gave a clear and informative presentation | 1,069 | 72.2 | 24.5 | 2.7 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 1.3 |
| The presenter answered questions well | 1,057 | 70.8 | 24.7 | 4.1 | 0.5 | - | 1.3 |
| The presenter used time effectively | 1,065 | 69.6 | 25.7 | 3.1 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 1.4 |

CONCLUSION

Between the GRC and the GSFI, 57 workshops produced evaluations. However, some workshops did not have any evaluations completed, and as mentioned in the introduction, this report is not intended to analyze actual attendee numbers or workshops numbers, only the evaluations completed by attendees. In the previous reporting period, a total of 60 workshops produced evaluations for analysis. There was a 31.7% decrease in the number of evaluations completed from this year as compared to the previous reporting period. Of the 1,078 evaluations completed, almost 99% were from face-to-face workshops (as opposed to online workshops). It was found, however, that although online workshops took place, many of the workshop attendees from the online sessions did not complete an evaluation at the end of the workshop, and there were no online workshops held for the Spring and Summer during 2013.

Similar to the previous reporting period, the Spring and Fall semesters saw the largest number of evaluations completed from the workshops. The months with the largest numbers of evaluations were July, October, and March. The months with the least amount of completed evaluations were August, June, and December. However it must be noted that very few workshops or none at all are held during these months.

For the most part, attendees reported being satisfied with the services provided by the GRC and GSFI. Respondents had the option to comment in several sections of the evaluation regarding what they found to be most valuable about the workshops, least valuable, and any suggested improvements they may have had. For the most valuable section, 702 (65.1%) of respondents indicated some aspect of the workshop, while only 369 (34.2%) of respondents reported an aspect of the workshop as being least valuable. Moreover, of those 369 respondents who reported a least valuable aspect, 160 (43.4% of the respondents who answered in the least valuable category) reported that there was nothing wrong, or N/A as being least valuable. So in total, only 2.7% of respondents reported something as being least valuable about the workshop they attended. Another indicator of how attendees feel about the workshops are the responses to the likert scale questions asking about general satisfaction with the workshop they attended. Averages never go above a 1.6 which means that on average, people either strongly agreed or agreed with statements such as, [this workshop] provided valuable information for my purposes as a graduate/professional student.

Appendix of relevant comments for particular workshops (ISR Staff comments in *italics*)

GRC Literature review

- It would be great if there could be variety in time presentations are offered.
- I need more help with how to organize a lit review

GRC Nuts and bolts of publishing

- I think the slide presentation was too long and had too much text, I think I would prefer a more concise presentation without group discussion.

GRC Qualitative analysis

- This one is especially outstanding.
- Review qualitative terms and bring questions.

GRC Jump start institute

- Super organized, thank you for extending me this opportunity. I gained a wealth of knowledge and am confident of my beginning semester.

GRC Building a bibliography with Zotero

- Wi-Fi connection didn't work, so it was impossible to use laptops.
- I think it may be a great thing but 1 hour was not enough for finding my way around. A more detailed manual would be great.

GRC Enhancing presentation through technology

- Talk about knowing your audience and then speak quickly and rush through so many points when most attendees are ESL? really?
- Think they knew the material well but didn't bridge gap for those of us who knew nothing.
- Too general; too introductory no/little discussion of title topic.
- Since the workshops are offered every week at the same time if you can't make to one, you can't make to all of them.

GRC Create and design an academic poster

- The presentation ranged from really basic to tantalizingly advanced.

GSFI Financial management of funds awarded

- Definitely learned new concepts-but financial management is complex I feel I would need help using them.
- Timing was off and talked fast so I missed some details.
- A lot of information in a short time.
- A detailed handout of the common terms, and spell out the formulas used to read reports.
- N/A the presenter has charisma and good vocal skills.

- This was a very helpful session, I have no complaints.

GSFI Research compliance overview

- Found earlier sessions potentially offensive to foreign nationals. I would recommend not to name specific countries in future talks.
- Clarification on whether kids and parents need to consent what things are controlled? What countries are excluded?
- The first presenter just went on and on. I'm totally confused by whether export control applies to me/my research.
- These sessions are required but have the potential to be useful-make the information you give concrete specific and to the point.
- Could hear the meeting next door, which was distracting.
- If people are going to read slides to us, I would strongly encourage you to consider an online deployment/delivery of these courses.
- Better management of highly specific irrelevant questions.
- This basement room is not very convenient.
- The OACC part was very rushed and went over time.
- It seemed like some of the presentations were rushed and didn't have enough time.

GSFI Introduction to responsible and ethical conduct in research-NSF, NIH training requirements

- Well presented, just a bit rushed.
- Very rushed

GSFI Conflicts of interest, intellectual property-What graduate students can encounter or expect

- Need more clear explanation for new people in research.
- Make class longer.

GSFI Writing effective email inquiries and letters of intent

- I plan to attend the budget workshop but got very confused doing the discussion of IDC.

GSFI Mentoring and whistleblowing

- Same people speaking - some negative and off track.

GSFI Step 2: Proposal Preparation - panel group sessions for specific agencies or programs

- I found this very informative and is helpful to aiding my future endeavors in grant writing.

GSFI How to prepare an IRB application, issues that can slow the approval process and how to manage them, and the expected timeframe

- Didn't learn much new info, not because workshop wasn't informative but simply because I already knew the info.
- Excellent as always I learn from these workshops.

GSFI Timeline, Time Management and Program Assessment

- The location is a bit difficult to get too. Far end of campus.

GSFI CV/Resume preparation, Letters of Support for Different Purposes

- When announcements go be specific about the content which will be covered, eg. is this information useful to undergrads, MA/MS students or Phd candidates. "CSEL LL" is difficult to understand I had no idea this was in the centennial library.
- As an undergrad I have class at 2 so a 1 hour workshop at 1 makes me late for class.
- Location is difficult to get to.
- This was way to elementary because of the description I thought this would be more helpful.
- Main problem is that I was already familiar with the material, not anything the presenters failed to provide.

GSFI Part 2 of 2: Evaluation Plans: writing a strong evaluation plan, use of a logic model

- Claudia is a very good presenter; she is enthusiastic, knowledgeable, and eager to share what she knows.
- Great - a great presenter, thank you.
- Shorter presentations if possible.

GSFI PI eligibility: What does it mean to be a PI for financial and compliance issues

- Some funding classes would be nice.
- I expected more information being PI eligible rather than rules and regs for studying people and animals.
- Most of today's questions are covered in basic research courses, and probably in other sessions in this series.

GSFI Use of animals in research-Ethical issues, implications, requirements

- How to deal with aggressive animals (dogs) in communities that one is doing research? Are there any standards on how one should conduct them self?

GSFI Literature review for grant-writing

- The workshop exceeded my expectations!

GSFI Use of human subjects in research-Ethical issues, implications, requirements

- Life examples and humor is great most of the time-some comments needed to be toned down.
- Longer lectures.

GSFI IRB 101 Basics of IRB

- The forms are new and the presenter was not familiar with them.

GSFI Data warehousing- Keeping records secure

- Previous workshops have been more captivating because instructor was standing and moving around during the presentation.

GSFI Evaluation plans pt 1: writing a strong evaluation plan

- Difficult to get, especially the first time.
- He spent more time on anecdotes than on (our) graduate applications.

GSFI Culture of research compliance: How/why follow IRB and IACUC protocols, export control, etc.

- Give explanation of NRDD, RCR, etc.-do we need? or not?

Appendix of workshops that students would like to see added

**Many attendees indicated workshops that already exist, so those are not recorded below.*

- Writing proposals for the NSF
- E-book and Apps
- Time management for Ph.D students writing dissertations. :)
- "Google Scholar" More specific
- Endnote use; hands on follow up steps toward narrowing down a topic through the use of database seeking and selecting
- A workshop for each component of thesis/dissertation (lit review methods, ...)
- Article writing techniques
- A STATA session 2
- Presenting data (quantitative) in professional/ academic papers
- One that covers ONE research and look at the research in the different stages if the process
- Maybe grad school applications
- More specifics of funding agencies/corporations etc..
- Workshop on how to word sentences, paragraphs, for properly writing etc, what language to use, word play, what not use, what is qualifying language, etc
- How to fund your idea
- About how to write a budget
- How to select a mentor
- IRB and publications/journal submissions specifics
- Academic to business transition
- Time management for research conference or presentation
- On how to write a teaching philosophy
- Workshops associated with the final Phd years, diss grants, postdocs and job market
- Publishing workshops that list possible sources
- Research presentations/conferences/how to do's and don'ts
- CV only workshop
- Formatting CV's-hands-on
- General student generated topics- maybe once a month on a topic people can vote on
- Expert vs. informed citizen
- Yes, some practical skills. e.g. development of models, learning of a new software
- Specific grant and budget management w/ all forms and details.
- Biosafety (*mentioned 3 times*)
- How to approach mentors (for international students).
- Conducting research in a foreign country
- Resources for the minority class that are planning to attend graduate school
- Perhaps one directed to fine art research
- Community research specific training
- HIPPA regulations
- Proper referencing and citations
- Grant funding examples

- A workshop on STATA
- Endnote full program
- Insurance info
- Pre Award services, future funding
- Controlled things and countries which have restrictions
- Writing improvements?
- Networking with people from other universities
- How to create questions for surveys
- Workshop on UNM areas, e.g. what is the provost? Where to go if you are starting a new research.
- More PI training for health sciences
- Would like to see more about presentation technology
- Reading academic articles effectively
- Social media to network (not only linked in)
- How to select a narrow topic
- TA/ teaching workshops (*mentioned often*)
- Using MS publisher/making posters
- About how and where to report awarded fellowships for tax purposes
- How do grad students get to do collaboration. Challenges and procedure
- How to find and apply for post-docs and tenure-track jobs

