



The University of New Mexico

**Graduate Resource Center
and Graduate Student
Funding Initiative
Workshops Evaluations
October 2011-September
2012**

Prepared by:

Paul Guerin, Ph.D.,

Erin R. Coleman and Elise Samuelson

Institute for Social Research, University of
New Mexico

Prepared for:

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

**INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
JUNE 2013**

INTRODUCTION

This report describes the workshop evaluations completed by students who attended Graduate Resource Center (GRC) and Graduate Student Funding Initiative (GSFI) workshops between October 2011 and September 2012 and completed a workshop evaluation. A total of 1,579 evaluations were collected from 1,810 attendees who signed the sign-in sheets for the workshops. Not all workshop attendees completed an evaluation and not all attendees signed in for the workshops so this report is not intended to analyze actual attendee numbers. The TutorTrac system is used to track and report attendees for both GRC and GSFI. For the reporting time period TutorTrac shows 1,671 attendees for GRC and GSFI workshops. This discrepancy of 139 attendees is due to several known factors. First, it is not possible to enter attendees into the TutorTrac database when the name on the attendance list is illegible or the attendee does not list their identification number. Second, in a discussion with GRC staff we believe there may be some very minor data entry errors.

Table 1- Count of Workshop Evaluations, Attendees and TutorTrac Attendees

Count Source	Count
Workshop Evaluations	1,579
Attendees who Signed In	1,810
Attendees as indicated by TutorTrac	1,671

The workshop evaluation form contains a variety of questions regarding the workshop attended. This includes the date of the workshop, the name of the workshop, the presenter(s), a series of statements about the workshop (i.e. location, time offered, organization, and value of information), a series of statements about the presenter(s) (i.e. informative and use of time), a comments section (i.e. least/most valuable and improvements), and whether the attendee was interested in a GSFI certificate program. A copy of the workshop evaluation form is attached as Appendix A. This report covers the listed topics.

Table 1 reports the number of evaluations completed by program type. Approximately 77% of evaluations was filled out by individuals attending GSFI workshops while 23% were completed by GRC workshop attendees.

Table 1- Number of Evaluations by Program Type

Program Type	Number	Percent
GRC	365	23.1%
GSFI	1,214	76.9%
Total	1,579	100%

Table 2 reports the frequencies of evaluations completed from online workshops and face-to-face workshops. Because the majority of workshops were offered face to face the large majority of evaluations were face to face. Only 13% of evaluations were filled out online. The GSFI offered online sessions in the Summer 2012 semester and the GRC offered online sessions during the Fall 2012 semester.

Table 2- Number of Evaluations by Workshop Format

Workshop Format	Number	Percent
Face to Face	1,374	87.0%
Online	205	13.0%
TOTAL	1,579	100%

Table 3 reports the number of evaluations where the attendees stated they were interested in obtaining a GSFI certificate. Only about 11% of respondents indicated they were 'not interested in a certificate'. Almost 28% of the workshop evaluations were missing this information and it is possible the missing information is a marker of not being interested in the certificate program. Also, the GRC does not offer certificates and because there are more evaluations completed by GSFI attendees, this may indicate that students using GSFI services are more aware of the certificate program.

Table 3- Number of Evaluations Indicating an Interest in Obtaining a GSFI Certificate

Interested in Obtaining GSFI Certificate	Number	Percent
No	130	11.4%
Yes	1,012	88.6%
Missing	437	(27.7%)*
TOTAL	1,579	100%

*Percent of the TOTAL that is missing

Table 4 reports the number of workshop evaluations by semester. For the two Fall Semesters, only September is counted for 2012 and October thru December are counted for Fall 2011.

Table 4- Number of Evaluations by Semester

Semester	Number	Percent
Spring	460	29.1%
Summer	468	29.6%
Fall 2011	390	24.7%
Fall 2012	261	16.5%
Total	1,579	100%

Table 5 reports the number of evaluations by month. The largest number and percent of evaluations were completed in June (16.7%) and the smallest number and percent was completed in December with nine evaluations (0.6%).

Table 5- Number of Evaluations by Month

Month Attended	Number	Percent
January	75	4.7%
February	168	10.6%
March	121	7.7%
April	96	6.1%
June	264	16.7%
July	204	12.9%
August	69	4.4%
September	192	12.2%
October	236	14.9%
November	145	9.2%
December	9	0.6%
Total	1,579	100%

Table 6 reports the name of each workshop, and the number of evaluations filled out for each individual workshop along with the percent. A count of the total attendees is also included. This information is useful for comparing the number of individuals who signed into the workshop as attendees and the number of individuals who completed workshop evaluations. This table reports 1,810 attendees and 1,579 workshop evaluations. This compares to 1,671 individuals indicated in the TutorTrac system. It is important to recognize that not all individuals who attended the workshops signed in as attendees and not all attendees completed a workshop evaluation. On a few occasions there were more total workshop evaluations than workshop attendees (i.e. Electronic Research Administration: Cayuse & Beyond). This is not an error and this may happen because occasionally individuals may complete a workshop evaluation and not sign in as an attendee. This table is not meant to report total attendees but only individuals who signed in as attendees and individuals who completed a workshop evaluation.

Table 6- Number of Evaluations by Workshop/Session

GRC or GSFI	Session Name	Number of evaluations	Percent of all Evaluations	Total Attendees on record
GSFI	IRB 101: Basics of IRB	83	5.3%	95
	Proposal Preparation in General, & Goals & Objectives	72	4.6%	80
	Timeline, Time Management & Program Assessment	65	4.1%	66
	CV/Resume Preparation, Letters of Support for Different Purposes	63	4.0%	67
	Budget Building, Budget Justification, Cost-sharing Issues	57	3.6%	58
	Data Warehousing: Keeping Records Secure	57	3.6%	62
	Writing Effective Email Inquiries and Letters of Intent	56	3.5%	58
	Mentoring and Whistleblowing	55	3.5%	56
	Evaluation Plans Pt. 1: Writing a Strong Evaluation Plan	54	3.4%	55
	Intro to Responsible & Ethical Conduct of Research-NSF, NIH Training Requirements	51	3.2%	55
	Conflicts of Interest, Intellectual Property: What Graduate Students Can Encounter or Expect	48	3.0%	55
	Research Compliance Overview	46	2.9%	60
	Authorship: Exploring Journal Ethics, 1 st Author Guidelines	46	2.9%	48
	Use of Human Subjects in Research: Ethical Issues, Implications, Requirements	44	2.8%	53
	How to Prepare an IRB Application, Issues That Can Slow the Approval Process & How to Manage Them	44	2.8%	44
	Social Responsibility of Researchers	43	2.7%	45
	Mentoring and Whistleblowing Pt. 2	42	2.7%	44
	Financial Management of Funds Awarded	41	2.6%	41
	Literature Review for Grantwriting	35	2.2%	36
	Evaluation Plans Pt. 2: Use of a Logic Model	32	2.0%	36
Use of Animals in Research: Ethical Issues, Implications, Requirements	30	1.9%	31	
Hands-on Workshop to Identify Sources of Funding	25	1.6%	39	
Electronic Research Administration: Cayuse & Beyond	20	1.3%	19	
PI Eligibility: What Does it Mean to be A PI for	18	1.1%	18	

	Financial & Compliance Issues			
	How to Prepare an IACUC Animal Use Protocol & Application	15	0.9%	17
	Research Collaborations and Scholarly Research Partnerships: How to Create & Manage Them	15	0.9%	15
	Step 1: Proposal Preparation-How to Turn a Research Idea into a Fundable Project	12	0.8%	13
	Discussion of CITI Human Subjects Research Online Training Content	9	0.6%	9
	Step 4: Proposal Preparation-Hands-on Working Group for Specific Grant Opportunities	9	0.6%	13
	Panel: Collaborations in Scholarly & Laboratory Research & Impact on Methods	6	0.4%	6
	IRB Amendments, Continuations, & Closures	5	0.3%	5
	Culture of Research Compliance: How/Why Follow IRB & IACUC Protocols, Export Control, etc.	4	0.3%	4
	How to Read/Interpret Guidelines of Selected Programs	4	0.3%	4
	Step 2: Proposal Preparation-Panel Group Sessions for Specific Agencies & Programs	3	0.2%	3
	Step 3: Grantwriting Discussion-Focus on Subsections of Grant Proposals	3	0.2%	3
	Panel Discussion of Research Compliance Case Studies	2	0.1%	2
GRC	Building a Bibliography with Endnote Web	34	2.2%	39
	Critical Reading Annotation Skills	30	1.9%	34
	Presentation Skills (Powerpoint, Keynote, Prezi, etc.)	29	1.8%	31
	Developing Literature Reviews	27	1.7%	31
	Research Question/Proposal Development for Thesis/Dissertation	22	1.4%	24
	Jump Start Institute	22	1.4%	28
	Building a Bibliography with Zotero	20	1.3%	23
	Graduate School 101/Recruitment Panel	19	1.2%	50
	Data Analysis Overview (Atlas Ti, NVivo, STATA, SPSS, etc.	19	1.2%	24
	Quantitative Analysis for Graduate Students	14	0.9%	18
	Dissertation 101: Planning the Dissertation Workshop	13	0.8%	18
	CV/Resume (Academic vs. Non-Academic	13	0.8%	16
	Thesis/Dissertation 101: From Concept to Execution	12	0.8%	16

	Editing & Revision Strategies for Graduate School	12	0.8%	15
	Applying to Graduate School (Letters of Support/Intent)	11	0.7%	13
	Negotiation Skills for Academic/Professional Women	11	0.7%	13
	Library Research	11	0.7%	11
	Qualitative Analysis	11	0.7%	15
	Style Manuals (APA/MLA/Chicago)	10	0.6%	32
	Technical Writing	10	0.6%	11
	Nuts and Bolts of Publishing	8	0.5%	10
	Leadership Development	4	0.3%	20
	Writing Teaching Philosophies for Higher Education	3	0.2%	3
	Total	1,579	100.0%	1,810
	GSFI Total	1,214	76.9%	1,315
	GRC Total	365	23.1%	495

Table 7 shows what the attendees reported they found most valuable about the workshop. In this section of the evaluation, attendees were asked to self-report what they found most valuable, what they found least valuable, and their suggested improvements for the workshop they attended. These sections were free text and coded into groups. The category, 'format/ppt./presentation' is the most varied category. Respondent's comments fell into this category if they answered that something particular about the presentation was helpful and their answer did not fit into other categories such as 'handouts' or 'examples'. These answers include things such as enjoying the power point, the way the presenter ordered the information, or the fact that the presenter left time at the end for questions. The category most comments fell under was the 'information offered/helpful'. These comments were mainly about a specific piece of information the student found to be helpful, such as 'the rule of 3's' or 'the distinction between goals, needs, and objectives', but this category also included such comments as 'all was helpful'. About 32% of attendees who filled out the evaluation did not answer this section of the survey

Table 7- Most Valuable

	Frequency	Percent
Information Offered/Helpful	501	36.9%
Examples	134	9.9%
Format/Ppt./Presentation	94	6.9%
Handouts	66	4.9%
Presenter(s)	49	3.6%
Everything/Thanks	53	3.9%
Discussion	37	2.7%
N/A	33	2.4%
Hands-on Practice	34	2.5%
Opinions Offered	28	2.1%
Support	18	1.3%
Time/Location	10	0.7%
Online Format	10	0.7%

Table 8 reports what respondents found least valuable about the session they attended. The most frequent answer was ‘nothing’ or ‘good job’ (34.2%). Also, not as many attendees completed this section compared to the ‘Most Valuable’ section. Only 483 or 30.5% of the attendees who completed workshop evaluations filled out the ‘Least Valuable’ section, while 1,067 (67.6%) of the attendees who completed a workshop evaluation filled out the ‘Most Valuable’ section. As indicated earlier, 181 (37.5%) of the 483 workshop evaluations noted there was ‘nothing’ that was not valuable or that the presenter(s) did a ‘good job’. This means that 302 workshop evaluations indicated something that was ‘least valuable’.

The ‘technical issues’ category included computer or powerpoint issues, the sound being too low, the handouts being unreadable, and the room not allowing for people in the back to see the presentation screen. Some examples of comments in this category are, ‘small print on handout’, ‘location and computer displays blocking view of projector’, and ‘technical difficulties in staying logged in’.

For the ‘unorganized’ category, the comments varied and include issues such as, too fast; too much time spent on a particular area; found the format (presentation, discussion, ppt.) to be unhelpful; didn’t understand presentation well; presenter was hard to understand; overall disorganization. Some comments in this area are, ‘it went fast and was hard to understand acronyms’; ‘extensive discussions about what an evaluation is’; ‘wasted time’; ‘too much background on IRB’ and ‘would have preferred to get the handouts earlier’.

Table 8- Least Valuable

	Frequency	Percent
Nothing/Good Job	181	34.2%
Unorganized	77	14.6%
Greater detail/Too general	36	6.8%
N/A	35	6.6%
Time(too long/too short)	32	6%
Examples/Discussion(need more/lack relevance)	27	5.1%
Gear toward more disciplines	19	3.6%
Boring/Irrelevant	18	3.4%
Location	12	2.3%
Distractions	9	1.7%
More handouts/Copies of ppt.	9	1.7%
Time offered(semester/time of day)	9	1.7%
Expand/Divide into 2	6	1.1%
Too specific	4	0.8%
Opinions offered	4	0.8%
Presenter(s)	4	0.8%
No snacks	1	0.2%

Table 9 shows the responses for the ‘suggested improvements’ category. Only 44 (28.3%) evaluations had this category filled out, and again, most attendees that filled this part out indicated that the GRC and GSFI did a good job with their workshops and that there were no suggestions for improvement.

Because this is a valuable area for evaluation this report will expound on the suggested improvements even though for the most part, attendees seem very satisfied with the workshops. The improvements that the attendees described are as follows:

For people who commented on the times that the sessions were offered, most suggested offering sessions during lunch or after five in the evening. People also suggested that the sessions be offered more than once a semester although they may not know that many sessions are in fact offered more than once a semester.

Much like the least valuable comments, the ‘technical issues’ category ranges from fixing computer issues, such as sound and log-in processes, to having tables where the presenter can put out handouts. Some comments in this area include, ‘A more reliable online delivery system’; ‘start on time’; ‘improve streaming and sound quality’; and ‘the presentation went too fast at times’.

In the length category, most of the people who answered said that they would have preferred to have a longer session so as to include more detail and not feel as rushed; only a few respondents suggested shortening the session.

The ‘additional info needed’ category varied quite a bit. Respondents in this category expressed interest in either expounding on a certain piece of information or offering different information in the session. Examples of comments in this category include, ‘more information on reading output’; ‘have a glossary of the terms used in the slides’; ‘explain the acronyms that you’re using’; ‘more practical information about how to organize the paper its self’.

For the ‘more (examples/handouts)’ category, many people suggested that there be copies of the power point (ppt.) provided, and they also indicated that they would like the presentation emailed to them prior to the session. A few example comments for this category include, ‘examples of a good and a bad CV’; ‘provide hardcopy of ppt. in advance’; ‘more real life examples’; ‘provide outline to refer to’.

In the ‘make available online’ category, many respondents indicated that they would like to see the sessions online. They also indicated that they would like the materials (i.e., handouts, examples, and ppt.) to be put online on the GSFI/GRC websites in order to refer to or to print materials from the session.

The ‘Broaden Focus’ and ‘More Specific’ categories contained comments that indicated the students would like the workshops tailored to their individual areas of study.

Table 9- Suggested Improvements

	Frequency	Percent
Good Job/No Suggestions	116	26%
More (examples/handouts)	75	16.8%
Fix Technical Issues	69	15.4%
Additional Info. Needed	44	9.8%
Offer Sessions at Various Times	27	6%
Be More Specific	26	5.8%
Length (too long/too short)	22	4.9%
Expand Sessions Into Two	21	4.7%
Change Location	15	3.4%
Make Available Online	15	3.4%
Broaden Focus to More Disciplines	11	2.5%
Provide Coffee/Snakes	6	1.3%

Table 10 reports evaluation questions where the students were asked to what extent they agreed with a statement. In this Likert Scale of 1-5, '1' is equivalent to 'strongly agree', and '5' is 'strongly disagree'. The averages are all below 2, indicating most students found the workshops to be helpful and gave generally good reviews of the workshops.

The GSFI and the GRC had different ways of asking essentially the same question. Table 10 reports the average answer to these questions; they varied slightly in wording between the GSFI and GRC evaluation forms. There are also variations of these questions based on whether it was an online or face-to-face workshop. All the averages, whether GRC, GSFI, face-to-face, or online, never go above a 2 on the Likert Scale indicating that students are generally happy with the workshops for all formats and program types.

Table 10- Sample of Workshop Evaluation Questions

	N	Average
Provided valuable info for my purposes as a graduate/professional student	1,263	1.4
The workshop met my expectations	1,265	1.5
The workshop seemed well organized and prepared	1,085	1.4
Gave important info about how to address the topic	1,179	1.4
As a result of attending this workshop, I learned new concepts and I feel prepared to use them	1,086	1.6
The workshop was in an appropriate location	1,063	1.5
The workshop was offered at a convenient time	1,077	1.5
I would like to attend other workshops like this	1,036	1.4
The presenter was knowledgeable about the topic	1,253	1.2
The presenter gave a clear and informative presentation	1,182	1.3
The presenter answered questions well	1,252	1.4
The presenter used time effectively	1,252	1.4

CONCLUSION

The information in the report covers GRC and GSFI evaluations for the time period of October 2011 through September 2012. In addition to the information provided last year, this report also indicates whether the session was online or face-to-face, and there is information included on whether the attendee was interested in receiving a certificate from the GSFI.

A total of 1,579 evaluations were completed. Similar to last year, there were more evaluations for the GSFI workshops (about 77%) compared to the GRC workshops (about 23%)..

As indicated earlier in the introduction, this analysis does not cover individuals attending the workshops, but rather the number of evaluations filled out by workshop attendees. Because

the evaluations are anonymous we cannot report on the number of students who attended the workshops, and TutorTrac should have a more accurate count of students who have received services from the GRC and the GSFI for further analysis.

To conclude this analysis, most evaluations indicated positive feedback. As table 10 shows, the averages of satisfaction never go above a 2, signifying that respondents were generally quite satisfied with the workshops. Furthermore, respondents were more likely to answer the question of what they found to be most valuable rather than giving suggestions for improvement or least valuable answers, indicating further that attendees were satisfied with the workshops and found them to be valuable.

