



Prepared by
Riki Garvin

**Webinar Evaluation: “An Intuitive Approach to Title III/V” Presenter: David Trujillo
Facilitator at CHC: Karen Childers**

Overview: On December 7, 2012, Crafton Hills College administrators, faculty and staff who work with a Title V grant attended a recorded webinar entitled “An Intuitive Approach to Title III/V” presented by David Trujillo of the University of New Mexico.

Methodology: Following the workshop, participants were asked to complete a paper survey. Participants wrote the name of the session, the last name of the presenter, and the date. The next item asked respondents their primary function at CHC (full-time faculty, part-time faculty, classified or confidential staff, or manager/administrator). Respondents then rated on a four-point Likert scale (4 = Strongly Agree, 3 = Agree, 2 = Disagree, and 1 = Strongly Disagree) the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements:

- The topic was relevant and timely
- The presenter’s knowledge of the subject was excellent
- The handouts and materials were useful
- The presentation style and techniques used by the presenter were appropriate for the topic being presented
- The information presented was useful for my professional development
- The information presented was useful for my personal development
- I would recommend this workshop to my co-workers

Respondents then answered four open-ended questions:

- What did you learn as a result of participating in this workshop?
- What suggestions do you have, if any, to help make this workshop more productive?
- What other topics/activities would you like to see offered through Professional Development?
- What topics would you like to see offered on the next flex day?

A total of seven CHC employees completed surveys.

Sample: Three participants were classified staff, three were full-time faculty, and one was a manager. No other demographic information was collected.

Findings: Participants rated their satisfaction with the presenter, the materials, and other aspects of the workshop; these results are presented in Table 2. The first column lists the statements, the second column (i.e., “N”) shows the number of faculty and staff who responded to the item, the column entitled “Min” shows the lowest response on the scale, the column entitled “Max” shows the highest response on the scale, the column “Mean” shows the average rating, and the last column shows the standard deviation. Respondents rated whether or not they agreed with the statements on a four-point Likert scale as follows: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree. If the Min (i.e., lowest) score was a “3”, that means that none of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. If the Max score was a “4”, that means that at least one respondent strongly agreed with the statement. As an illustration, if the mean score was 3.65, that would indicate that, on average, respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The table is arranged by Mean score in descending order.

As shown in Table 1, participants' evaluation of the workshop was very positive. Every participant strongly agreed that the presenter's knowledge of the subject was excellent. All participants agreed or strongly agreed that the topic was relevant and timely. In addition, all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the presentation style and techniques were appropriate, that they would recommend the workshop to their co-workers, that the handouts and materials were useful, and that the information was useful for their professional development. Two respondents disagreed that the information was useful for their personal development.

Table 1: Satisfaction with Workshop.

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements:	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
The presenter's knowledge of the subject was excellent.	7	4	4	4.00	.00
The topic was relevant and timely	6	3	4	3.67	.52
The handouts and materials were useful	3	3	4	3.67	.58
The information presented was useful for my professional development	7	3	4	3.57	.54
I would recommend this workshop to my co-workers	6	3	4	3.50	.55
The presentation style and techniques used by the presenter were appropriate for the topic being presented	6	3	4	3.50	.55
The information presented was useful for my personal development	6	2	4	3.17	.98

In the first open-ended question, participants were asked what they learned as a result of participating in the workshop. The following is a complete list of responses:

- How grant applications should be written, and how they are processed
- I have a clearer understanding of expectations from readers and the necessity for a clearly focused single activity based on objectives and data collection.
- This was a great webinar—very informative of the application process. I liked the history of Title III/V—great background.
- Very pertinent info

The next question asked for suggestions to make the workshop more productive. The following is a complete list of responses:

- It would have been nice to have a grant expert present to lead discussions and answer questions.
- The webinar speaker (Trujillo) talked about charts and graphs but did not show any!

No respondent answered the third open-ended question, "What other topics/activities would you like to see offered through Professional Development?"

The fourth open-ended questions asked participants what topics they would like to see covered in Flex Day workshops in the future. One participant wrote, "I would like to see members/staff from all grants at CHC get together and discuss the components of each grant to identify areas where we can combine our efforts. It would also allow faculty and staff to gain an understanding of programs and services available through these grants."