

WORKSHOP SESSION SUMMARY
POST-CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
2018 National Trainers' Exchange

1. Session Title and Presenter's Contact Information:

“Utilizing Course Evaluations and Developing an Annual Post-Impact Survey to Provide Effective Trainings”

Aurora Le, MPH, CPH & Jocelyn Herstein, MPH, PhDc

Indiana University School of Public Health-Bloomington & University of Nebraska Medical Center

Emails: able@indiana.edu, jocelyn.herstein@unmc.edu

2. Workshop Summary:

The objective of this 45-minute half-session workshop was to understand how evaluations are critical in the process of program improvement, by allowing for the analyses of a program's activities and content. Data collected from the evaluations can provide information on potential areas in which a program's effectiveness can be improved. The workshop also provided a refresher on the Kirkpatrick Model on levels of behavior change. This ideal audience for this presentation was trainers wishing to understand the value of course evaluations and administering them, as well as program managers/coordinators starting new evaluation systems.

This session presented the evaluation process the Biosafety and Infectious Disease Training Initiative (BIDTI)—part of the Infectious Disease Response (IDR) WTP—and how it utilizes evaluations to continually improve the effectiveness of the training program, using a hybrid paper/digital evaluation method, that is easy for the trainer to administer. Additionally, although it is not required, BIDTI conducts an annual post-impact survey that is administered to trainees of that training year to determine the training program's effect, if any, on long-term behavior and organizational-level changes. There was discussion and a sample shown of how to develop this type of evaluation process utilizing online survey development software, such as Qualtrics or Survey Monkey.

3. Methods:

This workshop was delivered as a PowerPoint presentation, with one-third of the time reserved for discussion at the end. The advantage of this method was that more information could be presented in a brief period, but the disadvantages were because this presentation was consortium-specific, it would be difficult for anyone not part of BIDTI to deliver it. Additionally, it was not an extremely interactive workshop geared towards tactical or kinesthetic learners. The recommended evaluation technique is a

discussion of the audience's understanding of the presentation and their thoughts on the efficacy of the BIDTI evaluation method.

4. Main Points/ Key Points Raised from Participants:

Key Lessons from the Presentation

The facilitator should ask questions as the presentation goes along to ensure clarity and address any concerns from the audience as they arise.

- Aside from looking at course evaluations once a year, as part of the final progress report, if the trainer and education specialist/curriculum developer has the time to look at course evaluations immediately upon delivery, it will help keep courses dynamic and relevant.
- It is useful to align the evaluation questions/statements with NIEHS WTP's objectives for the awareness and operations level training.

Responses from Participants

- A participant noted that given the worker populations that are being trained, some of the diction on the evaluation form may be at an inappropriate literacy level (too high) and therefore affect trainees' abilities to accurately respond to the course evaluation; it should be considered to re-word some of the evaluation statements if necessary.
- Another participant suggested that the evaluation form be available in a language other than English.
- Most participants did not have access or a subscription to Qualtrics, but Survey Monkey or a different survey building platform could be utilized instead.
- Questions were raised on how many comments it would take before an element of a course was changed. This is entirely dependent on the trainer and/or curriculum developer, but for BIDTI if an addressable issue is raised a handful of times (five or more), modifications to the training/course are made.

5. References:

Bates, R. (2004). A critical analysis of evaluation practice: the Kirkpatrick model and the principle of beneficence. *Evaluation and program planning*, 27(3), 341-347.

Newcomer, K. E., Hatry, H. P., & Wholey, J. S. (2015). *Handbook of practical program evaluation*. John Wiley & Sons.

6. Workshop Handouts/ Resources:

There are no additional handouts or resources for this workshop, other than the presentation file.