

San Diego Mesa College 2008 Classified Staff Development Conference Evaluation Report

INTRODUCTION

The Classified Staff Development Subcommittee conducted two complementary evaluations of the 2008 Classified Staff Interpersonal and Professional Development Conference, which was held at San Diego Mesa College on April 18 and 19 of 2008. The Session Evaluations collected feedback for the individual sessions from their respective participants, while the Overall Conference Evaluation gathered assessments of the Conference as an overall event.

METHODOLOGY

Two-hundred and forty-six (246) surveys were administered to Classified Staff over twelve sessions. The Session Evaluations were administered via paper-and-pencil to participants at the closing of each session. Although individual Session Evaluation reports will be compiled for each of the sessions and their respective presenters, the data presented in this report reflect an overall summary and are not disaggregated by session.

The Overall Conference Evaluation was administered primarily online to all Conference attendees approximately one month after the event. The Overall Conference Evaluation was conducted via paper-and-pencil for five members of Classified Staff to accommodate for late registration. Two of these five surveys were completed and returned. One-hundred and seventeen (117) Conference attendees were invited to participate in the Overall Conference Evaluation, among which 96 responded to the survey, yielding a participation rate of 82%.

RESULTS

Session Evaluations

Over 95% of the respondents were in agreement with the statements below, with the majority indicating strong agreement (see Table 1):

- The presenter delivered clearly understandable information.
- The training materials helped me understand the subject matter.
- The presenter involved the training session attendees.
- I will be able to apply what I learned to my job.
- I would recommend this training session to my colleagues.
- Overall, I was satisfied with this training session.

Table 1. Session Evaluations (paper)

Session Evaluations	5 = Strongly Agree	4 = Agree	3 = Neither agree nor disagree	2 = Disagree	1 = Strongly disagree	Mean
The presenter delivered clearly understandable information. (N = 246)	71.5%	27.6%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7
The training materials helped me understand the subject matter. (N = 243)	64.2%	31.7%	3.3%	0.4%	0.4%	4.6
The presenter involved the training session attendees. (N = 246)	73.6%	24.0%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7
I will be able to apply what I learned to my job. (N = 246)	59.3%	35.8%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5
I would recommend this training session to my colleagues. (N = 245)	69.0%	26.1%	4.1%	0.4%	0.4%	4.6
Overall, I was satisfied with this training session. (N = 245)	68.6%	28.2%	2.4%	0.4%	0.0%	4.6

Overall Conference Evaluation

Over 97% of the respondents were in agreement with the statements below, with the majority indicating strong agreement (see Table 2):

- The 2008 Classified Staff Development Conference was well-organized.
- The G-building at Mesa was a suitable location for the Conference.
- I would recommend this Conference to my colleagues.
- Overall, I was satisfied with the Conference.

A small percentage of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed (4.3% and 7.4%, respectively) and a few individuals were in disagreement (2.2% disagreed and 1.1% strongly disagreed, respectively) with the following statements. The remainder was in agreement (44.6% and 44.7% strongly agreed while 48.9% and 46.8% agreed, respectively):

- I was actively engaged in the Conference.
- The overall content of the Conference contributed to my interpersonal and professional development.

The majority agreed (57.8%), with approximately one-quarter strongly agreeing (26.7%), with the following statement. A comparatively substantial percentage neither agreed nor disagreed (14.4%) and one individual strongly disagreed (1.1%):

- I have been able to apply what I learned at the Conference to my job.

The higher degree of neutrality in the last statement regarding the application of skills gained at the Conference to job performance is a departure from the overall results. The intent of

some of the workshops, such as CPR / First Aid and Disaster Preparedness, was for participants to learn skills of preparedness rather than skills that would transfer directly to job performance. The decision to offer preparedness workshops was based on the Needs Assessment, which was conducted to gauge interest in workshop topics and inform Conference planning.

Table 2. Overall Conference Evaluation (online)

Session Evaluations	5 = Strongly Agree	4 = Agree	3 = Neither agree nor disagree	2 = Disagree	1 = Strongly disagree	Mean
The 2008 Classified Staff Development Conference was well-organized. (N = 95)	67.4%	31.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	4.6
The G-building at Mesa was a suitable location for the Conference. (N = 92)	71.7%	26.1%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%	4.7
I was actively engaged in the Conference. (N = 92)	44.6%	48.9%	4.3%	2.2%	0.0%	4.4
I have been able to apply what I learned at the Conference to my job. (N = 90)	26.7%	57.8%	14.4%	0.0%	1.1%	4.1
The overall content of the Conference contributed to my interpersonal and professional development. (N = 94)	44.7%	46.8%	7.4%	0.0%	1.1%	4.3
I would recommend this Conference to my colleagues. (N = 94)	66.0%	33.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	4.6
Overall, I was satisfied with the Conference. (N = 95)	63.2%	35.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	4.6

NEXT STEPS

The Classified Staff Development Subcommittee will review the results of the evaluations to inform the following decisions:

- Should the Conference be held again in the future?
- If the Conference is to be held again, which aspects of the event should remain unchanged and which should be different? Aspects to consider include frequency of occurrence, location, number of sessions offered, session length, and identification of presenters.