



Hawaii-Pacific Evaluation Association
Second Annual Conference

Evaluation Strategies: Methods of Madness?

Friday, September 7, 2007
Hilton Waikiki Prince Kuhio Hotel

Conference Evaluation Report

H-PEA 2007 Conference Evaluation Team:

Sorin Huh^a, Dennis Koyama^b, Castle Sinicrope^b

University of Hawaii at Manoa

^a*East Asian Languages and Literatures* and ^b*Second Language Studies*

Table of Contents

Summarized Results of 2007 H-PEA Annual Conference Evaluation.....	3
General Comments and Suggestions	3
Conference Organization	3
Areas of Interest for 2008 H-PEA Annual Conference	4
Section I. Participant Information.....	5
Participant Occupations	5
Primary Work Setting	5
Areas of Interest in Evaluation	6
Section II. Conference Organization.....	6
Pre-conference Organization	6
On-site Organization.....	7
Qualitative Feedback on Conference Organization: Comments and Suggestions.....	7
Section III: Conference Program	7
Section IV. Overall Conference Experience.....	8
Qualitative Feedback on Overall Conference Experience	9
Section V: Future Planning of the Conference	9
Question 1. What did you like about this year’s event that should be continued?	9
Question 2. What did you dislike about this year’s conference?	10
Question 3. Are there any topics you would like to see included in future conferences?	10
Question 5. Besides workshops and conferences, what can H-PEA do to meet your evaluation needs?.....	11
Appendix A: Conference Evaluation Results (Raw Figures)	12
Section I. Participant Profiles	12
1. Participants information.....	12
2. Participants’ work setting	12
3. Participants’ interest in evaluation.....	12
Section II. Conference Organization.....	13
1. Pre-conference organization	13
2. On-site conference organization	13
Section III. Conference Programs.....	13
Section IV. Overall Conference Experience.....	13
Appendix B: H-PEA Evaluation Form	14

Summarized Results of 2007 H-PEA Annual Conference Evaluation

The comments and suggestions listed below are based on the participant feedback form and the on-site observations of the evaluators.

General Comments and Suggestions

Expand and diversify H-PEA membership

- More active and widely spread publicity
- Encourage poster submissions and/or create venue for brief, refereed paper presentations
 - Provide H-PEA members opportunities to present work and receive outside funding
 - Forefront professionalism in public eye
- Recruit more students to H-PEA
 - Send H-PEA announcements to local university departments
 - Host/organize student-centered event
 - Add a student resources component to H-PEA homepage
- Recruit more faculty to H-PEA
- Provide incentive for companies and organizations to send internal evaluators
- Provide grant opportunities: potential for H-PEA to receive outside funding to recruit and support attendees
- Extend H-PEA involvement in the community

Improve survey response rate

- Response rate of less than 37% (over 100 attended but 37 completed the feedback survey)
- Suggestions: Offer raffle item(s), membership fee reduction, other(s) as incentive to fill out and return feedback surveys

Conference Organization

- *General*
 - Consider two-day conference schedule: first day as introduction to evaluation; second day as advanced applications
 - Provide contact information for presenters in panels, poster sessions, and workshops
- *Pre-registration*
 - Set a post-marked deadline for pre-conference, mail-in registration to facilitate check-in and receipts
 - Rationale: Informs organizers of approximate number of attendees for all head-count issues (e.g., handouts, food, tables, packets, chairs, parking validation stickers)
 - Include check-box for receipt of payment on pre-registration form
 - If possible, set-up on-line payment option (e.g., Paypal, credit card, direct transfer of funds)

- *Front desk check-in*
 - Create written protocol for check-in, on-site registration, and provision of receipts
 - Set up separate lines for check-in for pre-registration and on-site registration
 - Streamline payment and receipt process
- *Conference packet*
 - Include handouts and copies of speakers' presentations in packet
 - Request presentation materials from speakers 48 hours before conference. If not possible, request that speakers provide handouts for estimate based on pre-registration head-count.
 - Ask speakers for outline of presentations
- *Conference program*
 - Panels
 - Solicit member input on morning and afternoon panel topics via general H-PEA e-mail account (e.g., panels@hpea.org, speakers@hpea.org)
 - Roundtable
 - Revise written protocol for roundtable conversation activities
 - Designate roundtable facilitator/moderator to ensure equal participation from all
 - Clarify purpose of flipcharts for in-table discussion
 - Streamline and focus report-back portion of activity
 - Poster session
 - Encourage conference attendees to take part in poster session
 - Combine poster session and no-host bar, which had low attendance ($N = 12$). Alternatively, move poster session to after lunch
 - Business Meeting
 - Hold elections before lunch to increase voting participation
 - If possible, allow online voting and balloting for H-PEA members not in attendance
 - No-host bar
 - Promote as networking opportunity to increase attendance in tandem with poster session (See above)
- *Post-conference*
 - Upload speaker presentations to H-PEA webpage
 - Use positive open-ended feedback responses as conference testimonials and for publicity purposes

Areas of interest for 2008 H-PEA annual conference

- Examples and guides for evaluation
- Uses and reporting evaluation
- Social and ecological issues and evaluation

Section I. Participant Information

Participant occupations

Question 1: Which of the following are you?

[Faculty / Consultant / Student / Other _____]

Table 1.1. Participant occupations

Occupation	2007		2006		Change
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	
Faculty	10	26%	12	23%	3%
Consultant	5	13%	5	10%	3%
Student	2	5%	16	31%	-26%
Other	18	46%	19	37%	10%
No response	4	10%	0	0%	10%
Total	39*	100%	52	100%	

* Two attendees listed 2 occupations

Specified "other" occupations

Other responses (18)	
Evaluator (6)	PhD graduate (1)
State or government employee (3)	Quality Assurance Manager (1)
Administrator (2)	User of evaluation services (1)
Marine biology (2)	Not specified (1)
Staff (1)	

Primary Work Setting

Question 2: What is your primary work setting?

[Higher education / School system / Government agency / Non-profit organization / Private business / Other _____]

Table 1.2. Participant work setting

Setting	2007		2006		Change
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	
Higher Education	15	39%	24	49%	-10%
School system	4	11%	6	12%	-2%
Government	4	11%	4	8%	2%
Private Sector	2	5%	4	8%	-3%
Non-Profit	12	32%	11	22%	9%
No response	1	3%	0	0%	3%
Total	38*	100%	49	100%	

* One attendee marked two work settings

Areas of Interest in Evaluation

Question: 3 What is your area of interest in evaluation?

[Education / Health / Social service / Other _____]

Table 1.3. Participant areas of interest in evaluation

Areas	2007		2006		Change
	N	%	N	%	
Education	29	53%	31	52%	1%
Health	12	22%	15	25%	-3%
Social service	10	18%	10	17%	2%
Other	3	5%	4	7%	-1%
No response	1	2%	0	0%	2%
Total	55	100%	60	100%	

*A number of participants selected 2 or more responses

Specified “other” areas of interest in evaluation

Other (3)
Environmental issues (1)
Academic programs (1)
Economic development (1)

Section II. Conference Organization

Pre-conference Organization

Please rate the following features of conference organization

Scale: 1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = good; 4 = excellent; n/a = not applicable

Table 2.1. Pre-conference organization

	N	N/R	N/A	1	2	3	4	Mean	SD
Conference pre-registration	37	0%	14%	0%	5%	16%	65%	3.69	0.58
Availability of conference information	37	0%	14%	0%	5%	30%	51%	3.53	0.61
Timely announcement of conference	37	0%	19%	0%	5%	14%	62%	3.70	0.59
Poster submission procedure	37	0%	68%	0%	3%	5%	24%	3.67	0.62
Conference publicity	37	3%	30%	3%	19%	16%	30%	3.08	0.93

On-site Organization

Please rate the following features of conference organization

Scale: 1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = good; 4 = excellent; n/a = not applicable

Table 2.2. On-site organization

	<i>N</i>	N/R	N/A	1	2	3	4	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Check-in procedure	37	3%	3%	0%	3%	24%	68%	3.69	0.52
Lunch and refreshments	37	16%	0%	0%	0%	19%	65%	3.77	0.42
Conference packet	37	5%	0%	3%	11%	35%	46%	3.33	0.78
Location (i.e., convenience)	37	5%	0%	3%	8%	14%	70%	3.60	0.76
Adequacy of the facility	37	5%	0%	0%	0%	27%	68%	3.71	0.45

Qualitative Feedback on Conference Organization: Comments and Suggestions

Positive Comments	Suggestions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent venue (3) • Good food (2) • Excellent program (1) • “Fine job” (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide more handouts for presentation (3) • Provide handouts in conference packet (1) • Provide contact information for presenters (1) • Provide presenters’ PowerPoints (1) • Publicize conference more widely ahead of time (2) • Use stopper or hinge to prevent door from slamming (1) • Too cold at times (1)

Section III: Conference Program

Please rate each event you attended

Scale: 1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = good; 4 = excellent; n/a = not applicable

Table 3. Conference events

	<i>N</i>	N/R	N/A	1	2	3	4	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Morning panel	37	3%	5%	0%	22%	30%	41%	3.21	0.80
Conversation tables	37	0%	5%	0%	14%	41%	41%	3.29	0.70
Keynote address	37	5%	11%	0%	8%	46%	30%	3.26	0.62
Business meeting	37	8%	46%	3%	5%	14%	24%	3.29	0.89
Afternoon panel	37	16%	3%	0%	8%	22%	51%	3.53	0.67
Poster session	37	24%	22%	3%	8%	22%	22%	3.15	0.85

Qualitative Feedback on Conference Events: Comments and Suggestions

Positive Comments	Suggestions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Afternoon panel was better than the morning.” • “As usual, Lois-Ellin Datta is an intriguing and informative speaker.” • “Liked Lois-Ellin stories on evaluation.” • “Great speakers.” • “Conversation tables allowed good sharing of reactions.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “<u>Morning panel</u>: wanted more process info, not just results.” • “Less summary of data while interesting. I'd rather know the How and Why of what they did.” • “Need to encourage presenters to make presentations more lively and understandable for the non-evaluators who may not know the language. Don't just share numbers, statistics, and figures but share a story. How does evaluation affect the community, bringing info back to practical, usable community level.” • <u>Conversation tables</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “A bit complicated and too much to do in a short period of time.” • “If there is any way to also include conversation so people can share more about what they already know.” • “The quality of the conversation tables varied - ours was not very engaging.” • “The ‘report back’ part of the conversation tables was not clearly defined.”

Section IV. Overall Conference Experience

Please rate your overall conference experience

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = somewhat disagree; 3 = somewhat agree; 4 = strongly agree

Table 4. Overall conference experience

	N	N/R	N/A	1	2	3	4	Mean	SD
The session topics were important and timely	37	3%	0%	0%	8%	43%	46%	3.39	0.64
Length of time for each event on the schedule was adequate	37	0%	0%	0%	5%	43%	51%	3.46	0.60
The conference was a valuable professional development exercise	37	0%	0%	0%	14%	46%	41%	3.27	0.68
I found new contacts and opportunities for future collaboration	37	0%	0%	0%	22%	38%	41%	3.46	0.64
Overall, attending the conference was a worthwhile experience	37	0%	0%	0%	8%	38%	54%	3.53	0.67
I plan to attend next year's H-PEA conference	37	19%	0%	0%	8%	22%	51%	3.53	0.67

Qualitative Feedback on Overall Conference Experience

General comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “The pre-conference event was well worthwhile.”• “The conference was much better than the workshop.”• “Excellent.”• “Could the poster session be combined with no-host bars?”• “Great format for meeting people. Maybe include job-banking component rather than the poster session?”• “Wonderful presentations.”

Section V: Future planning of the conference

Question 1. What did you like about this year’s event that should be continued?

<p>General (5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• “I know how hard pulling off a conference... the location, facilities, food service and A/V were awesome. Great job!”• “Smart and friendly attendees and staff.”• “Location.”• “Time to meet folks.”• “Hands-on activity.”
<p>Format (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• “The variation of formats.”• “Having panel followed by conversation tables was an excellent learning strategy - Apply points, discuss, etc.”
<p>Panels (9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• “Variety and diversity of panelists.”• “Quality of presenters.”• “Excellent panels, both, specially afternoon panels. Would listen to Lois-Ellen for hours.”• “Christina Christie & Lois-Ellin Datta both gave excellent and appropriate speeches.”• “Panels were well-formed and provided great info.”
<p>Conversation Tables (9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• “Round table gave us the chance to talk to each other.”• “Roundtable discussion, hands on and practical session to promote involvement and group participation.”• “The roundtable discussions were very helpful and valuable exercises.”• “Opportunity to network at exercises (roundtable).”• “Roundtable interaction relevant to speakers.”
<p>Keynote Address (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• “Keynote was excellent”

Question 2. What did you dislike about this year's conference?

Organization and Format (5)

- “Needed more time for Q & A and morning panel.”
- “Lunch time speaker had spoken too often.”
- “Move business meeting to beginning or ending of the conference. So not to “waste” people's time that are not members or interested.”
- “I think that you need break out sessions, that fits interest specific to types of evaluators.”
- “Voting/ those of us who weren't involved went outside, but someone should have come out to let us know the panel started. I missed the first panelist presentation. A lot of people were out there.”

Venue (4)

- “Vegetarian entrée should have included a carbohydrate and protein (tofu, beans).”
- “More parking accessibility - e.g. Ala Moana Hotel.”
- “Tables were a little cramped.”
- “Cell phone going off and door slamming.”

Content (8)

- “Too much Stewart Donaldson; too little Lois-Ellin Datta.”
- “Some speakers weren't as good (too much data, not enough application).”
- “Poster session was rather underwhelming.”
- “Lack of "contextual/case" studies.”
- “Little to no discussion of environmental program evaluation.”
- “Not a clear understanding of how all the information shared gets translated into implementation, community uses, practical use. Make things more accessible and understandable, user-friendly, and so people are not so afraid of evaluation or participating.”
- “Very social/education focused. It would be nice to see evaluation of science/environmental programs.”
- “Not enough info about the practice of evaluation, the issues, and challenges and standard of practice.”

Question 3. Are there any topics you would like to see included in future conferences?

Examples and Guides for Evaluation

- “How to build high quality and realistic performance indicators.”
- “Exemplars of sound evaluations.”
- “Standards of evaluation practice.”
- “Information on resources available to aid program evaluation.”
- “Process of evaluation - what is/are the processes used to gather data.”
- “How to move organizations to utilization-focused evaluation.”
- “Evaluation designs, analysis and analytical method.”
- “How to enhance validity of evaluation.”
- “Specific evaluation presentations.”
- “Creative evaluation methods.”

Uses and Reporting Evaluation

- “Use and understanding of quality evaluation.”
- “Use of evaluation results.”
- “Specific tailored workshops on problems faced by evaluators.”
- “Working with stakeholders, anxiety, etc.”
- “Evaluation anxiety getting community members involved and alleviating stress for stakeholders.”
- “Panel of different discipline folks sharing findings that can inform others.”
- “Working with evaluation client, presenting results to them, decreasing evaluation anxiety.”
- “Discussion/activities for broader application of the evaluation (private business).”

Social and Ecological Issues and Evaluation

- “Culturally responsive evaluation.”
- “Review of indigenous issues involved in evaluation.”
- “Impact of "culture" on evaluation.”
- “More on locally and culturally appropriate evaluation.”
- “Focus on science/environmental problems.”
- “Environmental program evaluation is new and growing field.”

Question 5. Besides workshops and conferences, what can H-PEA do to meet your evaluation needs?

Networking

- “Social hours with visiting evaluators.”
- “Quarterly evaluation networking lunches (or semi-annual opposite the annual conference).”
- “More frequent opportunities to professionally network (not cocktail hours).”
- “Offer a list of contacts---possible groups that may be able to contract out to organization.”
- “Offer break out sessions at the conference.”
- “Have something for "young/junior" evaluators.”

E-mail and Internet Connectivity

- “Could I be in your email list for future workshops?”
- “Maybe email reminders of news and the announcement during the year on the website and if H-PEA website is announcing anything new that Hawaii people should check out.”
- “Put speaker's PowerPoint on the HPEA websites”

H-PEA Involvement in Community

- “Providing consultations on conducting evaluations.”
- “Advocacy for having more people and leadership and technical positions “trained/educated” in eval.
- “Put together a committee to screen evaluation, repats; put array of repats online in categories.”

Appendix A: Conference Evaluation Results (Raw Figures)

Section I. Participant profiles

1. Participants information

	2006	2007	
ID	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	List of Others (2007)
Others	19	15	evaluator (6), state or government employee (3), administrator (2), marine biologist (2), staff (1), PhD graduate (1), quality assurance manager (1), user of evaluation services (1), not specified (1)
Student	16	2	
Faculty	12	4	
Consultant	5	18	
Total	52*	39**	

*3 participants marked 2 categories, 1 participant marked 3 categories (2006).

**2 participants marked 2 categories (2007).

2. Participants' work setting

	2006	2007
Work Setting	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>
Higher-Education	24	15
Non-profit Organization	11	12
School System	6	4
Government Agency	4	4
Private Business	4	2
Other	0	0
No response	0	1
Total	49*	38

*2 participants chose 2 categories (2006)

*1 participant chose 2 categories (2007)

3. Participants' interest in evaluation

	2006	2007	
Interest Area	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	List of Others
Education	31	29	environmental issues (1), academic programs (1), economic development (1)
Health	15	12	
Social Service	10	10	
Others	4	3	
No response	1	1	
Total	61*	55	

*10 participants selected more than one area of interest (2006)

*11 participants selected more than one area of interest (2007)

Section II. Conference Organization

Please rate each event you attended

Scale: 1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = good; 4 = excellent; n/a = not applicable

1. Pre-conference organization

	<i>N</i>	N/R	N/A	1	2	3	4	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Conference pre-registration	37	0	5	0	2	6	24	3.69	0.58
Availability of conference information	37	0	5	0	2	11	19	3.53	0.61
Timely announcement of conference	37	0	7	0	2	5	23	3.70	0.59
Poster submission procedure	37	0	25	0	1	2	9	3.67	0.62
Conference publicity	37	1	11	1	7	6	11	3.08	0.93

2. On-site conference organization

	<i>N</i>	N/R	N/A	1	2	3	4	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Check-in procedure	37	1	1	0	1	9	25	3.69	0.52
Lunch and refreshments	37	6	0	0	0	7	24	3.77	0.42
Conference packet	37	2	0	1	4	13	17	3.33	0.78
Location (i.e., convenience)	37	2	0	1	3	5	26	3.60	0.76
Adequacy of the facility	37	2	0	0	0	10	25	3.71	0.45

Section III. Conference Programs

	<i>N</i>	N/R	N/A	1	2	3	4	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Morning panel	37	1	2	0	8	11	15	3.21	0.80
Conversation tables	37	0	2	0	5	15	15	3.29	0.70
Keynote address	37	2	4	0	3	17	11	3.26	0.62
Business meeting	37	3	17	1	2	5	9	3.29	0.89
Afternoon panel	37	6	1	0	3	8	19	3.53	0.67
Poster session	37	9	8	1	3	8	8	3.15	0.85

Section IV. Overall Conference Experience

	<i>N</i>	N/R	N/A	1	2	3	4	Mean	<i>SD</i>
The session topics were important and timely.	37	1	0	0	3	16	17	3.39	0.64
Length of time for each event on the schedule was adequate	37	0	0	0	2	16	19	3.46	0.60
The conference was a valuable professional development exercise	37	0	0	0	5	17	15	3.27	0.68
I found new contacts and opportunities for future collaboration	37	0	0	0	8	14	15	3.46	0.64
Overall, attending the conference was a worthwhile experience	37	0	0	0	3	14	20	3.53	0.67
I plan to attend next year's H-PEA conference	37	7	0	0	3	8	19	3.53	0.67

Appendix B: H-PEA Evaluation Form

Instructions: Please complete and return this evaluation form in the box at the REGISTRATION TABLE. Your input is important in planning for future H-PEA events. Mahalo!

I. Participant Information *(Please circle all that apply).*

1. Which of the following are you?

[Faculty / Consultant / Student / Other _____]

2. What is your primary work setting?

[Higher education / School system / Government agency / Non-profit organization / Private business / Other _____]

3. What is your area of interest in evaluation?

[Education / Health / Social service / Other _____]

II. Please rate the following features of conference organization *(Please ✓ the box).*

Scale: 1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = good; 4 = excellent; n/a = not applicable

Pre-Conference	1	2	3	4	n/a	On-site	1	2	3	4	n/a
Conference pre-registration						Check-in procedure					
Availability of conference information						Lunch and refreshments					
Timely announcement of the conference						Conference packet					
Poster submission procedure						Location (i.e., convenience)					
Conference publicity						Adequacy of the facility					
Comments:											

III. Please rate each event you attended *(Please ✓ the box).*

Scale: 1 = poor; 2 = fair; 3 = good; 4 = excellent; n/a = not applicable

Conference programs	1	2	3	4	n/a	Conference programs	1	2	3	4	n/a
Morning panel						Business meeting					
Conversation tables						Afternoon panel					
Afternoon panel						Poster session					
Comments:											

IV. Please rate your overall conference experience *(Please ✓ the box).*

Scale: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = somewhat disagree; 3 = somewhat agree; 4 = strongly agree

	1	2	3	4
The session topics were important and timely.				

	1	2	3	4
Length of time for each event on the schedule was adequate.				
The conference was a valuable professional development experience.				
I found new contacts and opportunities for future collaboration.				
Overall, attending the conference was a worthwhile experience.				
I plan to attend next year's H-PEA conference.				
Comments:				

V. Future planning of the conference

1. What did you like about this year's event that should be continued?

2. What did you dislike about this year's conference?

3. Are there any topics/activities that you would like to see included in future conferences?

4. Who would you like to have as a keynote speaker at a future conference?

Speaker: _____ Affiliation: _____ Reason: _____

Speaker: _____ Affiliation: _____ Reason: _____

Speaker: _____ Affiliation: _____ Reason: _____

5. Besides workshops and conferences, what can H-PEA do to meet your evaluation needs?

6. If you are interested in becoming more active in H-PEA, please provide your name, e-mail, and area of interest (e.g., conference planning, membership drive): _____
