

**DIIA Difficult Dialogs/Signature Course TA Training
Evaluation Results – Fall 2006**

Conclusions:

- Overall, participants rated the workshop as *Extremely useful* and were all very positive in their summary comments.
- Individual workshop sessions were also rated highly with mean ratings falling between *Very* and *Extremely useful* for all but one of the sessions (Faculty/TA checklist). No participants rated any of the sessions as *Not at all useful*.
- Suggestions for improving the training were varied. Three participants desired some sort of additional training time.
- Observations of training sessions indicate that, overall, trainers did a *Very good* to *Excellent* job in all the areas rated. Trainers stated session objectives clearly 75% of the time and summarized main points 67% of the time.

Recommendations:

- DIIA should retain the general format of the fall 2006 specialized TA training workshops for any similar workshops and should consider adding an hour to each day or providing a 2 hour mid-term follow-up session.
- DIIA training staff should work to further refine individual workshop sessions based on participant and observer feedback. Specifically, all trainers should strive to clearly state the learning objectives for their session and make a greater effort to summarize main points. Individual trainers should also strive to tailor their pacing and amount of content to fit the time period allotted for individual session(s).
- If available, DIIA training staff should use any program evaluation and/or course-instructor feedback data collected from students taught by the TAs trained to inform future workshop planning.
- DIIA training staff should request informal feedback at the end of the semester from workshop participants and their supervising faculty members asking what information or knowledge they think should be included in any future workshops.

**DIIA Difficult Dialogs/Signature Course TA Training
Participant Evaluation Results – Fall 2006**

Participants used the following scale to rate the overall usefulness of each training session attended.

Number of Participants Responding = 10

1 = Not at all useful 2 = A little useful 3 = Somewhat useful 4 = Very useful 5 = Extremely useful

DAY 1 - Tuesday	Mean
9:30 Ground Rules	4.00
10:15 Faculty/TA Checklist	3.76
10:20 Concerns	4.50
11:00 Designing Effective Discussions I & II	4.70
1:00 Integrating Writing into Discussion	4.50
DAY 2 - Wednesday	Mean
9:05 Muddiest Point	4.11
9:30 Assessing Writing: Minimal Marking Method	4.10
10:45 Assessing Discussion	4.44
12:30 Kidney Machine Exercise/Practice	4.60
BOTH DAYS	Mean
Please rate the overall usefulness of the 2-day training and provide a comment to explain it below.	4.80
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I feel much more comfortable with my concerns knowing now that they are shared by many and there are many useful solutions to alleviating those concerns. • I am glad I got the opportunity to attend this training now before I do my TA work. It was a lot of information to take in, but it will be nice to review the material as I need it. • I thought the training was a <u>very</u> effective mixing theory, application and exercises! I feel I have things I can use right away. • Having not TA'd before, I was/am extremely glad to have participated in this wonderful training. I feel more comfortable going into the semester than I previously did. • I like the interactiveness of this workshop. This really helped to make the lessons sink in and kept things interesting. • Was very helpful to those of us who are new to TAing difficult dialogue topics. • Very engaging and thought provoking. • Techniques for inclusion of all participants and for incorporating short writing exercises (student ownership) into my discussion section will greatly benefit my teaching experiences and students learning environment. 	

What suggestions do you have for improving the training? Please be specific.

Comments:

- I'm pretty sure that we all prescribe to a set of usual ground rules and although it's a very interesting thing to use in a class, we may not need to create those rules for this group.
- A lot to digest in just 2 days. Might be useful to regroup mid-semester and at the end.
- Maybe some more practice facilitating in a close to real life scenario where the facilitator is more knowledgeable and prepared.
- More time!
- It would have been nice to include incorporating diversity issues in the class specifically race/ethnicity issues etc. I would have also liked a guide review of blackboard functions.
- Not sure the signature course TAs and the Difficult Dialogue TAs share the same concerns.
- Put Lynn on the 2nd day. She holds attention better than anyone.
- I hesitate to say that we could use more time because all topics were well paced, but it seems we cut short a couple of topics.

**DIHA Difficult Dialogs/Signature Course TA Training
Participant Evaluation Results – Fall 2006**

Observers used the following checklist to document trainer behavior:

Which of the following occurred during the training session?		
	No	Yes
Session objective/purpose was clearly stated	25%	75%
Main points were summarized at end of session	33%	67%

Observers used the following scale to rate the trainer on the behaviors listed below. The overall mean for all presenters on each behavior is given.

1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Average 4 = Very Good 5 = Excellent

How well did the trainer do the following:	
	Mean
Explained content/ideas clearly	4.38
Used relevant examples for clarification	4.57
Asked questions to monitor student understanding	4.17
Restated key content/ideas	4.43
Appeared knowledgeable about content	5.00
Listened to student contributions	5.00
Gave students time to respond	4.75
Allowed students to engage each other	4.25
Responded to questions appropriately	4.86

Workshop sessions/trainers observed:

Workshop Session	Trainer
Kidney Machine Exercise	Joel
Ice Breaker	Lynn
Ground Rules	Mark
Concerns	Mark
Effective Discussion	Lynn
Integrating Writing	Josh
Minimal Marking Method	Josh
Assessing Discussion	Joel