

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following Evaluation Plan was developed by the team of Stella Wong, Erin Sappington, John Westhues, and Kelley Martin, to explore all major aspects of the Leadership Seminar presented by Alpha Gamma Rho and Sigma Alpha. A strategy is laid out in each section for assessing the strengths and comparable weaknesses that exist in the program. The evaluation will take place over a nine month period beginning in September of 2008 and end in April of 2009. The first deliverable will be the Formative Evaluation Report, which will layout suggested changes to the session documents and the final Evaluation Report will be delivered April 15, 2009.

The sessions will begin on consecutive weekends beginning in February 2009. The team has designed a method of assessing the value and needs of session attendees, which consists of online surveys conducted pre and post session, paper surveys, personal interviews, and focus groups. By using multiple data collection methods, the team will better be able to triangulate both the strengths and weaknesses in the program. Using the data presented by the evaluation team, the leadership of both Alpha Gamma Rho and Sigma Alpha will have a clear understanding of the direction for future sessions. The specific areas include but are not limited to session content, location, marketing, fee structure, and choice of facilitators.

INTRODUCTION

For the last four years Alpha Gamma Rho and Sigma Alpha have joined forces to produce a dynamic Leadership Seminar. In order for the seminar to maintain its high level of excellence, it is important to evaluate the current curriculum. An evaluation plan for the seminar will be presented in this document. We will explain in detail the background of the organizations, the purpose of the seminar, the specific audience the program is designed to educate, any decision that must be made, key questions that must be answered, and the evaluation methods that will be employed. Additionally, this document includes the specifics on study participants, what instruments will be used to measure the evaluation and what limits are imposed by those instruments. Lastly, we will explain the logistics and responsibilities of the evaluation stakeholders, the timeline that will be followed, and the budget requirements.

The evaluation team consists of Stella Wong, Erin Sappington, John Westhues, and Kelley Martin, graduate students in the Learning Systems Development and Design program at the University of Missouri. Erin and Stella are both professionals in Workplace Learning and Development and have experience in the creation of training programs. John, a technical support specialist, and Kelley, a project manager, round out the group's experience level by bringing their knowledge of procedural requirements necessary to return valid evaluation data.

BACKGROUND

The Alpha Gamma Rho and Sigma Alpha Leadership Seminars are a joint venture between two collegiate organizations Alpha Gamma Rho and Sigma Alpha. Both organizations target undergraduate students engaged in academic fields of study related to agriculture and life sciences. Alpha Gamma Rho is a professional and social fraternity more than 100 years old with 72 university

chapters found across the country. In contrast, the relatively new Sigma Alpha professional sorority was established in 1978 and has significantly fewer chapters and members than Alpha Gamma Rho. Attendees at the seminars were predominantly members of Alpha Gamma Rho with Sigma Alpha members accounting for approximately 30% of all attendees. The fourth annual leadership seminar series was recently completed. The traveling series was offered in St. Louis, Missouri; Denver, Colorado; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Atlanta, Georgia, during February of 2008.

Each seminar was comprised of a series of fifteen workshops ranging in length from 45 to 120 minutes. Workshop topics included: conflict management, leadership through influence, discovering and leveraging your strengths, workplace professionalism, stress management, professional communication, financial planning, risk management, dining etiquette, motivation, and team building.

Workshops were coordinated by five facilitators who were all alumni of either Alpha Gamma Rho or Sigma Alpha. Facilitators came from a variety of professional and academic backgrounds as well as diverse geographic locations. Training for facilitators occurred during a series of three two-day training sessions from September-January. In addition, the workshop content and facilitator delivery were evaluated by a professor in Agricultural Education at Texas A&M University who is a subject matter expert.

Following each workshop participants completed a simple "smile sheet" evaluation designed to provide facilitators with immediate feedback on the effectiveness of the workshop and engagement level of participants. This allowed facilitators to make changes to the workshops for subsequent seminars.

PURPOSE

The primary purpose of this evaluation is to provide Alpha Gamma Rho and Sigma Alpha leadership with the comprehensive information they need to enhance their annual leadership seminar series. Insights provided by the evaluation will give all stakeholders the feedback necessary to improve the content, participant materials, and delivery of subsequent seminars. Recommendations, if any, for modifications to the seminar will supply content providers and class facilitators with the valuable information they need to better meet the evolving needs of the membership in both organizations. During the process, both formative and summative data will be gathered to help improve the seminar series.

The goals of the evaluation are to:

- Collect data to improve marketing to organization membership
- Gather data to analyze cost effectiveness
- Evaluate choice of seminar's location
- Collect data on the need for continued education
- Investigate the need for online leadership training
- Set procedures for future evaluations

Formative Evaluation:

Formative evaluations such as user and expert reviews will aid in enhancing the learning materials prior to release. The evaluation team will examine the current components as they relate to the design and build of the seminar series. In addition, they will help guide the design and refinement process for the seminar to maximize the participants' experience. Items that will be considered include:

1. *Layout - Are the instructor and participant guides easy to follow and use?*
2. *Structure and flow - Is the content set up in a logical and meaningful way?*
3. *Content - Does the material accomplish the seminar's objectives?*

Summative Evaluation:

Summative evaluations, including participant surveys, will provide stakeholders with information regarding the success of the seminar in regards to intended vs. actual outcomes. This will help provide metrics that will be used to determine the efficacy of the seminar. Items of particular concern to the evaluation group include:

1. *Does the content of the course meet or exceed the expectations of the participants?*
2. *Is the course material being presented in such a way that it is understandable and relevant to those in attendance?*
3. *Do the course materials (participant workbook, fliers, etc.) add value to the seminar? Are there ways to make them more effective?*

AUDIENCE

The evaluation audience consists of a wide variety of stakeholders, including the National, Regional and Local staff and volunteers of both Alpha Gamma Rho fraternity and Sigma Alpha sorority. The staff members and volunteers who help develop the workshop content have a vested interest in the outcome of the evaluation since they help to manage the logistics of the seminar series as well as deliver its content. Additional audience members include undergraduates and alumni from both organizations, as well as external consultants who have been actively involved in the development and review of workshop content. Equally important are the corporate and individual sponsors of these organizations. As benefactors, these organizations have an interest in knowing whether their money has been well spent, so as an added benefit evaluation data can be used to legitimize funding.

DECISIONS

The evaluation process will allow Alpha Gamma Rho and Sigma Alpha leadership to shape the direction of the seminar series. From information uncovered by the evaluation team, the client will be presented with questions and information questions intended to facilitate the decision making process. The key areas in which decisions will be made are: material content, seminar logistics and efficacy. This step is critical to helping the client create priorities from the action items that come about as a result of this process. Alpha Gamma Rho and Sigma Alpha should be prepared to evaluate data that points to minor and major flaws in the seminar design. Results could range from simple recommendations for content edits to a complete overhaul of the program.

The stakeholders will also need to take into consideration their own limitations with regard to what changes can be made. It is important that they approach suggestions for change from a pragmatic and realistic viewpoint that takes into consideration:

- The time needed to create positive changes
- The money required to implement the new components of the course
- The students level of confusion indicated by the evaluation (i.e. is change really needed, or is the subject matter simply confusing?)
- The number of students the change would impact

QUESTIONS

To help facilitate the decision making process, the evaluation team will attempt to answer the following questions using a variety of data collection methods ranging from surveys (participant and facilitator), expert reviews and existing third party information (leadership programs for other collegiate organizations). These questions will explore both formative and summative components of the plan.

Formative Questions:

1. *If significant changes are proposed as a result of the evaluation, are there enough resources or time to re-do the material before the next session?*
2. *Is the current method of delivery appropriate for the content or should alternative/blended methods be explored in addition?*
3. *Are the seminar fees appropriate? Do they need to be raised or lowered?*
4. *Does new material need to be developed?*
5. *Are the cities and venues appropriate? Should a larger or smaller venue be pursued?*
6. *If it is determined that another delivery method is attractive, should a continuing education or follow up sessions also be considered?*
7. *What are the facilitators saying about:*
 - Participant involvement (are the exercises conducive to eliciting involvement?)
 - Venues (is the environment/setting appropriate for the leadership program?)
 - Cost (is the current cost structure set at the right level?)
 - Materials (are they easy to follow?)
8. *What feedback are participants giving in regards to:*
 - Promotion/Marketing (was the event well publicized?)
 - Facilitators (were the facilitators engaging and good at delivering content?)
 - Venues (were the venue locations convenient, were they conducive to learning?)
 - Cost (was the cost structure appropriate for the event?)
 - Materials (were the course materials well written, relevant and useful?)

Summative Questions:

1. *Was the seminar effective? Did it meet or exceed the expectations of the students?*
2. *How thorough should the post session evaluation process be? What data/info needs to be gathered?*
3. *Will long term data be collected to evaluate the long term affects of the session?*
4. *If this program is found to be extremely effective, will there be any interest in branching out to other fraternities and sororities?*

DATA GATHERING METHODS

To collect the information needed, we propose the following data gathering methods:

Questionnaires:

Questionnaires will help us to answer the following questions:

Formative

- 1. Is the current method of delivery appropriate for the content or should alternative/blended methods be explored?*
- 2. Are the seminar fees appropriate? Do they need to be raise or lowered?*
- 3. Are the cities and venues appropriate? Should larger or smaller venues be pursued?*
- 4. What feedback are participants giving in regards to:*
 - Promotion/Marketing- Was the event well publicized?
 - Facilitators- Were the facilitators engaging and good at delivering content?
 - Venues- Were the venue locations convenient? Were they conducive to learning?
 - Cost- Was the cost structure appropriate for the event?
 - Materials- Were the course materials well written, relevant and useful?

Summative

- 1. Did the course achieve the goals laid out in the agenda?*
- 2. Did it meet or exceed the expectations of the students?*

We recommend the creation of pre and post program surveys. The pre-program survey will allow us to gather information on the initial expectations of the participants before attending the session. A post program survey will allow us to compare whether or not those expectations were met. The surveys will be conducted anonymously to promote honest feedback and will be created based primarily on a 5 item Likert scale. It will be a combination of multiple choice and free form questions. The survey will be conducted via an online service to allow participants to complete it anywhere they have an internet connection. Online surveys increase the completion rate because participants do not have to take the extra step of mailing in their responses and online survey instruments are also cost effective. Participants will also be given an opportunity to provide us with their contact information so that we may follow up through one on one interviews or focus groups.

Survey items will be broken out into specific categories such as facilitator knowledge/skill and participant gauge on quality of seminar.

Interviews:

Interviews will be conducted in an attempt to answer the following questions:

Formative

- 1. If significant changes are proposed as a result of the evaluation, are there enough resources or time to re-do the material before the next session?*
- 2. Is the current method of delivery appropriate for the content or should alternative/blended methods be explored in addition*
- 3. What are the facilitators saying about:*
 - Participant involvement - Are the content topics engaging and/or interesting to participants? Do facilitators effectively engage audience members?
 - Venues- Are breakout rooms adequate in size for the number of participants and do they allow space for experiential learning?
 - Cost- Is the current cost structure set at the right level?
 - Materials- Are participants accessing the online versions of the participant manual for use after the conference? Are participants using/completing worksheets in the participant manuals during the sessions? Does the use of a participant manual enhance learning?

Summative

- 1. Did the course achieve the goals laid out in the agenda?*
- 2. Did it meet or exceed the expectations of the students?*
- 3. What percentage of the seminar was new information to the participants?*
- 4. How frequently will students use the information presented in class? Daily, Weekly, etc?*
- 5. Have participants applied knowledge gained at the conference in their chapters?*
- 6. Have participants shared or trained other members of their chapters that did not attend the conference on workshop topics?*
- 7. Did participants find workshop topics to be applicable to their roles as student leaders?*

Interviews done both in a one-on-one setting and in a focus group environment allow for a more in-depth study. Interview participants are able to elaborate on the question being posed, ask for clarification and bring up points that were not asked directly. Also, the interviewer has an opportunity

to probe further if necessary and clear up any misunderstandings on the questions being asked. For some, interviews lead to a more thoughtful answer due to the comfort of the participant in a setting that involves human interaction

Expert Reviews

Expert review of the existing material will help give our client additional insight into the effectiveness of the materials. Using this feedback, the team will be able to evaluate the program not only on how well it flows but also on whether or not it was built with sound instructional design principals. Our team will provide an in-depth review of the seminar materials, including both the facilitator and participant guides. This review will help answer the following questions:

Formative:

- 1. Are the materials easy to follow?*
- 2. Were the course materials well written, relevant and useful?*
- 3. Were the learning activities embedded in the material relevant and beneficial?*

Summative:

- 1. Did the overall design of the course meet the goals laid out in the agenda?*

Formative Questions

Methods	Is the current method of delivery appropriate?	Are the seminar fees appropriate?	Are the cities and venues appropriate?	Was the event well publicized?	Were the facilitators engaging and good at delivering content?	Were the venue locations convenient & were they conducive to learning?	Was the cost structure appropriate for the event?	Were the course materials well written, relevant and useful?
Anecdotal Records	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Attendee Questionnaires	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Facilitator Questionnaires	X		X			X		
Attendee Interviews	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Facilitator Interviews	X		X			X		
Attendee Focus Group	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Facilitator Focus Group	X		X			X		
Expert Review	X							X

Summative Questions

Methods	Was the seminar effective?	Did it meet or exceed the expectations of the students?	What percentage of the course was new information for the students?	How frequently will students use the information presented in the course? Daily, Weekly, etc.	Did the overall design of the course meet the goals laid out in the agenda?
Anecdotal Records	X	X	X	X	X
Attendee Questionnaires	X	X	X	X	X
Facilitator Questionnaires					X
Attendee Interviews	X	X	X	X	X
Facilitator Interviews					X
Attendee Focus Group	X	X	X	X	X
Facilitator Focus Group					X

SAMPLING METHODS

Sample size

5 facilitators

25 participants per session x 4 Locations = 100 total participants

2 subject matter experts

Questionnaires

Formative components: All *facilitators* will be asked to review all course materials. They will also be given the opportunity to review and make suggestions to the participant questionnaires prior to the seminar.

Summative components: All *course participants* will be asked complete a pre-session survey and asked to share their experiences in post-seminar questionnaires.

Interviews

Formative components: *Subject matter experts* will provide their insight and recommendations before the start of the first session. All *course facilitators* will be asked to share their experiences after each session. This consistent review process will serve as an improvement exercise so the course can be refined for subsequent sessions.

Summative components: Five *course participants* per session will be chosen through simple random sample and be asked to participate in post-seminar interviews within a week of the end of their session.

INSTRUMENTATION

Questionnaires

Participants in the session will be asked to complete a pre-session online survey prior to their arrival at the course. Pre-session survey questions revolve around the personal expectations of the *participants* with regard to the course objectives and course outline. The pre-session survey results will serve as a baseline against which a post-session survey will be compared.

A post-session online survey will be conducted at the conclusion of each session. (Appendix A) In the post-session survey, *participants* will be asked a number of questions that will follow-up on their initial assessment. The post-session survey will also address with the *participants*, questions regarding the efficacy of the course materials and their presentation.

All surveys will be conducted anonymously and be comprised of a combination of multiple choice and open-ended questions.

Interviews

Interviews will be conducted during several phases of the session. *Subject matter experts* will be interviewed once course materials are nearly finalized. Interview questions at this phase will revolve around the improvement of course materials and suggestions as to how the materials will best be presented. Once the advice of the *subject matter experts* has been taken into consideration, class *facilitators* will be given copies of the updated materials for review.

Pre-session interviews will be conducted with the facilitators once they have had the opportunity to review the course materials in detail. Interviews at this phase will be concerned primarily with presentation of the information. Course *facilitators* will be asked questions regarding the sequence of the information being presented and whether they think any improvement can be made in the course materials or course outline.

A random sample of five *participants* will be drawn from each session and asked to participate in a post-session interview. These wide-ranging interview sessions will encompass all aspects of the participants experience with the course. Questions will explore the *participant's* impression of the quality of the course with special emphasis on: marketing of the course, usefulness of the material, and caliber of the instruction.

A post-session interview will also be conducted with all course *facilitators* after each session. (Appendix B) These interviews will focus on means of improving the instruction of course materials from one session to the next.

LIMITATIONS:

During the evaluation process, the evaluation team may come across limitations or stalling points in regards to our ability to deliver on various components of the project. It is important to note that many of the deliverables proposed in the plan are contingent upon cooperation from others. The primary areas that may be affected are:

Project Component	Limitations/Stalling Points	Potential Impact
Surveys and Interviews	Participants unwilling or unable to complete a survey or interview, low number of respondents	Insufficient data to analyze, may drag out timeline if due date is extended
	Participants misinterpreting questions being asked	Erroneous data that may skew the analysis
Expert Reviews	Late submittal of review material to the evaluation team	Delay in data analysis and recommendation based on findings
Monetary	Cost of project components are based on estimates only, unforeseen expenses may arise during the process	Client may reject additional costs which could hinder project findings
Discovery of New Project Needs	New needs, not thought of by the Evaluation Team or Client may arise during the data gathering phase	Depending on agreed upon action, this may increase costs by adding on more components to the project and result in a significant delay in final findings
Weekly Project Updates	Unforeseen circumstances that prevent either party from attending the weekly meeting (illnesses, other work obligations, etc.)	Depending on the decision(s) that need to be made, the delay in the project timeline could be significant.

Though the evaluation team will work to prevent as many limitations as possible, it is important that the client be aware of issues that may be beyond our control. If such issues should arise, the evaluation team will bring it to the client's attention for recommendations on actions to be

taken as a result of finding(s). The Evaluation Team will provide weekly updates on the progress of the project and road blocks or potential road blocks will be discussed at that time.

LOGISTICS

The following people will be responsible for the various components:

Project Component	Responsible Party
Delivery of existing training material to the Evaluation Team	Client
Questionnaires and Surveys	
Creation of	Evaluation Team
Approval of	Client
Delivery of	Evaluation Team
Compiling and Analyzing Results	Evaluation Team
Weekly Project Updates	Evaluation Team and Client
Final Analysis and Write Up of Recommendations	Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team feels it is important to be clear on the responsibilities of each party as we will rely on each other to ensure the thoroughness of the project as well as a timely completion. It is important to note that responsibilities for different components can change during the course of the project but these decisions will always be discussed prior to implementation. The primary venue for discussing project issues will be during the weekly project updates.

TIMELINE

The completion of each item depends on the timely completion of the previous task it is important to remain on schedule. Any delays may cause the materials to be delivered to the facilitators late, giving them less time to prepare.

Activity	Activity Detail	Deadline
Final Evaluation Plan Approval	Approval to come from client	September 1, 2008
Session Document to Experts for Review	Original documents from client	October 15, 2008
Expert Review Completed	Review delivered to Evaluation Team	November 1, 2008
Session Document to Facilitators for Review	Original documents from client	November 15, 2008
Facilitator Review Completed	Review delivered to Evaluation Team	December 1, 2008
Formative Evaluation Report	Evaluation report delivered to client	December 20, 2008
Final Session Documents to Facilitators	Client reviews report and, if necessary, makes changes to materials	January 7, 2009
On-line Pre Session Survey	Available from registration to just prior to each session	March 1, 2009
“Smile” Evaluation Sheet	Immediately after each session	March 1, 2009
On-line Post Session Survey	Available after the first session will remain available until two weeks after final session	March 15, 2009
Facilitator Interviews	Immediately after each session	March 1, 2009
Participant Interviews	One week after each session	March 1, 2009
Facilitator Focus Group-Postmortem	Immediately after each session	March 1, 2009
Participant Focus Group	One week after each session	March 7, 2009
Summative Evaluation Report		April 15, 2009

BUDGET

For this budget we have made several assumptions with regard to funding. Part of the facilitator's remuneration is to take part in interviews and focus groups. We also expect participants to take part in focus groups located on their home campuses after attending the sessions without a stipend and that a facilitator for that focus group can be found locally, negating the need to pay travel expenses.

Item	Rate	Amount
Instrumentation Creation – <i>Writing surveys and interview guides, developing online surveys, etc.</i>	20 hours @ \$75	\$1500
Expert Reviews	2 @ \$1500	\$3000
Formative Data Analysis and Evaluation Report	N/A	\$1125
Focus Group Facilitator	8 sessions @ \$200	\$1600
Interviews of Facilitators	4 @ \$200	\$800
Travel & per diem – <i>Facilitator focus groups & interviews</i>	4 trips @ \$750	\$3000
This is were stipend for participant focus group was		
Phone Interviewer for Participants	25 subject/25 hours @ \$75	\$1875
Materials, printing, copying, postage		\$550
Summative Evaluation Report	30 hours @ \$75	\$2250
Total		\$15700

**Alpha Gamma Rho Fraternity and Sigma Alpha Sorority
2008 Leadership Seminars Evaluation**

Welcome and thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedule to complete this survey for the 2008 Leadership Seminars. Your input is valued and greatly appreciated. Complete the form below and click on "Submit." Questions with the number in **red** require a response.

1. Please select the seminar you attended: St. Louis Denver Pittsburgh Atlanta

2. Have you attended an AGR/SA Leadership Seminar before? YES NO

3. Would you attend a Leadership Seminar again? YES NO

4. Why did you attend LS this year?

- To improve my overall leadership skills.
- To learn more about my chapter officer responsibilities.
- Fun and networking with others.
- It was expected of me.
- Other: _____

5. Who pays for your registration fee?

- I do
- Chapter
- Alumni
- Chapter and Alumni
- My college/university
- Other: _____

6. Who pays for your transportation costs?

- I do
- Chapter
- Alumni
- Chapter and Alumni
- My college/university
- Other: _____

DIRECTIONS: Please evaluate by using the following scale:

Excellent = 5 Good = 4 Average = 3 Below Average = 2 Poor = 1

Seminars	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
7. Housemothers, Advisors, and Alumni Roundtable	5	4	3	2	1
8. Ignite the Fire: Motivation Secrets for Success	5	4	3	2	1
9. Discovering and Leveraging Your Strengths	5	4	3	2	1
10. Backpack to Briefcase: Professionalism in Your Career	5	4	3	2	1
11. The Situational Leadership Challenge	5	4	3	2	1
12. Real World Risk Management	5	4	3	2	1
13. Stand up, Speak Out	5	4	3	2	1
14. AGR Special Session	5	4	3	2	1
15. Sigma Alpha Special Session	5	4	3	2	1
16. Paper or Plastic: Understanding Credit and Debt	5	4	3	2	1
17. So, It's Hit the Fan: Conflict Management	5	4	3	2	1
18. All Stressed Out! Managing Personal and Organizational Stressors	5	4	3	2	1
19. Leadership Through Influence	5	4	3	2	1
20. Personal Branding and Selling Yourself	5	4	3	2	1
21. When Your Employer Calls: Effective Communication Skills in the Workplace	5	4	3	2	1
22. Best Practices – Taking It Home	5	4	3	2	1
Activities					
24. Welcome and Team Challenges	5	4	3	2	1
25. The meeting facilities were:	5	4	3	2	1

26. The LS participant guide was:	5	4	3	2	1
27. Friday Dinner - Meal	5	4	3	2	1
28. Friday Dinner - Program	5	4	3	2	1
29. Achievement Luncheon – 2008 AGR Convention Promo	5	4	3	2	1
30. Achievement Luncheon – 2008 SA Convention Promo	5	4	3	2	1
31. Achievement Luncheon – Grand Presidents Award	5	4	3	2	1
32. Achievement Luncheon – SA Ag Advocate Award	5	4	3	2	1
33. Saturday Banquet - Meal	5	4	3	2	1
34. Saturday Banquet - Program	5	4	3	2	1

Facilitators

35. Seminar Facilitator: Brad Garrison	5	4	3	2	1
36. Seminar Facilitator: Becky Hines	5	4	3	2	1
47. Seminar Facilitator: Erik Risa	5	4	3	2	1
48. Seminar Facilitator: Erin Sappington	5	4	3	2	1
49. What suggestions do you have for improving the Leadership Seminars?					

50. Please list any specific topics or programming ideas to improve next year's Leadership Seminars.

51. Please list any comments overall about the Seminar you attended.

Thank you for completing this survey. Please click on the "Submit" button below.

This template is designed to be used as a guide when conducting face to face or phone interviews with the facilitators of the Alpha Gamma Rho and Sigma Alpha Leadership Seminars.

(This section will help us understand whether or not the facilitators are adequately prepared for their role and whether or not we need to look at revamping this part of the seminars)

Facilitator Preparation/Development:

Describe the selection/interview process you went through to get this role.

What type of skills/knowledge did you need to be successful in your role?

Were there any skills/knowledge that could have helped you be better prepared for your first seminar?

How did you prepare to teach the material? Please comment on both formal and informal methods used.

What type of support did you receive from the organizers Alpha Gamma Rho and Sigma Alpha prior to the Leadership Seminars?

Were there any skills/knowledge that could have helped you be better prepared for your first seminar?

(This section explores the facilitator's opinions on the training material)

Leader's Guide and Facilitator Materials:

What materials and tools were you given to teach your seminars?

Were the lesson plans specific enough for you to teach from? Would you like to see more or less specificity in the lesson plans you are given?

How do you feel the structure and layout of the participant manual could be improved?

What types of learning activities were included throughout the seminar?

Were these learning activities appropriate in your opinion?

Tell me about the length of the seminar overall and also the length of the individual segments you were responsible for. Did you feel the length of time was appropriate?

Do you feel the objectives of the seminar were met? What were your indications?

What else, if anything would you like to see out of future editions of the lesson plans?

(Probes for information on the setting of the seminar, whether or not an appropriate venue was selected)

Seminar Environment

Describe your training environment.

Was the setting appropriate for the seminar?

Were all needed resources available to you?

What resources could be added? Any resources that was not necessary?

(This section gives insight into the motivating factors of the facilitators to allow for seminar planners for future sessions to recruit and attract the quality of people desired)

Facilitator Experience

What interested you in being a Facilitator for the seminar series?

Were those expectations met?

How were you compensated for your work? Do you feel it matched the level of work expected? Performed?

Would you recommend this position to interested parties?

How could your experience have been enhanced?

How would you describe your experience as a facilitator?

Any other comments or suggestions you have in regards to the seminar series?