



**Hawai'i-Pacific Evaluation Association  
2009 Annual Conference**

Thursday and Friday, September 10-11, 2009  
Hilton Waikiki Prince Kuhio Hotel

**CONFERENCE EVALUATION REPORT**

Ida Strom MA & Lisa Kehl MSW  
Myron B. Thompson School of Social Work  
Center for Training, Evaluation and Research of the Pacific  
University of Hawaii at Manoa

## I. REPORT SUMMARY

Hawai'i Pacific Evaluation Association held its fourth annual conference at the Prince Kuhio Hotel in Waikiki, HI in September 2009. Presented here is a summary of the main findings of the data collected from the attendees at the conference.

### *Conference*

- The majority of the attendees were H-PEA members.
- The attendees had diverse professional titles, in which evaluators, faculty and administrators were mainly represented.
- The main primary work settings were higher education and non-profit organization.
- Area of interest was dominated by education.
- The attendees were overall satisfied with both the pre-organization and the on-site organization of the conference. However, some of the negative comments included the need for better publicity and to include the membership cost in the conference price.
- The conference program was overall rated as excellent by the participants with the exception of the paper presentation where the majority rated it as good.
- For the overall conference experience, the attendees were highly satisfied and “strongly agreeing” to the positive quotes concerning the conference. However some dissatisfaction regarding the time management was expressed.
- Other suggestions from the attendees include:
  - To address different types of evaluation (within organizations, of governments, policy and health) as well as to establish a link between evaluators and community activities.
  - To use new technologies in evaluation as well as the use of cultural approaches.
  - To create more web-based resources from the conference.

### *Workshop*

- The attendees expressed high levels of satisfaction with all three workshops.
- The workshops “*Mission, Planning, & Outcomes: A Role for Logic Models*” and “*Beyond Survey Monkey: New Ways to Use Tech in Evaluation*” received the highest scores, while “*Cultivating Self as Instrument*” received the lowest score.
- “*Cultivating Self as Instrument*” (Workshop A) was complemented for the great discussions and the examples of real life experience, but some of the participants’ thought the presentation was vague and that she was moving too fast.
- The participants at the “*Beyond Survey Monkey: New Ways to Use Tech in Evaluation*” (Workshop B) expressed high satisfaction with the presentation on pollecerywhere.com. The negative comments addressed the technical difficulties that occurred during the presentation.
- The “*Mission, Planning, & Outcomes: A Role for Logic Models*” (Workshop C) received great complements for their overall presentation and no negative comments were given.

## II. TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>RESULTS AND FINDINGS: CONFERENCE.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. Participant Information.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>H-PEA Membership &amp; Participant Occupations .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Primary Work Setting.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Area of Interest.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Years of Being an Evaluator .....</i>	<i>6</i>
<b>2. Conference Organization.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<i>Conference Pre-Organization.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>On-site Organization.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<b>3. Conference Program .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. Overall Conference Experience.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>5. Future Planning of the Conference.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<i>Positive aspects of this year’s event.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Aspects of this year’s event that should be changed.....</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Topics/activities for future conferences.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Keynote speakers for future conferences .....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>What H-PEA can do to meet participant’s evaluation needs .....</i>	<i>15</i>
<b>RESULTS AND FINDINGS: WORKSHOPS .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Workshop A .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Workshop B.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Workshop C .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix A: Conference Comments.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix B: Workshop Comments .....</b>	<b>23</b>

### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Ina Chang and Aloha Data for entering the data from the surveys collected at the conference. We would also like to thank the Evaluation Team for helping to edit the questionnaires.

### III. RESULTS AND FINDINGS:

#### CONFERENCE

The results and findings are based on surveys that were handed out to participants at the conference (N=68).

#### 1. Participant Information

##### *H-PEA Membership & Participant Occupations*

- The majority of the respondents were H-PEA Members (77.9%, n=53).
- Reported job titles were: Faculty (27.9%, n=19), Evaluator (25%, n=17), Administrator (16.2%, n=11), Student (11.8, n=8), Consultant (10.3%, n=7), and Other (8.8%, n=6).
- Specified job titles were Analyst (n=1), Data Analyst (n=1), DOE State Educational Officer (n=1), Funder (n=1), Graduate Assistant (n=1), Non-Profit Program Development (n=1), Research & Development (n=1), Retired (n=1), Staff (n=1), UH Staff (n=1).

Table 1. Occupation

Occupation	2006	2007	2008	2009
Faculty	23% (n=12)	26% (n=10)	18% (n=14)	<b>27.9%</b> <b>(n=19)</b>
Consultant	10% (n=5)	13% (n=5)	9% (n=7)	<b>10.3%</b> <b>(n=7)</b>
Student	31% (n=16)	5% (n=2)	13% (n=10)	<b>11.8%</b> <b>(n=8)</b>
Administrator				<b>16.2%</b> <b>(n=11)</b>
Evaluator				<b>25.0%</b> <b>(n=17)</b>
Other	37% (n=19)	46% (n=18)	55% (n=42)	<b>8.8%</b> <b>(n=6)</b>
No Response	0% (0)	10% (n=4)	5% (n=4)	-
Total	100% (N=52)	100% (N=39)*	100% (N=77)	<b>100%</b> <b>(N=68)</b>

Note \*Two attendees listed 2 occupations

##### *Primary Work Setting: Higher Education and Non-Profit*

- The main primary work settings were Higher Education (47.1%, n=32) and Non-Profit Organization (26.5%, n=18).
- Followed by School System (13.2%, n=9), Private Business (5.9%, n=4), Government Agency (4.4%, n=3) and Other (2.9%, n=2).
- Specified primary work settings were Community (n=1) and Consultant (n=1).

**Table 2. Primary Work Setting**

Primary Work Setting	2006	2007	2008	2009
Higher Education	49% (n=24)	39% (n=15)	31% (n=24)	<b>47.1%</b> <b>(n=32)</b>
School System	12% (n=6)	11% (n=4)	5% (n=4)	<b>13.2%</b> <b>(n=9)</b>
Government	8% (n=4)	11% (n=4)	8% (n=6)	<b>4.4%</b> <b>(n=3)</b>
Private Sector/For-Profit Organization	8% (n=4)	5% (n=2)	1% (n=1)	<b>5.9%</b> <b>(n=4)</b>
Non-Profit	22% (n=11)	32% (n=12)	45% (n=35)	<b>26.5%</b> <b>(n=18)</b>
Other			5% (n=4)	<b>2.9%</b> <b>(n=2)</b>
No Response	0%	3% (n=1)	4% (n=3)	-
Total	100% (N=49)	100% (N=38)*	100% (N=77)	<b>100%</b> <b>(N=68)</b>

*Note* \* One attendee marked two work settings

*Area of Interest: Education*

- The main interest among the participants was Education (73.5%, n=50).
- Other areas of interest were Social Service (8.8%, n=6), Other (7.4%, n=5), Health (5.9%, n=4), and General (2.9%, n=2).
- “Other” interests included Environment (n=1), Evaluation (n=1), Technology (n=1), and “Varied” (n=1).

**Table 3. Areas of Interest**

Areas of Interest	2006	2007	2008	2009
Education	52% (n=31)	53% (n=29)	55% (n=42)	<b>73.5%</b> <b>(n=50)</b>
Health	25% (n=15)	22% (n=12)	10% (n=8)	<b>5.9%</b> <b>(n=4)</b>
Social Service	17% (n=10)	18% (n=10)	16% (n=12)	<b>8.8%</b> <b>(n=6)</b>
General				<b>2.9%</b> <b>(n=2)</b>
Other	7% (n=4)	5% (n=5)	13% (n=10)	<b>7.4%</b> <b>(n=5)</b>
No response	0%	2% (n=2)	6% (n=5)	<b>1.5%</b> <b>(n=1)</b>
Total	100% (N=60)	100% (N=55)*	100% (N=77)	<b>100%</b> <b>(N=68)</b>

*Note* \* A number of participants selected 2 or more responses

*Years of being an Evaluator (see Table 4)*

- The years of being an Evaluator ranged from 1 year to 37 years (N=43).
- Over 1/3 of the attendees (44%, n=22) have been an Evaluator for 1 to 5 years, followed by 12 % (n=6) that have been an Evaluator for 6-10 years.

**Table 4. Years of being an Evaluator**

Years of being an evaluator	
1-5 Years	44% (n=22)
6-10 Years	12% (n=6)
11-15 Years	6.0% (n=3)
16-20 Years	10% (n=5)
21-25 Years	4% (n=2)
26 + Years	10% (n=5)
N/A	14% (n=7)

## **2. Conference Organization**

*Conference Pre-Organization: Excellent, but publicity could be better*

- The attendees were overall satisfied with the conference Pre-Organization and overall rated the five categories regarding the Pre-Conference as excellent (see table 5). However, 50% of the respondents answered not applicable to the Poster/Paper submission procedure and the Conference Publicity was rated as good rather than excellent.
- The comments were mostly positive but there were some negative comments regarding the publicity of the conference and the membership costs (see table 7).

**Table 5. Conference Pre-Organization**

Pre-Conference (N=68)	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A
Online Registration	1.5% (n=1)	1.5% (n=1)	19.1% (n=13)	<b>61.8%</b> <b>(n=42)</b>	16.2% (n=11)
Availability of conference information	-	6% (n=4)	38.8% (n=26)	<b>55.2%</b> <b>(n=37)</b>	-
Timely announcement of the conference	-	3.0% (n=2)	29.9% (n=20)	<b>58.2%</b> <b>(n=39)</b>	9.0% (n=6)
Poster/Paper submission procedure	-	4.5% (n=3)	13.6% (n=9)	31.8% (n=21)	<b>50%</b> <b>(n=33)</b>
Conference publicity	1.6% (n=1)	14.1% (n=9)	<b>37.5%</b> <b>(n=24)</b>	31.2% (n=20)	15.6% (n=10)

*On-site Organization: Excellent*

- The attendees were overall satisfied with the On-site Organization and rated the five categories as excellent (see table 6).

Table 6. On-site organization

On-site (N=68)	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A
Check in procedure	-	4.4% (n=3)	14.7% (n=10)	<b>79.94%</b> (n=54)	1.5% (n=1)
Lunch and refreshments	-	-	9.1% (n=6)	<b>90.9%</b> (n=60)	-
Conference packet	2.9% (n=2)	5.9% (n=4)	25.0% (n=170)	<b>66.2%</b> (n=45)	-
Location (i.e., convenience)	1.5% (n=1)	1.5% (n=1)	22.1% (n=15)	<b>75%</b> (n=51)	-
Adequacy of the facility	-	1.5% (n=1)	14.9% (n=10)	<b>83.6%</b> (n=56)	-

Table 7. Comments (N=9) on Pre-Conference and On-Site Conference

	Positive	Negative
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Everything is perfect, just need to work on publicity, love the hotel: good food, parking, space etc, excellent &amp; responsible leadership (H-PEA).”</li> <li>• “Excellent improvement on conference registration procedure and web info.”</li> <li>• “Fabulous Job!”</li> <li>• “Liked the small sheet conference agenda.”</li> <li>• “Appreciate the volunteers effort.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “More PR Needed. Where is the link to the community?”</li> <li>• “Not sure about timeliness, but there were others who hadn’t heard about H-PEA or the conference-not a good thing.”</li> <li>• “Only valet parking, the conference link didn’t work.”</li> <li>• “Suggestion is to keep membership cost included in cost of the conference. University does not pay for membership. Place a person’s affiliation on name badge.”</li> </ul>

### 3. Conference Program

- The Conference Program was overall rated positively by the participants at the evaluation conference, with the exception of the Paper Presentation where the majority rated it as good (see table 8).
- The comments reveal both negative and positive comments. The positive comments addressed the good presentations and complemented the panel and the conference in general. The negative comments however complained about bad presentations and that the presenters went over time (see table 9).

Table 8. Rating of Conference Program

Conference program (N=68)	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A
Morning keynote address	1.5% (n=1)	10.4% (n=7)	11.9% (n=8)	<b>67.2%</b> (n=45)	9.0% (n=6)
Morning panel	-	4.5% (n=3)	31.8% (n=21)	<b>59.1%</b> (n=39)	4.5% (n=3)
Afternoon keynote address	-	8.5% (n=5)	27.1% (n=16)	<b>62.7%</b> (n=37)	1.7% (n=1)
Paper presentations	-	3.9% (n=2)	<b>47.1%</b> (n=24)	43.1% (n=22)	5.0% (n=3)
Poster session	-	8.9% (n=4)	31.1% (n=14)	<b>42.2%</b> (n=19)	17.8% (n=8)

Table 9. Comments (N=21) on Conference Programs

	Positive	Negative
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Good presentation.”</li> <li>• “Good use of time with morning panel stories and table group discussions.”</li> <li>• “Great conference.”</li> <li>• “I enjoyed the stories of the morning panel and the fact that 3 different cultures were represented. I enjoyed Fiona’s perspective and how that relates to Hawaiians.”</li> <li>• “Ice cream and networking.”</li> <li>• “The first paper presentations were good.”</li> <li>• “The keynotes were both wonderfully vibrant &amp; communicative.”</li> <li>• “Loved Hazel’s facility with language and sound, loved the illustration of her slam poetry performance.”</li> <li>• “Liked youth speak, the poetry was inspiring.”</li> <li>• “Nice work.”</li> <li>• “The paper sessions were good.”</li> <li>• “It was the most successful panel at H-PEA to date.”</li> <li>• “Very informative session.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Afternoon keynote too long.”</li> <li>• “Not as good presentations.”</li> <li>• “The two last papers were not good.”</li> <li>• “Morning keynote: anecdotes like a bridge to nowhere, unfocused, confused, poorly communicated.”</li> <li>• “Presenters went overtime, too much. Need to be more forceful with time monitoring.”</li> <li>• “Separate the group of evaluators and everyone else. I am not an evaluator, yet interested in how to strengthen my program.”</li> <li>• “All the talks went pass the time.”</li> <li>• “Presenters went over their time.”</li> </ul>

#### 4. Overall Conference Experience

- The majority of the attendees strongly agreed with the positive comments regarding the conference, such as the topics, panel and speakers as being important and interesting (see table 10).
- However, some of the comments revealed dissatisfaction with time management (see table 11).
- 56.7% (n=38) of the respondents attended a previous H-PEA conference, while 43.3% (n=29) had not. 47.4% (n=18) attended the 2006 conference, 18.4% (n=7) attended the 2007 conference, and 34.2% (n=13) attended the 2008 conference.
- 40% (n=24) of the attendees thought the conference was better, while 21.7% (n=13) thought it was about the same. 38.3 % (n=23) reported not applicable.
- Most of the attendees strongly agreed (71.7%, n=43) or somewhat agreed (23.3%, n=23) that they planned to attend next year’s H-PEA conference.

Table 10.

Overall Conference (N=68)	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	N/A
The topics were important and timely	-	1.5% (n=1)	29.2% (n=19)	<b>69.2% (n=45)</b>	-
Length of time for each event on the schedule was adequate	1.5% (n=1)	9.2% (n=2)	38.5% (n=25)	<b>50.8% (n=33)</b>	-



Overall Conference (N=68)	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	N/A
The keynote and panel speakers were interesting and well-prepared	-	4.6% (n=4)	24.6% (n=16)	<b>70.8% (n=46)</b>	-
The paper presentation speakers were interesting and well-prepared	1.8% (n=1)	3.5% (n=2)	35.1% (n=20)	<b>56.1% (n=32)</b>	3.5% (n=2)
The conference was a valuable professional development experience	-	-	30.8% (n=20)	<b>69.2% (n=45)</b>	-
I found new contacts and opportunities for future collaboration	1.6% (n=1)	6.2% (n=4)	29.7% (n=19)	<b>53.1% (n=34)</b>	9.4% (n=6)
Overall, attending the conference was a worthwhile experience	-	-	26.2% (n=17)	<b>73.8% (n=48)</b>	-
I plan to attend next year's H-PEA conference	1.7% (n=1)	-	23.3% (n=14)	<b>71.7% (n=43)</b>	3.3% (n=2)

Table 11. Comments (N=13) on the Overall Conference Experience

	Positive	Negative
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Each year gets even more better.”</li> <li>• “Good dialogue of evaluator change.”</li> <li>• “I became a student member.”</li> <li>• “Lois-ellin Datta her presentation was insightful and oriented a valuable experience.”</li> <li>• “Loved keynotes.”</li> <li>• Workshops as well as paper presentations were really good.”</li> <li>• “The time that was set for each presentation was managed well.”</li> <li>• “Pre-conference workshop on tech evaluation tools was the best part of the conference. Very good!”</li> <li>• “This was a new experience for me. I have so much to learn.”</li> <li>• “This was a very informative and enjoyable event. My compliments to the organizers.”</li> <li>• “Very helpful in terms of understanding the nature/importance of evaluation work.”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Lunch break a little long.”</li> <li>• “More time needed for Hazel’s presentation.”</li> <li>• “More time needed for panelists and for Lois-ellin Datta, and less time for morning keynote speaker Dr. Symonette.”</li> <li>• “No time for Q&amp;A, more time management by the presenters.”</li> </ul>

## **5. Future Planning of the Conference**

### *Positive aspects of this year’s event*

- The respondents were very satisfied with this year’s event and only positive comments were given, such as complementing the networking at the conference, the presentations, panel discussions and key note speakers as well as the cultural diversity and participation.

- No specific suggestions were made as to which of the events should be continued (see table 12).

Table 12. Comments (N=42) on this year's event

	Comments (N=42)
Keynote Speakers (n=13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "High quality speakers."</li> <li>• "Nationally recognized speakers."</li> <li>• "Excellent keynotes."</li> <li>• "Diversity of voices, presentation styles."</li> </ul>
Topic (n=9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Culture theme."</li> <li>• "Technology used in evaluation."</li> <li>• "The human aspect of why &amp; how evaluation can be done more."</li> </ul>
Panel (n=7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "The panel discussions were excellent."</li> <li>• "The panel was great."</li> </ul>
Networking (n=5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "The opportunity to talk and network."</li> </ul>
General (n=4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Good balance of sessions and participation."</li> </ul>
Posters (n=3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "The poster session with ice cream in the room was productive and interesting."</li> </ul>
Paper (n=3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Having paper presentations on the same floor was great."</li> </ul>

Note: The responses are not mutually exclusive and are overlapping.

#### *Aspects of this year's event that should be changed*

- The most frequent response as to what to change was the organization and time management of the different events.

Table 13. Comments (N=31) on events that should be changed

	Comments (N=31)
Organization/Time Management (n=13)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "More time for paper presentations."</li> <li>• "Rooms too close so noise in the afternoon."</li> <li>• "Encourage more paper presentations."</li> <li>• "Make the conference longer."</li> </ul>
General (n=7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Add prizes."</li> <li>• "Larger breakfast or earlier lunch."</li> </ul>
Keynote Speakers (n=5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "More Hawaiian cultural speakers."</li> </ul>
Papers (n=4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "It was not clear what the grouping for the paper presentations were based on."</li> </ul>
Posters (n=1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Poster presentation session: broken down into multiple sessions throughout the day."</li> </ul>

#### *Topics/activities for future conferences*

- The most frequent comments promoted different types of evaluation (within organizations, of governments, policy and health) as well as to establish a link between evaluators and community activities.
- In addition, the use of new technologies and other research methods (including data analysis) in evaluation as well as the use of cultural approaches were mentioned.

Table 14. Comments (N=26) on events that should be included in future conferences

Evaluation (n=9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Establishing a link between evaluators and community activities. Query of what value is evaluation expertise to community capacity building and community improvement.”</li> <li>• “Evaluation 101, evaluation of quality for program directors.”</li> <li>• “Evaluation Building capacity within organization.”</li> <li>• “Evaluation of govt agendas.”</li> <li>• “Evaluation and policy, invite elected officials to be part of the panel.”</li> <li>• “Evidence based community health.”</li> <li>• “Involving community in evaluator.”</li> <li>• “Skill building in how you leave behind evaluation skills in the programs you evaluate.”</li> <li>• “Topics on process use many articles accumulating recently. Developmental evaluation (Patton) is a new topic that is emerging.”</li> </ul>
Research Methods and Data (n=8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Data collection, analyze programs/software.”</li> <li>• “Focus group reporting.”</li> <li>• “Formative vs. summative assessment, qualitative vs. qualitative assessment-what to use when.”</li> <li>• “Group activity to present a hypothetical organization given a scenario on how each dept/staff member work together to accomplish the mission/values of the organization using various, measuring tools, delta points, and analyzing data.”</li> <li>• “More discussion on rigor &amp; culture based approach.”</li> <li>• “Place-based inquiry.”</li> <li>• “Quantitative/description reporting federal grants especially for Native Am.”</li> <li>• “The lesson between funders measurement expectations vs. program outcomes described/measured by practitioners.”</li> </ul>
New Technology (n=3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “More discussion around technology tools used in evaluation vendors offering evaluation system.”</li> <li>• “Use of social media in evaluation.”</li> <li>• “Visual texts as forms of evaluation.”</li> </ul>
Other (n=6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Intentional religious events.”</li> <li>• “Invite speakers from Manoa Hawaii Nui Akea.”</li> <li>• “Job/employment forum.”</li> <li>• “More free workshops.”</li> <li>• “Stakeholder involvement.”</li> <li>• “Survey Monkey, part II for workshops.”</li> </ul>

*Keynote speakers for future conferences*

- 15 different speakers were suggested for future conferences (see table 15).

Table 15. Keynote speakers suggested for future conference

Speaker	Affiliation	Topic
Crime Ducan (?)	DOE	Educational Evaluation
Hazel Symonette		Cultural Competence
Jiff Hurt	UH Windward	Assessment of government
Linda Tuiwai Smith	Maori	Indigenous evaluation
Maenette Benham	UH Manoa	Place-based inquiry
Michael Pavel	University of Washington	Student success
Michael Scriven	Western Michigan	
Michael Patton		Any topic by him
Peter Hanohano	OHA	Culture based

Speaker	Affiliation	Topic
Ramy	UH	Hawaii
Rockferre Ka'aloa	NHM	Technological evaluation
-	-	Workshop on indigenous framing for evaluation
David Fetterman	Stanford	Recent developments in empowerment evaluation
Kahunawaii Wright		Cultural conference in evaluation
Lui Hokoava	UH Windward	Achieving the dream and implementation of intervention to facilitate successful outcomes for Community College students
Verlie Ann Malina Wright		PAF

*What H-PEA can do to meet participants' evaluation needs*

- The need that was most frequently mentioned was to make the conference materials (references, list of speakers, etc.) available on the H-PEA web site.
- Other requests were to build links between program evaluation and community organization and improvement, more workshops/events and announcing possible job opportunities for evaluators.

Table 16. Comments (N=26) on what H-PEA can do to meet the participants' evaluation needs

Item	Comments (N=26)
Web Resources (n=10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Post papers, handouts, references online for download."</li> <li>• "Expand the H-PEA Web site to include more evaluation related resources."</li> </ul>
Workshop/Training/Events (n=7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "More workshops."</li> <li>• "Quarterly events to evaluate evaluations and various other topics."</li> </ul>
Community (n=3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "What are some issues with respect to building links between program evaluations and community leaders (entrepreneurs) who view it as their responsibility to build the programs they believe are necessary to meet the needs of their respective communities."</li> </ul>
Job (n=2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Announce job opportunities for evaluators."</li> </ul>
Other (n=4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Provide scholarship opportunities to mainland and for local evaluation events."</li> <li>• "Indigenous aspects in evaluation."</li> </ul>

## IV. RESULTS AND FINDINGS:

### WORKSHOPS

#### Workshop A

The results and findings are based on surveys that were handed out to participants at the workshop on “*Cultivating Self as Instrument*” by Hazel Symonette (N=7).

#### Participant information and interests

- All of the participants at this workshop were H-PEA members and the widely held job titles were Faculty.
- Primary work setting was Higher Education and Non-Profit Organization and the main interest reported was Education.

#### Rating of Presentation

- The presentation was overall rated as good.

Table 17.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Presentation style	28.6% (n=2)		28.6% (n=2)	42.9% (n=3)
Organization	14.3% (n=1)	42.9% (n=2)	42.9% (n=3)	-
Content	14.3 (n=1)	14.3% (n=1)	42.9% (n=3)	28.6% (n=2)
Pace	28.6% (n=2)	14.3% (n=1)	42.9% (n=3)	14.3% (n=1)

- Five of the seven participants strongly agreed or agreed to the statements that the workshop was useful, the difficulty level was appropriate and that they would recommend this workshop to others. However two of the participants strongly disagreed with the same statements.

#### Comments on aspects of the workshop

*Most valuable aspects of workshop* (N=7)

- The group discussions, handouts, and sharing of real life experiences were valued.

*Least valuable aspects of the workshop* (N=5)

- The comments addressed that the presentation was vague and not clear and that the presenter went too fast through the handouts.

*Future topics of interest* (N=4)

- More evaluation models involving community.

*Additional comments and suggestions* (N=3)

- Ending on time, include presenters contact information and the presentations were “very unfocused.”

(See appendices for all the raw comments.)

## **Workshop B**

The results and findings are based on surveys that were handed out to the participants at the workshop on “*Beyond Survey Monkey: New Ways to Use Tech in Evaluation*” (N=25).

### **Participant information and interests**

- The majority of the participants at this workshop were H-PEA members and the widely held job titles were Evaluator and Faculty, followed by Student.
- Primary work settings were Higher Education and Non-Profit Organization and the main interest reported was Education.

### **Rating of Presentation**

- The presentation was overall rated as excellent.

Table 18.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Presentation style	-	4.5% (n=1)	45.5% (n=10)	50.0% (n=11)
Organization	-	4.5% (n=1)	45.5% (n=10)	50.0% (n=11)
Content	-	13.6% (n=3)	27.3% (n=6)	59.1% (n=13)
Pace	-	13.6% (n=3)	31.8% (n=7)	54.5% (n=12)

- The majority (50%, n=12) agreed or strongly agreed (45.8%, n=11) to the statement that the workshop was useful to them.
- 50% (n=12) of the attendees agreed that the difficulty level was appropriate for them and 37.5% (n=9) strongly agreed to the same statement.
- The majority of the respondents agreed (50%, n=12) or strongly agreed (45.8%) that they would recommend this workshop to others.

### **Comments on aspects of the workshop**

#### *Most valuable aspects of workshop (N=23)*

- The most frequent comments were the satisfaction with Donnels’ presentation on polleverywhere.com and the satisfaction of learning the latest technology for evaluation.

#### *Least valuable aspects of the workshop (N=17)*

- The comments varied, but some of them addressed the technical difficulties (n=4) that occurred during the presentations as well as dissatisfaction with Kaviyas’ presentation on elluminate (n=2), Lai’s presentation (n=1) and the presentation on therapy group work (n=1). However the majority (n=7) of comments stated that “nothing” was less valuable.

#### *Future topics of interest (N=17)*

- Most of the comments addressed an interest in new technology and other new tools to do evaluation, in addition to addressing indigenous evaluation procedures.

*Additional comments and suggestions (N=11)*

- Some of the comments complemented the workshops (n=4), while others complained about Internet connection at the hotel (n=2), pictures taken without permission (n=2), and the need for handouts for each presentation (n=1).

(See appendices for all the raw comments.)

**Workshop C**

The results and findings are based on surveys that were handed out to participants at the workshop on “*Mission, Planning, & Outcomes: A Role for Logic Models*” by Lily Bloom Domingo (N=14).

**Participant information and interests**

- The majority of participants at this workshop were H-PEA members and the widely held job titles were Evaluator, Faculty and Administrator.
- Primary work settings were Higher Education, followed by School System and Non-Profit Organization and the main interest reported was Education.

**Rating of Presentation**

- The presentation was overall rated as excellent.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Presentation style	-	-	21.4% (n=3)	78.6% (n=11)
Organization	-	-	21.4% (n=3)	78.6% (n=11)
Content	-	-	21.4% (n=3)	78.6% (n=11)
Pace	-	-	21.4% (n=3)	78.6% (n=11)

- All the attendees strongly agreed or agreed with statements about the workshop, that the workshop was useful, the difficulty level was appropriate and that they would recommend this workshop to others.

**Comments on aspects of the workshop**

*Most valuable aspects of workshop (N=13)*

- The overall explanation of the theory components of the logic model, the handouts, the power point presentation, the discussion and practicing.

*Least valuable aspects of the workshop (N=6)*

- All of the comments stated that there were no less valuable aspects of the workshop with the exception of one that stated the need for alternative takes on logic models.

*Future topics of interest (N=7)*

- To give examples of how organizations/agencies use logic model in a “real setting” and how to use computer software for logic modeling.

*Additional comments and suggestions (N=8)*

- Thank you for a great and fabulous workshop.

(See appendices for all the raw comments.)



## APPENDICES

### Appendix A

#### Conference

Comments (N=42) on this year's event.

- Liked topic (because I also suggested it).
- Culture theme.
- Data update.
- Different fields were represented in the speakers backgrounds.
- Discussion around cultural evaluation - breakout presentation, pre - workshops, wonderful facilities.
- Diversity of voices, presentation styles.
- Excellent keynotes, opportunities to talk & network ice cream!
- Good balance types of sessions & participation.
- Good pace of activities.
- Great key not address speaker like Hazel - she rocks.
- Hands on qualitative tech tools and handouts, info, resources.
- Hye-ryeon's presentation - stories from approach the field exercise.
- Having paper presentations on the same floor was great. Presentation context – converged.
- Hazel's key note speech, analysis of field stories.
- High quality speakers opportunity for networking.
- I especially enjoyed the beyond survey monkey presentations and the moving session speaker.
- I liked that the questions for the "Navigating the logic models" presentation were e-mailed before the day of the training this helped to prepare an outline of how to complete a logic model.
- Lois-ellin Datta, Panelists, work sheets & table work well executed.
- Long lunch time, social good to talk with many people, ice cream.
- Lunch, sessions work.
- The panel discussion interactive with group work was a good idea. It made things more interesting, kept us active and allowed us to get to know each other.
- Nationally recognized speakers.
- More time for papers - maybe only 2 per session.
- Networking, keynote posters.
- Networking time.
- New ideas from good presenters.
- Youth speaker Hawaii was opening by Brandon.
- Panel discussion in on various topics relevant to conference theme.
- Panel discussions.
- Paper sessions, panel format speakers, group disc, then speakers again.
- Poster sessions.
- Presentation rooms next to the main room.
- Some aspect of culture should always be present.
- Survey & relevant instrument for child welfare mental health programs or direct to resources.
- Technology used in evaluation.
- The case studies discussion.  
The keynote by Hazel, the poem reading, and the panel discussion are excellent! They are inspiring informative, and make me want to be a better evaluator and person in general.
- Better my effective ways to do evaluation, forwarding on the human aspects of why & how evaluation could be done more.
- The panel was great, and the poster / session with ice cream in the room was productive and interesting.
- The story activity.
- Youth present speaker.

Comments (N=31) on things that should be changed.

- A bit more time for paper presentations, perhaps 30-minutes each, would give presenters more space to describe the complexity of their projects.
- A closer review of key note speakers curriculum and evaluation before request to speak is extended.
- Add prizes.
- Better prepared speaks.
- Breath of application of evaluation.
- Create stands or call for proposals on specific stands for presentation, and encourage more paper presentations.
- End form of comments & evaluation.
- Good idea about questions & answer during the social activity - paper session felt as though there wasn't enough time.
- Have more paper presentations instead of 2 keynote speakers.
- I thought the conference went well and there is nothing I would change.
- I was distracted, people walking at event so much.
- Invite Collin Kippin to speak.
- It was not clear what the grouping for the paper presentations were based on.
- Just the topic.
- Larger breakfast or earlier lunch.
- Longer breakout presentations.
- Maybe another location.
- More Hawaii cultural speakers.
- More time for paper presentations.
- Rooms too close so noise in afternoon.
- Nothing, it is okay.
- Perhaps 2 days?
- Please inform conference participants about taking pictures during the conference without permission.
- Possibly not fixable, but I wanted to go to more than just one of the paper sessions. Fruit instead of just pastries.
- Poster presentation session: broken down into multiple sessions throughout the day. The conference organizer should provide the poster boards and basic supplies.
- Pre-conference session should be created so that it is not repeated the next day.
- Presenters need a remote to advance.
- Structure works well.
- Timeless of presentations.
- Use of microphone for all speakers.
- Visual aids for after lunch session.

Comments (N=26) on what H-PEA can do to meet the participants' evaluation needs.

- Announce job opportunities for evaluators.
- Continue to put founder & evaluation together.
- Cost benefit analysis speakers & day long workshop community/ society improvement indicates how to develop them, inductions that seem to be compelling relevant & measureable.
- Could provide list of bibliographic references, include on article in packet that speaker in innovative ways to the theme or topic of the conference.
- Evaluation resources online?
- Help coordinate communities of practice among evaluators in different contexts. Early childhood education k-12, higher education community health programs etc.
- I like the training workshops. Food choice, would like repeat so I can attend more than one.
- Indigenous aspects in evaluation.
- Link for all evaluators. So you can see backgrounds for future use.
- Loading up ppt. list of resourced by speakers onto HPEA websites.
- Make conference materials (i.e., case studies by Cram, Evensen & Lee on-line) Please!!!
- Market conference to encourage attendance of trainees who do not primarily identify as an "evaluator" - who assume these duties an their other roles or may be represents in evaluation.
- May be a new surfer on the HPEA website informing trends (technology methods) in education (?)
- More workshops.
- Non-credit courses.
- Organizing professional development.
- Perhaps expand the website to include more evaluation - related resources.
- Post papers, handouts online for download and want copy of the new NHEC fabric for evaluation Culture Based programs.
- Posting work online.
- Provide scholarship opportunities to mainland and for local evaluation events.
- Quarterly events to evaluate evaluations and various other topics.
- References, Job recruitment.
- Sponsor/producers training during the year, esp. to get people who need to use evaluation & professional evaluator to interface. Somehow throw in a discn issue to spur use of the listsen. (?)
- The pre-conference workshops (Logic model & beyond survey monkey) were really valuable & helpful.
- What are some issues with respect to building links between program evaluations and community leaders (entrepreneurs) who view it as their responsibility to build the programs they believe are necessary to meet the needs of their respective communities.
- Workshop interviews on specific evaluation method or analysis strategy.

## **Appendix B**

### **Workshop A**

#### *Comments on most valuable aspects of workshop (N=7).*

- Discussion & application of use itself in concept of evaluation; representational exercises.
- Group discussion.
- Handouts.
- Not too much.
- Sharing real life examples and insights, handouts!
- Specific examples & What to do - Group discussion-Positive attitude of the presenter.
- Updated resourced on this topic.

#### *Comments on least valuable aspects of the workshop (N=5).*

- All aspects were valuable.
- Blazing through handouts.
- I am linear thinker - this is not always linear I think! Need a map, may be more opportunities to do things sitting down so much is difficult.
- Oral presentation, Anecdotal insights not very helpful.
- Some of the language used was too vague and not clear. Even she said we have different meanings for the same words, so I was surprised she didn't be more exacting.

#### *Comments on future topics of interest (N=4).*

- Community of practice (Starting, implementing, etc).
- Increasing stakeholder involvement, community use.
- More models - graphics are good. Linear works.
- Models of strategic evaluation.

#### *Additional comments and suggestions (N=3).*

- Ending on time is important, please keep speakers on time.
- Is it possible to contact Hazel after this? No contact information?
- Unimpressed & unfulfilled. Presentation very unfocused.

## **Workshop B**

### *Comments on most valuable aspects of workshop (N=23).*

- 1st presentation of poll everywhere.com and the strengths guest activity.
- All.
- All of it, but especially the cell phone polling.
- All the weblines and resources on the new technologies.
- Donnel's presentation on polleverywhere.com/ video self-modeling, interesting methods of engaging evaluation participants.
- Examples of different software programs.
- Exposure to new tools and the ways those programs are applied in real practical application.
- Information on online resources/ websites.
- Introduction to new online tools.
- learning about all the different tools.
- Learning the latest technology for evaluation. It was very interactive.
- Monis fai's joints most valuable. Then technological software/usage.
- Poll everywhere.com Morris lai.
- Poll4.com.
- Polling, Technology.
- Polls everywhere, elluminate.
- Real time usage of poll everywhere. Videos of elluminate sessions exciting use of technology.
- Tech.
- The kinds of technology used for evaluation; assessment brave new with of assent.
- The technical stuff and also cultural inclusion.
- Using Elluminate.
- Varims tech tools available.
- Web-based options to collect data, new innovative computer software.

### *Comments on least valuable aspects of the workshop (N=17).*

- 3rd presentation of videos.
- Elluminate live due to technology issues.
- I couldn't see the connection of lai's presentation to the subject of the workshop.
- I didn't have a phone connected to the internet.
- Infinity to afford stuff.
- Kavitas presentation on elluminate.
- No.
- None.
- Nothing.
- Pros and cons of the Prel presentation because it's self-explanatory.
- Tech problems - on/off connections of the internet.
- Therapy Group Work.
- Too bad tech facility in hotel- what's new w/that always heggies.

### *Comments on future topics of interest (N=17).*

- Additional e-survey methods - survey monkey is not the only one out there, what are the + of others.
- Application of evaluation outside of the "box".
- Continuous update of available tech tools.
- Focus group's reporting.
- I love video and technology so more workshops showing hands-on topics are always great!
- More handsome computer software/ programs to collect quantitative, qualitative data for surveys and focus groups.
- More of the same, e.g. Beyond survey monkey, part II.

*Comments on future topics of interest (N=17).*

- Move about indigenous pedagogies of evaluation.
- Move on how recent technology can be used in evaluation.
- Panel division between "more mainframe evaluation" methods and indigenous evaluation procedures.
- Poll everywhere.com.
- Survey monkeys, more on the use of the iphone for evaluation (examples?)
- T & H change so quickly- update session.
- Using technology in evaluation, the current trend.
- Video self-modeling, recording/ digital archive tech tools focus interviews.
- Web Based Social Networking W/ Data Collection Capability.
- What's going to be the newest "trend/ topic" in the evaluation field?

*Additional comments and suggestions (N=11).*

- Ask if attendees mind having photos being taken - culturally in appropriate and what about issues of recording voices for those not obey with it.
- Excellent workshop! I attend numerous conferences per year, this was one of the best sessions I attended this year.
- Great!
- Great presenters.
- Having more time to discuss the web based software and its features.
- Hotel internet WIFI not stable.
- Internet connection was poor. Previous conference here results regarding internet connection is the same.
- Love it! Great job by all presenters.
- Please - announce to people in sessions about "talking" pictures of attendees what permission.
- Room is very cold.
- Would have been better if we had received a hand out of each presentation.

## Workshop C

### *Comments on most valuable aspects of workshop (N=13).*

- Clarify a logic model process.
- Doing a logic model.
- Explaining the why and how.
- Explanation of the theory component of logic models, difference between outputs and outcomes, process mapping.
- Handouts.
- Handouts and pamphlets to use when I go back to the office.
- Outputs definitions and examples.
- Power point presentation regarding logic model development.
- Practicing the logic model - apply it to your own program.
- The big picture.
- The big picture logic model diagram.
- The discussion part.
- Very clear guidelines and heights of example stories step by steps.

### *Comments on least valuable aspects of the workshop (N=6).*

- More alternative takes, less linear examples of logic models.
- N/A.
- None.

### *Comments on future topics of interest (N=7).*

- Computer software program - template to create a logic model.
- Developmental evaluation (Patton !!) expensive though.
- Example from an agency their development & use of logic model in their evaluation process.
- Examples of how organizations have used logic models and how they've involved stakeholders in the process.
- Logic model II.
- Qualitative evaluation methods - digital story telling, photo voice focus interviews etc, quantitative evaluation tools - data collection and statistical analysis training workshops.
- Real examples of how different evaluation approaches worked in the real world.

### *Additional comments and suggestions (N=8).*

- Fabulous workshop. Really clarified the purpose and how to use the logic model. Nicely done.
- Great presenters; very valuable info. They are very knowledgeable & helpful.
- Great workshop!
- May be develop a sample logic model using a real company and go through the process and the group help to put it together.
- N/A.
- Thank you! You both were informative, helpful.
- Thank you, very helpful info, useful hands-on examples and handouts.
- Thanks.

**H-PEA Conference Evaluation Form  
September 11, 2009**

**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 describe you best?  
Faculty / Administrator / Evaluator / Consultant / Student / Other \_\_\_\_\_
2. Are you an H-PEA Member / Non-Member
3. What is your primary work setting?  
Higher ed. / School system / Government agency / Non-profit organization / For-profit organization / Other \_\_\_\_\_
4. What is your area of interest in evaluation?  
Education / Health / Social service / General/ Other \_\_\_\_\_
5. How many years have you been an evaluator? \_\_\_\_\_

**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
Online registration						Check-in procedure					
Availability of conference information						Lunch and refreshments					
Timely announcement of the conference						Conference packet					
Poster/Paper submission procedure						Location (i.e., convenience)					
Conference publicity						Adequacy of the facility					
<b>Comments:</b>											

**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 keynote address						Paper presentations (Track #: _____)					
Morning panel						Poster session					
Afternoon keynote address											
<b>Comments:</b>											



**IV. Please rate your overall conference experience** (Please  $\surd$  the box).

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

Overall Conference	1	2	3	4	n/a
The topics were important and timely.					
Length of time for each event on the schedule was adequate.					
The keynote and panel speakers were interesting and well-prepared					
The paper presentation speakers were interesting and well-prepared					
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.					
<b>Comments:</b>					

1. Have you attended any previous H-PEA Conferences? Yes / No

Which years?                      2006                      2007                      2008

2. Compared to previous H-PEA Conferences, how would you rate the overall quality of this year's conference?

Better                      About the same                      Worse                      N/A

**Comments:**

**V. Future planning of the conference**

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

2. What aspects of this year's event should be changed for next year's H-PEA 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: \_\_\_\_\_ Topic: \_\_\_\_\_

Speaker: \_\_\_\_\_ Affiliation: \_\_\_\_\_ Topic: \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Workshop Evaluation Form  
September 10, 2009**

*Beyond Survey Monkey: New Ways To Use Tech In Evaluation*

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

1. Which of the following describe you best?  
 Faculty / Administrator / Evaluator / Consultant / Student / Other \_\_\_\_\_  
 H-PEA Member / Non-Member
2. What is your primary work setting?  
 Higher ed. / School system / Government agency / Non-profit organization / Private business /  
 Other \_\_\_\_\_
3. What is your area of interest in evaluation?  
 Education / Health / Social service / Other \_\_\_\_\_
4. How many years have you been an evaluator? \_\_\_\_\_

**II. Please rate the following features of the presentation:**

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Presentation style				
Organization				
Content				
Pace				

**III. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:**

1. The information presented in the workshop is useful.  
 Strongly Disagree       Disagree       Agree       Strongly Agree
2. The difficulty level of information was appropriate for me.  
 Strongly Disagree       Disagree       Agree       Strongly Agree
3. I would recommend this workshop to others.  
 Strongly Disagree       Disagree       Agree       Strongly Agree

**IV. Other aspects of the workshop:**

1. What parts of the workshop were most valuable to you?
2. What parts of the workshop were least valuable to you?
3. Are there any topics in particular you would like to see in future workshops?
4. Do you have any additional comments/suggestions? Please share them with us.

*Thank you for your input!*