



SPSS October Workshop: Evaluation

Rick Speare
10 November 2012

1. Evaluation Tools

The Tropical Health Solutions Workshop *Using SPSS for Statistical Data Analysis* was held at Mater Educational Centre, Townsville on the weekend of 27th and 28th October. The facilitators were Petra Buettner and Monika Buhner-Skinner. There were 13 paying participants and a freeloader, THS Director, Emeritus Professor Rick Speare. All participants had bachelors degrees, most, but not all, in health, and many with postgraduate degrees or professional qualifications.

The Workshop was evaluated using three (yes 3!) tools: 1) a *THS Feedback Form*; 2) a *SPSS Workshop Evaluation Form*; and 3) an *One Minute Reflection* form (see Appendices). All participants were asked to complete all three items at the end of the Workshop. The responses were anonymous. Responses were entered into SPSS version 20 for the *Feedback Form* and into Excel for the *SPSS Workshop Evaluation Form*. Descriptive statistics only were performed.

2. Overall Rating of Workshop

One set of data was obtained from written responses to the *SPSS Workshop Evaluation Form* via a question "How would you rate this workshop – out of 10 (please circle)". A similar question was asked in the *Feedback Form*: "Overall rating of the course?" with answer options as four categories.

12 participants responded (response rate = 12/14 = 85.7%) to the rating out of 10 and 13 to the categorical rating.

Rating out of 10 (mean±sd, range) was 8.18±0.75 (8-10). For the categorical rating, "good" = 38.5% and "excellent" = 61.5% (Table 1).

Specific Comment: The Workshop overall was rated highly using both tools.

3. Recommend Course to Others

The answers to the question "Would you recommend this course to others?" were "good" = 28.6% and "excellent" = 71.5% (Table 1).

Specific Comment: The scaling of the question "Would you recommend this course to others?" is unusual as it is really a question that begs a yes/no answer. However, since all responses were in the top half of the ordinal categorical scale, overall response is a unanimous "Yes".

4. Rating of Workshop Components

Components of the Workshop were rated using a standard THS Course *Feedback Form*. Most participants answered all questions (Table 1).

Table 1: Rating of components of the SPSS Workshop from the *Feedback Form*.

COURSE OVERALL:	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent	Number
How easy was the course to understand?	0	0	42.9%	57.1%	14
Was the content suited to your requirements:	0	7.1%	21.4%	71.4%	14
Were the topics covered in sufficient detail?	0	7.1%	42.9%	50.0%	14
Would you recommend this course to others?	0	0	28.6%	71.4%	14
Overall rating of the course? (missing=1)	0	0	38.5%	61.5%	13
COURSE MATERIAL:	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent	Number
Clarity of the training content?	0	0	42.9%	57.1%	14
How well did the course materials follow the course?	0	0	28.6%	71.4%	14
Overall quality of training materials?	0	0	42.9%	57.1%	14
Overall rating of the course material?	0	0	35.7%	64.3%	14
INSTRUCTOR/S:	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent	Number
Ability to provide real world experience?	0	0	35.7%	64.3%	14
Ability to respond appropriately to questions?	0	0	28.6%	71.4%	14
How well prepared was the instructor?	0	0	21.4%	78.6%	14
Knowledge of subject matter?	0	0	7.1%	92.9%	14
Presentation abilities?	0	0	21.4%	78.6%	14
VENUE:	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent	Number
Venue appropriateness to the course delivery?	0	14.3%	28.6%	57.1%	14
Location and parking?	0	0	35.7%	64.3%	14
Food? (missing=2)	0	8.3%	33.3%	58.3%	12

Specific Comments on Workshop: Ratings of Workshop overall and instructors were very good, with the highest score for “Knowledge of subject matter” attesting to the high level expertise of the facilitators. The slightly lower spread of responses to “average” for “Content suited to needs” and “Topics covered in sufficient details” were related to a couple of participants having good knowledge of basic statistics and needing more knowledge on multiple regression.

Comments on Venue: The venue in the Mater Educational Centre lecture room 2 was rated as suitable. Some participants experienced problems with hypothermia due to a low setting on the air-conditioning (see comments in Table 3). This could not be changed unfortunately.

5. Marketing

From the *Feedback Form*, email was how the majority of participants became aware of the course (Table 2).

Table 2: Marketing data.

ADVERTISING:	Notice board	Website	Email	Newspaper	Newsletter	Word of mouth	Number
Where did you hear about us? (missing=1)	7.1%	0	64.3%	7.1%	0	14.3%	13
Where do you recommend we promote this course in the future? (missing=4; multiple answers allowed, 18 suggestions used as denominator)	16.7%	16.7%	50.0%	0	0	0	10

Most participants recommended email as the major means of advertising future courses.

Specific Comments: Since most participants came from JCU and The Townsville Hospital, the importance of notifications via email is highlighted by this result.

6. Open Comments

Participants had several opportunities to provide comments through the *Feedback Form* (Table 3) of the *One Minute Reflections* form (Tables 4).

Table 3: Comments on *Feedback Form*.

Excellent
I have never ticked the extreme for everything in any workshop I can remember previously.
Recommend the wearing of appropriate clothing! to keep warm.
Venue too cold.
At times the stats component (not SPSS component) was too complex.
Excellent course – many thanks.
An excellent course with statistics revision and basic use of SPSS.
Really enjoyed course.
Will consider doing a follow up course some mths later.
Integration of theory with software package was very helpful. Understanding WHY – so important.
Time constraints were probably the main reason I ticked “average” for topics in detail and this didn’t apply to all topics.
Air-conditioning made room cold.

Table 4: Response in One Minute Reflections at the end of the Workshop to the question: “What was the most useful, meaningful or intriguing thing/s that you learnt today?”

P1: Practical examples; flowchart to choose analysis
P2: Some of the information on the theory behind tests; eg, beta, p-value; multiple uses of ANOVA and regression
P3: Inferential stats refresher (and some new things); recap from previous day was good; practical use of SPSS data set.
P4: I really like the nut shell approach to stats. I need to understand what & why, not how; the practical approach is great.
P5: Massive insight on what statistical tests to use and hoe to do them. Thank you!
P6: How to access the various “test” functions in SPSS. But not sure I would use them appropriately.
P7: How to decide on test depending on variable.
P8: Going through which stats tests to use and when and how; good opportunity to ask questions.
P9: Background knowledge about confidence intervals and statistical testing; Details about what statistical tests to use and hoe to use SPSS to perform these.
P10: Useful tool; Different information from same data.
P11: Understanding of when to use statistical tests.
P12: Finally a way to make a choice about tests via the chart (gpt 3); reduced anxiety about testing data.
P13: Which statistical test to apply to which data set!
P14: Use of statistical tests for different analysis types.

Specific comments: The low temperature in the room was mentioned by three participants (Table 3). Open ended responses about the Workshop were positive.

7. Future Workshops

Information about future workshops could potentially fall into two areas: 1) ways of improving current Workshop; and 2) topics for workshops to build on this one. Data were collected through two open ended questions (Tables 5 & 6).

Table 5: Response in *One Minute Reflections* at the end of the Workshop to the question “What question/s remain uppermost in your mind as we end today?” The numbers used in this table link responses in Tables 4 and 5 only and do not identify any participant.

P1: How can I manipulate my data to provide more meaningful analysis?; What if you have inherited the data and it is a bit yucky – what will I do from here?
 P3: Practice, practice, practice. Thank you.
 P4: Step 2.
 P5: Very good introduction. Obvious that I will need to take it from here.
 P6: How to know that the results obtained should be looked at a different way or which results to ignore. I feel that kind of decision is still out of my reach and would still very much need the input of a “real” statistician.
 P8: None. Particularly, am aware of need to use or lose this “know-how” from the course!
 P10: Nothing in particular at this stage due to a bit of information overload in this afternoon’s session. Will contact when faced with stumbling block.
 P13: Reviewing output + enduing that the results are meaningful – ie, not using invalid results.
 P14: Numerical analysis; regression and correlation.

Data was obtained from the *SPSS Workshop Evaluation Form* in response to the question: “Comments and suggestions for future workshops”.

Six participants made 12 suggestions (Table 6).

Table 6: Suggestions on topics for future SPSS workshops and recommended changes.

Suggestion	Number	Percent of total suggestions
Advanced	4	33.3%
More practicals	2	16.7%
Analyse own data	4	33.3%
Other tests	1	8.3%
Research design	1	8.3%
	12	100.0%

Specific Comments: From the *One Minute Reflections* responses (Table 5) it was apparent that participants recognized the need to build on the Workshop by analyzing their own data and that they would still need statistical advice. There was one request for further information on multiple regression. From the direct request for advice on future workshops (Table 6) there is a desire for a more advanced workshop using the participants own data.