

Aggie ALLIES Workshop Evaluation Spring 2015

Background

Aggie Allies is an organization at Texas A&M University whose mission is to provide visible support to and a safe environment for the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people in the Texas A&M community. The organization is composed of faculty, staff, students, and community members. In order to become an Ally, people must complete the three-hour educational Aggie Allies Workshop training session. Trained facilitators run the workshop that includes common definitions, the coming out process developmental model, several activities, and a panel of LGBT people. At the end of that workshop, participants are given the opportunity to sign a contract to be an Ally, but they are not required to do so.

Aggie Allies has used Student Life Studies since 2007 for the evaluation workshop. Aggie Allies has also used Student Life Studies for web-based membership surveys.

Method and Sample

The 16 question survey was developed using Teleform[®], survey design software that creates scannable forms and databases. The survey consisted of 12 quantitative questions and four qualitative questions. The surveys were distributed to 242 participants before the workshops; all participants completed the survey yielding a 100% response rate. The data was analyzed using SPSS[®], a statistical software package, and Microsoft Excel[®].

Results

Results will be reported as means, standard deviations (sd), and frequency percentages for the number of people (n) who responded to the question. For ease of reading, frequency percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent, so totals may not add up to exactly 100%. The table is organized in descending mean order for the after condition. Also reported are the results of paired sample t-tests used to determine if there was a significant difference between reported before and after effects, reported as t, degree of freedom (df) and 2-tailed significance (Sig). Qualitative themes are reported in this report; the entire list can be found in a separate document.

The results of the workshops by presenters are included in Appendix A at the end of the document. Table 1, on the following page, shows the comparison between the before and after responses of the participants in the program, as well as the paired sample t-test. Participants were asked to rate their agreement with six statements before the presentation, and then rate their agreement again, to the same six questions after the presentation. Before the presentations, very few participants strongly agreed with any of the statements, however some did agree with them. After the presentations, almost all of the participants strongly agreed or agreed with the statements, leaving only a few participants feeling neutral or disagreeing with them. All of the paired sample t-tests showed a statistically significant increase in the results from before to after the presentations.

	<i>Strongly Agree</i> (5)	<i>Agree</i> (4)	<i>Neutral</i> (3)	<i>Disagree</i> (2)	<i>Strongly Disagree</i> (1)	Mean (sd) [n]	Paired sample t-test (df) [Sig.]
Before Workshop: I could define the expectations of being an Ally.	9%	24%	28%	32%	8%	2.95 (1.10) [240]	
After Workshop: I can define the expectations of being an Ally.	56%	41%	4%	--	--	4.52 (.57) [242]	-22.39 (239) [.000]
Before Workshop: I understood the GLBT environment at Texas A&M	6%	35%	34%	23%	3%	3.18 (.94) [239]	
After Workshop: I have a better understanding of the GLBT environment at Texas A&M	50%	47%	3%	<1%	--	4.47 (.57) [242]	-19.54 (238) [.000]
Before Workshop: I could identify/explain campus and community resources.	10%	26%	28%	30%	7%	3.01 (1.01) [241]	
After Workshop: I can identify/explain campus and community resources.	48%	49%	3%	--	--	4.45 (.55) [240]	-21.31 (238) [.000]
Before Workshop: I knew steps to take when someone comes out to me	11%	37%	30%	21%	2%	3.33 (.99) [241]	
After Workshop: I know steps to take when someone comes out to me.	46%	50%	4%	--	--	4.42 (.57) [242]	-19.614 (240) [.000]
Before Workshop: I could explain the societal factors that impact how sexual orientation is perceived.	12%	52%	24%	12%	1%	3.61 (.87) [241]	
After Workshop: I can explain the societal factors that impact how sexual orientation is perceived.	38%	58%	4%	--	--	4.34 (.56) [242]	-14.76 (240) [.000]
Before Workshop: I was confident taking steps to interrupt homophobia.	10%	38%	29%	20%	3%	3.34 (1.00) [241]	
After Workshop: I am confident taking steps to interrupt homophobia.	40%	47%	12%	1%	--	4.25 (.71) [242]	-15.45 (240) [.000]

Table 1: Before and After Comparisons

Next participants were asked what they thought to be the most beneficial part of workshop. With 229 responses recorded, many participants noted they enjoyed the Q&A session, defining terms activity, and the panel. Participants were subsequently asked what part of the workshop they found least beneficial. While many of the 165 responses collected praised the workshop, or noted everything as being beneficial, many responses stated that the defining terms activity was not as beneficial as they would have liked, because they were already familiar with the terms, or because the terms were not clearly defined.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The workshops presented this year should be considered a success, the participants in the workshops showed a large increase in agreement from before the workshops to after, and all of the statements showed a statistically significant increase in the paired the sample t-tests.

Although most participants felt positive about all of the statements presented in the workshops, some participants did not feel as confident about the steps to take to interrupt homophobia. When the participants were asked the most and least beneficial aspects of the workshops, many participants liked the Q&A session, the panel, and the activity involving defining terms, however some participants noted that the defining terms activity was the least beneficial aspect for them, because they already knew the terms, or because the definitions were not clear. Also noted was the need for a brochure or handout for the participants to be able to follow along during the workshop.

Aggie Allies might want to consider focusing more on educating the participants on the steps to take to interrupt homophobia, as well as work on ways to make the defining terms activity more personal for the participants. Perhaps program organizers could consider dividing the participants into groups by knowledge level of the terms as to help the participants learn the terms who have the least knowledge of them, and help review the terms with participants who are familiar with them. Aggie Allies could also create a handout for the participants to be able to follow along throughout the workshop and reference to afterward.

The Allies Executive Committee is also encouraged to share information about the assessment results with various campus organizations such as the GLBT Resource Center, the Office of the Vice President for Diversity, the GLBT Professional Network, GLBTA, or other stakeholders interested in diversity education.

Report prepared for: Antoine Jefferson, Aggie Allies
Report prepared by: Tyler Harkrider, Student Life Studies
Report prepared on: July 15, 2015
Survey created by: Bettina Trejo, Student Life Studies
Analysis completed by: Tim Salazar, Student Life Studies

*Services provided by Student Life Studies are funded, in part, by Texas A&M University Advancement Fees.
Follow Student Life Studies on Facebook!*

Appendix A

After Results	Andrew Roblyer & Katie Stoeber (6-2 & 4-7)	Jackie & Jenny (3/29)	David Kessler & Diane Kraft (2/19)	A.Jefferson & Cunningham (2/1)	Bruce Neville & McKay Walsh (2/22)	A.Jefferson & Mary (4/12)	A.Jefferson & Diane Kraft (5/14)	A. Jefferson & Katie Stoeber (3/8)	A. Jefferson (3/27)
	Mean (sd) [n]	Mean (sd) [n]	Mean (sd) [n]	Mean (sd) [n]	Mean (sd) [n]	Mean (sd) [n]	Mean (sd) [n]	Mean (sd) [n]	Mean (sd) [n]
I can define the expectations of being an Ally	4.55 (.51) [31]	4.62 (.51) [13]	4.53 (.51) [19]	4.67 (.52) [6]	4.30 (.68) [10]	4.60 (.55) [5]	4.18 (.56) [38]	4.59 (.58) [106]	4.79 (.43) [14]
I have a better understanding of the GLBT environment at Texas A&M	4.35 (.61) [31]	4.46 (.66) [13]	4.47 (.51) [19]	4.67 (.52) [6]	4.30 (.48) [10]	4.60 (.55) [5]	4.32 (.53) [38]	4.53 (.59) [106]	4.64 (.50) [14]
I can identify/explain campus and community resources	4.39 (.50) [31]	4.46 (.52) [13]	4.28 (.46) [19]	4.33 (.82) [6]	4.10 (.32) [10]	4.60 (.55) [5]	4.37 (.49) [38]	4.55 (.60) [105]	4.50 (.52) [14]
I know steps to take when someone comes out to me	4.23 (.61) [31]	4.46 (.52) [13]	4.11 (.66) [19]	4.33 (.52) [6]	4.40 (.52) [10]	4.60 (.55) [5]	4.32 (.53) [38]	4.53 (.56) [106]	4.64 (.50) [14]
I can explain the societal factors that impact how GLBT community is perceived	4.26 (.58) [31]	4.38 (.51) [13]	4.21 (.54) [19]	4.50 (.55) [6]	4.20 (.42) [10]	4.60 (.55) [5]	4.29 (.46) [38]	4.35 (.60) [106]	4.64 (.50) [14]
I am confident taking steps to interrupt homophobia	4.19 (.75) [31]	4.23 (.60) [13]	4.26 (.65) [19]	4.67 (.52) [6]	4.30 (.68) [10]	4.60 (.55) [5]	4.00 (.70) [38]	4.24 (.75) [106]	4.79 (.43) [14]

“After attending today’s Aggie Allies workshop:” Displayed by Presenter