

Aggie ALLIES Workshop Evaluation Spring 2016

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

Method and Sample

The 15 question survey was developed using Teleform[®], survey design software that creates scannable forms and databases. The survey consisted of nine quantitative questions, three qualitative questions, one demographic question, and two questions asking the date of the workshop and workshop facilitator name. The surveys were distributed to 224 participants after the workshops; 223 participants completed the survey yielding a 99% 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%. Qualitative themes are reported in this report; the entire list can be found in a separate document.

First the participants were asked if they identified as a faculty member, staff member, graduate student, undergraduate student, or community member. Out of 223 respondents, 53% selected undergraduate student, 25% staff, 12% faculty, 9% graduate student, and 1% community member. The results of the workshops by presenters are included in Appendix A at the end of the document.

Next, participants were asked a series of questions related to how the workshop aided them in understanding different aspects of the workshop's learning objectives. In Table 1, on the following page, participants were positive about recognizing what it means to be an ally, recalling campus and community resources, identifying and reflecting on privilege, phobias, and heterosexism, and explaining the current LGBTQIA+ terminology. However participants were less positive about developing support and action techniques, and evaluating the origins of their ideas of sexuality and gender.

Please indicate to which degree this presentation aided you in being able to:	To a great extent (3)	Somewhat (2)	Very little (1)	Not at all (0)	2016 Mean (sd) [n]
Recognize what it means to be an Ally.	93%	6%	1%	--	2.92 (.30) [219]
Recall campus and community resources.	85%	14%	<1%	<1%	2.84 (.42) [219]
Identify and reflect on privilege, phobias, and heterosexism.	81%	18%	1%	--	2.80 (.42) [220]
Explain current LGBTQIA+ terminology.	80%	20%	--	<1%	2.79 (.44) [221]
Develop support and action techniques.	78%	21%	1%	--	2.76 (.46) [219]
Evaluate the origins of your ideas, sexuality, and gender.	68%	29%	3%	<1%	2.64 (.56) [221]

Table 1: Workshop Learning Outcomes

Next, participants were asked to respond to three questions regarding the knowledge of terminology used during the workshop and workshop’s facilitator. As seen in Table 2, participants agreed that the facilitators were knowledgeable about the topic, and most respondents agreed that the facilitators fully engaged the participants. However, far fewer respondents agreed when asked if they were familiar with the terminology used in the workshop before they attended.

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements:	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2016 Mean (sd) [n]
The facilitator was knowledgeable about the topic.	87%	14%	--	--	--	4.86 (.34) [222]
The facilitator fully engages the participants.	71%	26%	3%	<1%	--	4.67 (.55) [222]
I was familiar with terminology discussed during this workshop before today.	29%	46%	17%	6%	2%	3.95 (.93) [222]

Table 2: Terminology and Facilitator

Next respondents were asked to give an example of one new thing they learned from the workshop. Of the 192 participants who responded with a comment, many mentioned that they learned specific examples of terminology including pansexual, asexual, and intersex. Some other comments included knowledge of resources on campus and what to do if someone comes out to you.

Participants were then asked how they will apply what they learned from the workshop. One hundred ninety-five (195) responses were collected, many of the comments mentioned creating a safe place and listening to others. Many other comments suggested becoming more understanding, being better informed, and being more inclusive to others.

Finally participants were asked what could be done to improve the workshop. One hundred seventy (170) participants responded, most of the comments suggested that nothing needed to be changed and that they thought the workshop was good the way it was. However, some comments suggested making the workshop more interactive and including more activities and games would make it better. Other comments suggested having an advanced training class, smaller groups that could lead to more conversations, and having real life scenarios for participants to react to.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The workshops presented this year should be considered successful; participants are able recognize what it means to be an ally, can recall campus and community resources, and can explain current LGBTQIA+ terminology after the workshops. Participants were also able to evaluate the origins of their ideas, sexuality, and gender, and develop support and action techniques, however the level of agreement with these statements was slightly lower than others.

Participants also felt that the facilitators were knowledgeable about the topics presented, but were less positive about the facilitators engaging the participants at the workshops. Participants also felt that they were not very familiar with the terminology discussed at the workshop before they arrived.

While many participants felt that they could develop support and action techniques and evaluate the origins of their ideas, sexuality, and gender, almost one third felt less confident in those areas. Aggie Allies may want to consider emphasizing how to develop support and action techniques and how to properly evaluate the origins of their ideas, sexuality, and gender. Aggie Allies could also consider making the workshops more interactive by adding activities and games, and having the facilitators be more engaging with the participants. Finally Aggie Allies could give out a list of terms to the participants prior to the workshops so that they are familiar with the terms before the workshop begins.

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: Steven Crudele, Aggie Allies
Report prepared by: Tyler Harkrider, Student Life Studies
Report prepared on: July 12, 2016
Survey created by: Rachael Hovey, Student Life Studies
Analysis completed by: Dan Yin, 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

Please indicate to which degree this presentation aided you in being able to:	Katie Stober and Micah Waltz (2-7) Mean (sd) [n]	Bruce Neville and Ryan Riqda (2-17) Mean (sd) [n]	Ryan Rigda and Steven Crudele (2-20) Mean (sd) [n]	Bruce Neville and McKay Walsh (2-21) Mean (sd) [n]	Steven Crudele and Katie Stober (3-11) Mean (sd) [n]	David Kessler (3-23) Mean (sd) [n]	Steven Crudele and Andrew Roblyer (3-25) Mean (sd) [n]	Ryan Rigda (3-30) Mean (sd) [n]	Steven Crudele and Katie Stober (4-4) Mean (sd) [n]	Katie Stober and Andrew Roblyer (4-17) Mean (sd) [n]	David Kessler and Micah Waltz (4-20) Mean (sd) [n]	George Cunningham and Ryan Rigda (4-25) Mean (sd) [n]	Andrew Roblyer (5-9) Mean (sd) [n]	Andrew Roblyer and George Cunningham (5-12) Mean (sd) [n]	Steven Crudele and Bruce Neville (6-13) Mean (sd) [n]
Explain current LGBTQIA+ terminology.	2.60 (.55) [5]	3.00 (.00) [5]	2.92 (.29) [12]	2.92 (.29) [12]	2.89 (.33) [9]	2.82 (.41) [11]	2.86 (.38) [7]	3.00 (.00) [5]	2.77 (.44) [13]	2.60 (.52) [10]	2.75 (.45) [12]	2.63 (.76) [19]	2.89 (.33) [9]	2.71 (.49) [7]	2.78 (.42) [85]
Evaluate the origins of your ideas, sexuality, and gender.	2.40 (.55) [5]	2.80 (.45) [5]	2.67 (.49) [12]	2.67 (.49) [12]	2.44 (.72) [9]	2.55 (.52) [11]	2.14 (.90) [7]	3.00 (.00) [6]	2.69 (.48) [13]	2.60 (.70) [10]	2.67 (.49) [12]	2.58 (.84) [19]	2.88 (.35) [8]	2.57 (.54) [7]	2.66 (.50) [85]
Identify and reflect on privilege, phobias, and heterosexism.	2.80 (.45) [5]	3.00 (.00) [5]	2.67 (.49) [12]	2.67 (.49) [12]	2.67 (.50) [9]	2.82 (.41) [11]	2.29 (.76) [7]	3.00 (.00) [6]	2.85 (.38) [13]	2.90 (.32) [10]	2.75 (.45) [12]	2.63 (.60) [19]	3.00 (.00) [8]	3.00 (.00) [7]	2.85 (.36) [84]
Recognize what it means to be an Ally.	3.00 (.00) [5]	3.00 (.00) [5]	2.83 (.58) [12]	2.83 (.58) [12]	3.00 (.00) [9]	3.00 (.00) [11]	3.00 (.00) [7]	3.00 (.00) [6]	3.00 (.00) [13]	3.00 (.00) [10]	3.00 (.00) [12]	2.89 (.32) [19]	3.00 (.00) [8]	2.86 (.38) [7]	2.86 (.39) [83]
Develop support and action techniques.	3.00 (.00) [5]	3.00 (.00) [5]	2.73 (.47) [11]	2.73 (.47) [11]	3.00 (.00) [9]	2.73 (.47) [11]	3.00 (.00) [7]	2.83 (.41) [6]	2.62 (.51) [13]	2.70 (.48) [10]	2.83 (.39) [12]	2.53 (.70) [19]	3.00 (.00) [8]	2.71 (.49) [7]	2.74 (.50) [84]
Recall campus and community resources.	2.20 (.84) [5]	3.00 (.00) [5]	3.00 (.00) [12]	3.00 (.00) [12]	3.00 (.00) [9]	3.00 (.00) [11]	2.86 (.38) [7]	3.00 (.00) [5]	3.00 (.00) [13]	2.90 (.32) [10]	2.73 (.47) [11]	2.63 (.76) [19]	2.89 (.33) [9]	2.29 (.49) [7]	2.88 (.33) [84]

“Workshop Learning Outcomes:” Displayed by Presenter

Appendix B

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements:	Katie Stober and Micah Waltz (2-7) Mean (sd) [n]	Bruce Neville and Ryan Riqda (2-17) Mean (sd) [n]	Ryan Rigda and Steven Crudele (2-20) Mean (sd) [n]	Bruce Neville and McKay Walsh (2-21) Mean (sd) [n]	Steven Crudele and Katie Stober (3-11) Mean (sd) [n]	David Kessler (3-23) Mean (sd) [n]	Steven Crudele and Andrew Roblyer (3-25) Mean (sd) [n]	Ryan Rigda (3-30) Mean (sd) [n]	Steven Crudele and Katie Stober (4-4) Mean (sd) [n]	Katie Stober and Andrew Roblyer (4-17) Mean (sd) [n]	David Kessler and Micah Waltz (4-20) Mean (sd) [n]	George Cunningham and Ryan Rigda (4-25) Mean (sd) [n]	Andrew Roblyer (5-9) Mean (sd) [n]	Andrew Roblyer and George Cunningham (5-12) Mean (sd) [n]	Steven Crudele and Bruce Neville (6-13) Mean (sd) [n]
I was familiar with terminology discussed during this workshop before today.	4.00 (.71) [5]	3.40 (1.14) [5]	3.83 (.94) [12]	3.83 (.94) [12]	3.67 (1.23) [9]	4.36 (.92) [11]	4.43 (.54) [7]	4.29 (.49) [7]	3.69 (1.18) [13]	3.70 (.95) [10]	4.08 (.52) [12]	3.63 (1.12) [19]	3.56 (.88) [9]	3.57 (.79) [7]	4.20 (.74) [84]
The facilitator was knowledgeable about the topic.	5.00 (.00) [5]	5.00 (.00) [5]	4.92 (.29) [12]	4.92 (.29) [12]	5.00 (.00) [9]	4.91 (.31) [11]	4.86 (.38) [7]	5.00 (.00) [7]	4.69 (.48) [13]	4.90 (.32) [10]	4.75 (.45) [12]	4.74 (.45) [19]	4.89 (.33) [9]	5.00 (.00) [7]	4.86 (.35) [84]
The facilitator fully engages the participants.	4.80 48 [5]	5.00 (.00) [5]	4.50 (.67) [12]	4.50 (.67) [12]	4.67 (.50) [9]	4.91 (.30) [11]	5.00 (.00) [7]	5.00 (.00) [7]	4.62 (.51) [13]	4.80 (.42) [10]	4.67 (.49) [12]	4.53 (.70) [19]	4.89 (.33) [9]	5.00 (.00) [7]	4.52 (.63) [84]

“Terminology and Facilitator:” Displayed by Presenter

