

# **Aggie Allies Workshop Evaluation 2017-2018**

## **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 or anyone dealing with sexual orientation issues in the Texas A&M community. The organization is composed of faculty, staff, students, and community members. In order to become an Ally, people 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. Each workshop is limited to 15 participants.

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<sup>®</sup>, 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 participants at the end of 12 workshops, which were held between October 15, 2017 and August 24, 2018. Of the 126 attendees who received the survey, 126 participants completed at least a portion of it, yielding a 100% response rate. The data was analyzed using SPSS<sup>®</sup>, a statistical software package, and Microsoft Excel<sup>®</sup>.

## **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% and comparison to previous years' results are provided where available. Summary themes are reported in this report; the entire list can be found in a separate document.

The participants were asked to note the date of the workshop they were attending and the facilitators' names. The dates and the frequency percentage of the pairs of facilitators can be found in the attached data documents. Next participants were requested to identify their classification as a faculty member, staff member, graduate student, undergraduate student, or community member. Out of 118 respondents, 71% were staff, 6% were faculty, 9% were graduate students, and 12% selected undergraduate student and 1% selected community member. Compared to the spring 2017 workshops, nearly 19% more participants identified themselves as staff and 18% fewer identified themselves as faculty; the percentages of graduate students, undergraduate students and community members were similar.

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. Table 1, on the following page, shows participants were most positive about recognizing what it means to be an Ally, and were least positive about evaluating the origins of their ideas of sexuality and gender, similar to the spring 2017 and fall 2016 workshop attendees.

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)	2017-2018 Mean (sd) [n]	Spring 2017 Mean (sd) [n]	Fall 2016 Mean (sd) [n]
Recognize what it means to be an Ally.	94%	6%	--	--	2.94 (.23) [126]	2.92 (.27) [125]	2.93 (.29) [101]
Explain current LGBTQIA+ terminology.	86%	13%	1%	--	2.86 (.37) [126]	2.70 (.60) [126]	2.74 (.56) [100]
Identify and reflect on privilege, phobias, heterosexism and cissexism.	80%	18%	2%	--	2.79 (.45) [126]	*	*
Recall campus and community resources.	81%	16%	2%	1%	2.78 (.51) [123]	2.69 (.50) [121]	2.84 (.37) [97]
Develop Ally support and action techniques.	75%	24%	1%	--	2.74 (.46) [124]	2.72 (.50) [124]	2.67 (.54) [99]
Evaluate the origins of your ideas of sexuality, and gender.	63%	34%	2%	--	2.61 (.54) [125]	2.54 (.60) [125]	2.41 (.67) [99]

Table 1: Workshop Learning Outcomes  
\*Question not included

Next, participants were asked to respond to three questions regarding their knowledge of terminology used during the workshop and the workshop’s facilitator. As seen in Table 2, the majority of participants strongly agreed and agreed that the facilitators fully engaged the participants and were knowledgeable about the topic.

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements:	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2017-2018 Mean (sd) n=126	Spring 2017 Mean (sd) n=126	Fall 2016 Mean (sd) [n]
The facilitator was knowledgeable about the topic.	87%	12%	1%	--	--	4.87 (.37)	4.79 (.47) [126]	4.74 (.47) [99]
The facilitator fully engaged the participants.	79%	19%	1%	2%	--	4.75 (.55)	4.64 (.68) [126]	4.78 (.48) [100]
I was familiar with terminology discussed during this workshop before today.	32%	50%	10%	7%	1%	4.05 (.88)	4.01 (.93) [126]	4.08 (.99) [100]

Table 2: Terminology and Facilitator

Next respondents were asked to give an example of one new thing they learned from the workshop. Of the 121 participants who responded with a comment, many mentioned that they learned specific examples of terminology including intersex, cisgender, and pansexual. Other comments included knowledge of resources on campus, importance of asking students their preferred name and pronouns, more awareness of privilege and about how to become more inclusive.

Participants were then asked how they would apply what they learned from the workshop. One hundred eighteen (118) responses were collected; many mentioned offering support and a safe place and becoming more inclusive in language and interactions. Others indicated they will promote and publicly state their status as an Aggie Ally, and use the action items or do's and don'ts of Ally-ship in their work and personal lives.

Finally, participants were asked what could be done to improve the workshop. Ninety-three (93) participants responded, and many indicated the program was fine as presented. The most frequent recommendations for change were about making the workshop more interactive and including more activities, and group exercises, and practice for participants. A few mentioned the program could be improved if presenters did not read information from the presentation slides.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

The workshops presented in the 2017- 2018 year should be considered successful; participants were able recognize what it means to be an Ally, developed support and action techniques and could explain current LGBTQIA+ terminology after the workshops. Participants also indicated that they could recall campus and community resources and that the workshop aided them in evaluating the origins of their ideas, sexuality, and gender, and developing support and action techniques; although 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 slightly less positive regarding finding the facilitators engaging. Participants also felt that they were not very familiar with the terminology discussed at the workshop before they arrived.

When asked for improvements that could be made to the workshop, many participants recommended a more interactive workshop, so Aggie Allies workshop organizers may want to consider adding more activities, such as group discussions, or role-playing scenarios. Some would like more resources to take away with them, as well so they can more readily apply the concepts they learned during the workshop. If activities are changed or increased, future assessments should reflect those changes to help determine their effectiveness.

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: Bradley Matthews, Aggie Allies  
Report prepared by: Susan Fox-Forrester, Student Life Studies  
Report prepared on: January 29, 2019  
Survey created by: Barbara Schumacher, Student Life Studies  
Analysis completed by: Lyric Jackson, 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!*