
Systems Transformation Learning Series
August 21, 2014 Kenneth Krygel and Beth Rutkowski
Evaluation Summary Report

51 evaluations received

Demographics

- Average years in current field: 7.9
- Professional Occupation:
 - Parent: 4.0% ($n=2$)
 - Social Worker: 58.0% ($n=29$)
 - Nurse: 0.0% ($n=0$)
 - Psychiatrist: 0.0% ($n=0$)
 - Counselor: 12.0% ($n=6$)
 - Physician: 0.0% ($n=0$)
 - Psychologist: 0.0% ($n=0$)
 - Peer Support Specialist: 4.0% ($n=2$)
 - Administration: 12.0% ($n=6$)
 - Other: 10.0% ($n=5$)
 - E.g. student, case manager, peer mentor, manager

Presentation Assessment

Table 1 - Presenter Evaluation

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The presenter demonstrated mastery of the subject matter. ($n=50$)	78.0%	20.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2. The learning goals and objectives were clearly stated. ($n=50$)	60.0%	26.0%	8.0%	6.0%	0.0%
3. The presentation was well organized. ($n=50$)	50.0%	34.0%	8.0%	8.0%	0.0%
4. The visual aids were useful. ($n=50$)	78.0%	22.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5. The presenter used an effective method/style of presentation. ($n=50$)	56.0%	38.0%	2.0%	4.0%	0.0%
6. The learning goals and objectives were met. ($n=50$)	54.0%	28.0%	18.0%	0.0%	0.0%
7. The presenter(s) were responsive to the participants' questions and comments. ($n=48$)	66.7%	31.3%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%

8. The information presented was relevant to my work. (n=50)	68.0%	26.0%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9. The information presented was easy to follow and understand. (n=50)	54.0%	38.0%	6.0%	2.0%	0.0%
10. The training will assist me in improving service to my target population. (n=50)	60.0%	30.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Narrative

The following responses are from a variety of participants; administrators, community members, consumers, family members, peer support specialists and professionals.

Overall, the training received positive feedback from participants. When asked what they found to be the most helpful about the conference, many of the participants responded that they liked the entire training and thought all of it was helpful. Other responses included: common street names of drugs; current trends with marijuana; drug paraphernalia; going through the drug categories with effects; household chemicals that when mixed produce a high euphoric effect; info. On how to identify drug use without screening via blood; information on choices of drugs; demonstrations of drugs; the handouts; visual aids; update on current SUD usage.

Information provided that was cited as being the least helpful included: would have liked more in-depth intervention strategies; making meth; the pet toad (?); would have liked to see some videos of drug use.

Participants responded that they would use the information provided to: in clinical assessments; being aware of possible signs of client drug use; educate co-workers; data proposal submission; educate clients; use in treatment planning for prevention goals and objectives; help parents to look for signs of substance abuse; be more mindful; use in school-based assessments; in therapy with co-occurring consumers; more able to notice different highs through looking at pupils; teach to younger populations.

Other training topics suggested by participants included: actual live video footage of SA cases; ASD topics; pain and ethics; chronic depression; SA recovery; integrated health care wellness; psychotropic medications; motivational interviewing; sexual education classes; teen and family interventions and support.

Participants were asked if all presentations were fair, balanced and free of commercial bias. 96.1% (n=49) said that “yes”, they were. 3.9% (n=2) said that “no,” they weren’t, but didn’t provide a reason for believing that.

Participants were asked if they chose this training to fulfill their requirements for continuing education licensure, CMHP and/or QMHP. 81.3% (n=39) responded with “yes” while 18.8% (n=9) responded with “no.”