



2006 Institute Evaluation Summary

NOTE: We did not receive the twelfth and final completed evaluation form.

Summary

On the advice of the Assessment Consultant, Mary Sue Ammons, the rating scale for 2006-2007 was changed from the scale used in preceding years.

NEW RATING SCALE (2006-2007)

VALUE RATING	SATISFACTION RATING
1 – Not at all valuable	1 – Not at all satisfied
2 – Somewhat valuable	2 – Somewhat satisfied
3 – Moderately valuable	3 – Moderately satisfied
4 – Mostly valuable	4 – Mostly satisfied
5 – Extremely valuable	5 – Extremely satisfied

PREVIOUS RATING SCALE (2003/2004-2005/2006)

VALUE RATING	SATISFACTION RATING
1 – Not at all valuable	1 – Not at all satisfied
2 – [somewhat valuable]	2 – [somewhat satisfied]
3 – valuable	3 – satisfied
4 – [very valuable]	4 – [very satisfied]
5 – Extremely valuable	5 – Extremely satisfied

OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS of the Institute

The Institute received a median ranking of 4 (mostly effective) from Institute participants.

QUALIFICATION OF RESULTS

It should be noted that one participant opted not to complete the session ranking sections of Evaluation form. In addition (and in contrast to previous years' experiences), for each of the individual session ranking questions, two to three participants left blank either a value ranking, or a satisfaction ranking, or both.

VALUE of the Institute Sessions

Of the sixteen Institute sessions, four received a median rating of 4.5-5 (extremely valuable), two received a median rating of three (moderately valuable), one of which was a luncheon discussion, and the remaining nine received a median rating of four (mostly valuable).

The sessions ranked most highly with respect to their value to the Fellows were:

- 5 Students and Library Research
- 5 Assignment Incubator
- 5 Next Steps for 2006-2007
- 4.5 Lunch Discussion: Case Study of Course and I-Team Collaboration

Percentage of sessions receiving a median value ranking of 4 or 5: 87.5%

SATISFACTION with the Institute Sessions

Of the sixteen Institute sessions, three received a median rating of 5 (extremely satisfied), three received a median rating of three (moderately satisfied), two of which were luncheon discussions, and the remaining nine received a median rating of four (mostly satisfied).

The sessions ranked most highly with respect to satisfaction with the session were:

- 5 Students and Library Research
- 5 Assignment Incubator
- 5 Next Steps for 2006-2007

Percentage of sessions receiving a median satisfaction ranking of 4 or 5: 81%

VALUE RATING	SATISFACTION RATING
1 – Not at all valuable	1 – Not at all satisfied
2 – Somewhat valuable	2 – Somewhat satisfied
3 – Moderately valuable	3 – Moderately satisfied
4 – Mostly valuable	4 – Mostly satisfied
5 – Extremely valuable	5 – Extremely satisfied