

AIPG Continuing Education Activities: Evaluation of Activities by Participants

Robert G. Corbett, CPG-04502
rcorbett@ilstu.edu

AIPG has a mission to provide training and education for professionals to keep their skills up to date.

In order to qualify for accreditation by AIPG and for participants to be awarded Continuing Education Units (CEUs) an activity must first have an approved plan, the details of which must be reviewed in advance.

During my term as president, I set as a priority for AIPG to become a provider of CEUs (*TPG*, vol.41, no 1, p. 21). This was needed to strengthen our program of Continuing Professional Development (CPD). By May of 2004, we became authorized to award CEUs (*TPG*, vol. 41, no. 3, p. 6). Central to this effort was following the guidelines of the International Association of Continuing Education and Training (IACET) for their CEU programs, without seeking formal affiliation with IACET. Since then, the **Standard for Continuing Education and Training** has been developed by ANSI/IACET, and is available on the internet.¹

Our system for evaluation of activities requires each activity to be proposed, reviewed, and approved, in order for participants to qualify for AIPG CEUs. Normally the system involves a questionnaire developed by the presenter or instructor submitted with the request for AIPG approval. Each application should have a form tailored to the specific activity. I present a sample evaluation form to minimize effort and improve understanding by those colleagues who are developing activities. The evaluation form starts with the name, time, and place of the event, and the respondent may remain anonymous. The form is

given to participants to fill out at the end of the activity.

Then results are tabulated by the presenter or designee for benefit of the presenter and AIPG. A summary is submitted to the national office.

Are we serious about evaluation? Indeed we are. This is how the instructor and AIPG establish quality control over the offerings. We see participants, generally professional colleagues, as clients.

In general, the continuing education or training event should be evaluated with respect to theme or topic, presentation, schedule, satisfaction, and venue.

Theme or Topic

- Was the theme or topic appropriate for my professional development?
- The scope of the course (was it what was expected?)
- Was content appropriate to the time available?
- Was the program too long?

Presentation

- Organization
- Clarity of presentation
- The pace of the presentation (too fast? too slow?)
- Were audiovisuals, handouts, etc. appropriate?

Schedule

- Did participants engage in discussions?
- Was there opportunity to ask questions and be given answers?
- Were there sufficient comfort breaks?

Satisfaction

- Was the material new and challenging?
- Rate the overall quality of the activity.
- Would the participant recommend this activity to colleagues?
- How could the activity be improved?

Venue

- Was the venue appropriate?
- What could have been improved?

Scoring the Results

Evaluation forms commonly employ a numerical scale, a question-and-answer format, or both. The former allows a numerical average and a faster summary of the results, and it is used in most evaluations. A blank form is used to tabulate results, and which are sent to the AIPG National Office.

Optional and Additional Measures Less Commonly Employed

Assessment of learning can be accomplished by testing before and after the activity. Complexity, time and cost make the following measures less useful, but they are listed for the evaluation wonks among us.

- Improvement in participant's skills can be shown by surveying over time others close to the participant.
- Lasting effects on the participant's practice can be determined by surveys of clients at later times.

A sample evaluation form is presented on the next page.

1. ANSI = American National Standards Institute

SAMPLE

Evaluation form for the course *Groundwater Flow Through Basalt*, presented at Standard College, May 23, 2013.

Please evaluate the activity by scoring each component of the activity with the appropriate numerical rank, Leave blank anything that does not apply. You may choose to give your name or to remain anonymous.

Component of the Activity	Ranking				
	Poor (1)	Below Average (2)	Average (3)	Above Average (4)	Excellent (5)
Is topic appropriate for my professional development?					
Was course what I expected?					
Did course material fit within time allowed?					
Was course well organized?					
Was presentation clear?					
Was pace of presentation appropriate?					
Were audiovisuals and handouts clear and helpful?					
Was adequate discussion time scheduled?					
Were questions welcomed and answered?					
Were comfort breaks offered?					
Was the material new and/or challenging?					
Was overall quality of the activity high?					
Likelihood I would recommend activity to colleagues					
Was the venue appropriate?					

Was the program too long?

If I were to present a similar course, here is how I would improve it:

Here are more comments I'd like to make about the component(s) evaluated above.

Signature (optional)