



Evaluation Data Report

Multiscale Modeling of the Life Cycle of *Toxoplasma gondii* Working Group Meeting One: May 16-18, 2011

Pamela Bishop
Program Evaluation Coordinator
National Institute for Mathematical and Biological Synthesis
July, 2011

Table of Contents

Evaluation Design	1
Evaluation Questions.....	1
Evaluation Procedures	1
Evaluation Data.....	2
Respondent Satisfaction.....	2
Suggestions for NIMBioS to improve the resources and/or accommodations available to working group participants:	3
Views of Group Progress.....	3
Comments about finding a common language:	3
Working Group Format and Content.....	3
Suggestions for improving group format:.....	4
Comments about understanding research in other disciplines:.....	4
Most Useful Aspects of the Meeting	5
Impact on Future Research Plans	5
Comments about influence on future research:.....	5
Comments about plans for collaborative research:.....	6
Comments about understanding what is expected of working group members:	6
Suggestions for Future Meetings	6
Additional Comments about working group	7
Appendix.....	8

List of tables

Table 1. Satisfaction with content and format of the working group	2
Table 2. Satisfaction with working group accommodations	2
Table 3. Learning about issues related to the working group's research problem.....	4

List of figures

Figure 1. Do you feel the working group made adequate progress, for its first meeting, toward finding a common language across disciplines in the research area?	3
Figure 2. How do you feel about the format of the working group?	3
Figure 3. Do you feel the participating in the working group helped you understand the research happening in other disciplines in the group's topic area?.....	4
Figure 4. Do you feel that the exchange of ideas that took place during the working group will influence your future research?	5
Figure 5. Did you develop unanticipated plans for collaborative research with other working group participants?	6
Figure 6. Do you feel the expectations for the next working group are clear (in the sense that you are leaving this meeting with a good idea of what your contribution will be at the next meeting)?	6

Multiscale Modeling of the Life Cycle of *Toxoplasma gondii*

Working Group, Meeting One

Evaluation Data Report

Evaluation Design

Evaluation Questions

The evaluation of the working group was both formative and summative in nature, in that the data collected from participants was intended to both gain feedback from participants about the quality of the current working group and also to inform future meetings. The evaluation framework was guided by Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Evaluation model for training and learning programs (Kirkpatrick, 1994¹). Several questions constituted the foundation for the evaluation:

1. Were participants satisfied with the working group overall?
2. Did the meeting meet participant expectations?
3. Do participants feel the working group made adequate progress toward its stated goals?
4. Do participants feel they gained knowledge about the main issues related to the research problem?
5. Do participants feel they gained a better understanding of the research across disciplines related to the working group's research problem?
6. What impact do participants feel the working group will have on their future research?
7. Were participants satisfied with the accommodations offered by NIMBioS?
8. What changes in accommodations, group format, and/or content would participants like to see at future meetings?

Evaluation Procedures

An electronic survey aligned to the evaluation questions was designed by the NIMBioS Evaluation Coordinator with input from the NIMBioS Director and Deputy Director. The final instrument was hosted online via the University of Tennessee's online survey host mrlInterview. Links to the survey were sent to eleven working group participants on May 18, 2011 (working group organizers and participants associated with NIMBioS were excluded from the evaluation). Reminder emails were sent to non-responding participants on May 25 and June 1, 2011. By June 8, 2011, eight participants had given their feedback, for a response rate of 72%.

¹ From Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1994). *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Evaluation Data

Respondent Satisfaction

Table 1. Satisfaction with content and format of the working group

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I feel the working group was very productive.	67%	33%	-	-	-
The working group met my expectations.	67%	33%	-	-	-
The presenters were very knowledgeable about their topics.	100%	-	-	-	-
The presentations were useful.	100%	-	-	-	-
The group discussions were useful.	67%	33%	-	-	-
I would recommend participating in NIMBioS working groups to my colleagues	100%	-	-	-	-

Table 2. Satisfaction with working group accommodations

Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the working group accommodations:

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Strongly dissatisfied	Not applicable
Comfort of the facility in which the working group took place	100%	-	-	-	-	-
Resources of the facility in which the working group took place	88%	13%	-	-	-	-
Travel arranged by NIMBioS	88%	13%	-	-	-	-
Housing arranged by NIMBioS	88%	13%	-	-	-	-

Suggestions for NIMBioS to improve the resources and/or accommodations available to working group participants:

No comments

Views of Group Progress

Figure 1. Do you feel the working group made adequate progress, for its first meeting, toward finding a common language across disciplines in the research area?



Comments about finding a common language:

No comments

Working Group Format and Content

Figure 2. How do you feel about the format of the working group?



Suggestions for improving group format:

No comments

Figure 3. Do you feel the participating in the working group helped you understand the research happening in other disciplines in the group's topic area?



Comments about understanding research in other disciplines:

This was the first meeting and I feel it was very productive. I am looking forward to see how the group works together.

Table 3. Learning about issues related to the working group's research problem

As a result of participating in this working group, I have a better understanding of:	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
The research data available on the working group's topic	100%	-	-	-	-
The modeling techniques available on the working group's topic	62%	38%	-	-	-
New methods and modeling techniques that need to be developed	62%	38%	-	-	-
The types of data needed to better inform existing models	38%	62%	-	-	-

Most Useful Aspects of the Meeting

The exchange of ideas.

Presentations and discussions.

Talking to researchers from a variety of backgrounds.

Impact on Future Research Plans

Figure 4. Do you feel that the exchange of ideas that took place during the working group will influence your future research?



Comments about influence on future research:

The first meeting of the working group has resulted in collaboration on a project involving mathematical modeling of toxoplasma infection. The organizers have put to ether and submitted a research proposal to NIH on a related project that I would not have been involved with if not for NIMBios. Gustavo and I may be starting collaboration on a side line project due to our interactions at the meeting.

Figure 5. Did you develop unanticipated plans for collaborative research with other working group participants?



Comments about plans for collaborative research:

Academic collaborations have not begun yet but they should soon.

Figure 6. Do you feel the expectations for the next working group are clear (in the sense that you are leaving this meeting with a good idea of what your contribution will be at the next meeting)?



Comments about understanding what is expected of working group members:

It looks like we all have a good handle on what is expected.

Expectations were clear to me, at least.

We seem to be pretty well organized.

Suggestions for Future Meetings

The last morning was too short because we started to do some interesting work, an additional afternoon would be better.

Additional Comments about working group

*I found the working group to be very promising - a great group of people with much knowledge of and interest in *T. gondii* and very much wanting to work together to learn new and useful things about this disease.*

It was productive in general as the first meeting.

Very active working group; good blend of math and biology. Well defined plans for future work and collaborations.

Appendix

Toxoplasma gondii Working Group Evaluation Survey

Toxoplasma gondii Working Group Survey

Thank you for taking a moment to complete this survey. Your responses will be used to improve the working groups hosted by the National Institute for Mathematical and Biological Synthesis. Information supplied on the survey will be confidential, and results will be reported only in the aggregate.

Please check the appropriate box to indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about this working group: (Very satisfied, Satisfied, Neutral, Dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied)

I feel the working group was very productive.

The working group met my expectations.

The presenters were very knowledgeable about their topics.

The presentations were useful.

The group discussions were useful

I would recommend participating in NIMBioS working groups to my colleagues.

Please check the appropriate box to indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

As a result of participating in this working group, I have a better understanding of:

(Strongly agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly disagree)

the research data available on the working group's topic

the modeling techniques available on the working group's topic

the types of data needed to better inform existing models

new methods and modeling techniques that need to be developed

Do you feel the working group made adequate progress, for its first meeting, toward finding a common language across disciplines in the research area?

Yes

No

Comments:

Do you feel the participating in the working group helped you understand the research happening in other disciplines in the group's topic area?

Yes

No

Comments:

Do you feel the expectations for the next working group are clear (in the sense that you are leaving this meeting with a good idea of what your contribution will be at the next meeting)?

Yes

No

Comments:

Do you feel that the exchange of ideas that took place during the working group will initiate or influence your future research?

Yes

No

Please explain:

Did you develop unanticipated plans for collaborative research with other working group participants?

Yes

No

Please explain:

What do you feel was the most useful aspect of the working group?

What would you have changed about the working group?

How do you feel about the format of the working group?

This was a very effective format for achieving our goals

This was not a very effective format for achieving our goals ->

The working group format would have been more effective if:

Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the working group accommodations:

(Very satisfied, Satisfied, Neutral, Dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied)

Travel arranged by NIMBioS

Housing arranged by NIMBioS

Comfort of the facility in which the working group took place

Resources of the facility in which the working group took place

Please indicate any changes NIMBioS can make to improve the resources and/or accommodations available to working group participants:

Please provide any additional comments about your overall experience with the working group: