PN-ACB-545

Evaluation Report on the NASW Violence & Development Teach-In/Teleconference

Prepared for:
The Violence & Development Project
National Association of Social Workers
750 First Street, NE, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20002-4241

July 12, 1996

Roberta C. Cronin
Research, Evaluation, &
Program Development Consultant
3618 Porter Street, NW
Washington, DC 20016
Tel.: 202-966-4823
Fax: 202-966-2154

Points of view expressed in this document are the author's own and do not represent the official position of the National Association of Social Workers or the U.S. Agency for International Development.

To assess the response to the Violence & Development Project's teleconference, two main methods were used:

- Host site coordinator forms, designed to capture key characteristics of the teleconference at each site and the perspectives of the site coordinator. These forms were part of the NASW pre-conference packets furnished to participating sites. The local coordinator was asked to return the completed form to NASW. Nonrespondents received a mail reminder, and in many cases, telephone reminders as well.

- Audience evaluation forms for each day, designed to capture audience reactions to the teleconference. These forms also were furnished by NASW as part of the planning materials. Local organizers were requested to distribute the forms and return them to NASW.

In addition, the evaluation consultant observed the teleconference, viewing the telecast and attending follow-up workshops at New York University on Tuesday and attending the broadcast at Virginia Commonwealth University-Fairfax on Friday. She also made follow-up telephone calls to eight teleconference sites, selected at random from the first 80 respondents to the host site survey. Finally, she analyzed a small number evaluation forms received from people who had requested the teach-in/teleconference organizing kit and other materials, but who did not serve as teleconference coordinators. Because project resources precluded aggressive follow-up to this last group and the return rate was low, we will refer only occasionally to those results.

Response rates

Site coordinator forms were returned by 123 respondents, representing 52 percent of the 236 host sites who had some contact with NASW and were believed to have participated in the teleconference.[1] Eighty-two sites, or 35 percent, also voluntarily provided a total of 3147 usable audience evaluation forms.[2] Seventy-one sites provided both site coordinator and audience

---

[1]The exact number of sites is not known. The survey included the 236 sites with whom NASW had some direct mail or telephone contact. It is possible that some of these sites dropped out and did not offer the teleconference after all. On the other hand, it is known that the teleconference was downlinked to 115 Veterans Administration locations nationwide, only a few of which were on NASW's list of contacts. The Minnesota chapter of NASW also reports that 34 Department of Human Service sites in their state participated. Another confounding factor is that the term "host site" is not synonymous with physical location, as a few hosts were known to have arranged to broadcast the teleconference in more than one location. We do not have precise information on how often that occurred, however.

[2]A few additional sites tabulated their own forms and sent only a summary; unfortunately, these summary forms were not usable in our analysis.

evaluation forms. For these sites we calculated that the audience response rate averaged about 63 percent, using information on attendance from the site coordinators and comparing it to the number of audience evaluations received.

Overall, these are respectable response rates for surveys of this type. We cannot be sure, of course, that there are no systematic differences between survey respondents and nonrespondents in terms of their characteristics or opinions. Even so, we are encouraged by the fact that we received site coordinator responses from a very diverse group of sites. There were respondents from 33 of the 41 states that participated, as well as sites in the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. These sites reported a combined attendance of 9132 people for the two days of telecasts, with turnouts ranging from a low of two to a high of 400.

In most respects, the sites that provided audience evaluations were not very different from those that only returned host coordinator evaluations. They provide a similar cross-section of states and attendance levels, although they are a bit more likely to have participated in the teleconference on both days and they reported slightly higher attendance levels on each day. These sites also are somewhat more likely to have involved social work practitioners in their planning process. None of these differences is large enough to be statistically significant however.

Findings

Site and program characteristics. Table 1 provides a summary of the characteristics of the 123 conference sites that responded to the site coordinator survey. In the vast majority of locations, the teleconference was sponsored by a college or university, alone (80%) or in collaboration with another organization (8%). Several programs were sponsored by Veterans Administration (VA) hospitals, reflecting the fact that the VA had taken an early interest in NASW's teleconference effort and publicized it to their network of sites. Other organizations involved, either as primary or secondary sponsors, included state or local chapters of the NASW, churches, other health and social service providers, public television stations, school districts, and a state department of juvenile justice. One- third of the college-based sites reported that multiple institutions had participated in their programs.

For programs delivered at a college or university, the primary sponsor was usually the social work department or school of social work (90%). Other groups taking a primary or secondary role at academic locations included: university offices concerned with continuing education, teacher preparation, career counseling; departments of social sciences, sociology, criminal justice, and family medicine; and an International Center.

The diversity of sponsorship is echoed in the diversity of the planning teams reported. While social work faculty were by far the most common group to be involved in planning (at 74% of the sites), social work students were involved at 32 percent of these sites, NASW staff were involved at 26 percent, and social work practitioners participated in planning at 20 percent.

Other faculty, community organizations, and "others" (typically the institution's staff) were involved at over 10 percent of the sites. Non-social work students were the group least likely to have helped with the planning. Over half the planning efforts (53%) involved representatives from two or more these groups. About a fourth involved social work faculty and students working together on the program, alone or with others. Eighty percent of the sites reported on the size of their planning team, revealing that typically, 4 to 7 people were involved. At these 99 sites alone, 658 planners were involved.

Table 1. Characteristics of Teleconference Host Sites That Responded to Survey

Characteristic	Sites	
	Number (N=99-123)[1]	Percent
Sponsorship		
Sponsoring institution		
-College or university	98	80
-College or university plus other organization	10	8
-Veterans or other hospital	7	6
-Other	8	7
University sites where multiple institutions participated	36	33
Sponsoring department (if university-based)[2]		
-Social work	88	82
-Social work plus other department or group	9	8
-Other department or group	11	10
Planning		
Local planners of the teleconference and related activities[3]		
-Social work faculty	83	74
-Social work students	36	32
-NASW chapter	29	26
-Social work practitioners	21	20
-Other faculty	18	16
-Community organizations	15	13
-Other students	7	6
-Others	20	18

Table 1. Characteristics of Teleconference Host Sites That Responded to Survey		
Characteristic	Sites	
	Number (N=99-123)[1]	Percent
Sites with two or more groups involved in planning	60	53[4]
Total number of individuals involved in planning (all reporting sites)[5]	658	
Average number of individuals involved in planning[6]	6.6 (4.0)	
Participation and attendance		
Sites that participated on both days	105	85
Number of attendees		
-February 6: total, all sites	5729	
-February 6: average per site[6]	50.2 (35.0)	
-February 6: range	2 to 400	
-February 9: total, all sites	3403	
-February 9: average per site[6]	32.1 (21.5)	
-February 9: range	2 to 159	
Sites that did not have enough space to accommodate everyone	3	3
Other Activities		
Sites that scheduled other activities in connection with the teleconference	62	52
Sites that scheduled:[3]		
-Symposia or panels	38	31
-Special classroom activities	22	18
-Hunger banquet	16	13
-Other	31	25
Sites planning to show tapes again	68	67[7]
Sites planning follow-up activities	31	26
Publicity		
Sites receiving any media attention	74	60

Table 1. Characteristics of Teleconference Host Sites That Responded to Survey		
Characteristic	Sites	
	Number (N=99-123)[1]	Percent
Sites receiving media attention from:[3]		
-campus newspaper	56	46
-other newspaper(s)	46	37
-campus radio/TV	20	16
-other radio	19	15
-other TV	10	8

Notes
1. Number of sites varies somewhat by analysis because of missing data.
2. Percentages based on 110 sites that were university or college-based.
3. Percentages do not add to 100 because sites could select more than one category.
4. Based on 113 sites reporting.
5. Based on 99 sites reporting.
6. The first number shown represents the arithmetical mean or average. The number in parentheses is the median, or the number that represents the middle observation when all values reported are ordered from smallest to largest. In contrast to the mean, the median is not affected by extreme values.
7. Percent of all sites that taped the teleconference.

Over 85 percent of the sites presented the conference on both days. In fact, several of the remaining sites mentioned that they were prevented from participating on both days by weather, technical problems, or other circumstances. Reported attendance across all sites was 5729 on February 6 and 3403 on February 9. For February 6, attendance ranged from two to 400, with a mean of 50.2 and a median of 35.0.[3] On February 9, the range was narrower--from two to 159, and the mean and median attendance were 32.1 and 21.5 respectively. If we assume that these sites are a representative sample of the 236 sites with which NASW had contact, we can estimate overall attendance at 17,562 for the two days.

About two-thirds of the sites that hosted the conference on both days experienced some drop-off in attendance between the Tuesday and Friday sessions, while attendance at the remainder increased or stayed the same. The survey responses provide few clues to this pattern, but it does not appear to be strongly related to factors like the size of the teleconference program at the site or whether the site offered supplemental activities (analyses not shown in table). Some of the explanation may lie in scheduling factors. For example, three of the eight site coordinators who were participated in a follow-up telephone interview mentioned that the Friday time slot had

[3]The median is a measure of the average which is less affected by extreme values than the mean. See the footnotes to Table 1 for further clarification.

been inconvenient for their students, although one site compensated by more actively promoting the Friday program in the community. Another site said that the two-day schedule was deemed too unworkable for their students, so the entire program was presented on Friday only, with a tape of the Tuesday program shown before the live telecast.

Over half of the sites scheduled other activities in connection with the teleconference, as NASW had encouraged in its pre-conference mailings. The most frequent collateral activities were symposia or panels (at 31% of sites), special classroom activities (18%), and "other" activities (25%). The latter included a wide variety of activities such as post-conference discussion groups, video or film programs, special lectures, and displays of materials. Sixteen sites, or 13 percent of the total sites responding to the survey, presented hunger banquets. Eleven of these 16 sites provided attendance figures for the banquet, ranging from 18 to 350 per site, and totaling 900 people overall.

Of the sites that taped the broadcast, two-thirds reported that there were plans to show the tape again. In fact, some noted that they had already done so.. Most of the remaining respondents reported that they were "not sure" if the tapes would be reshown. Over a quarter of the respondents (26%) also indicated that there would be follow-up activities in the weeks or months ahead, while 33 percent were not sure.

About 60 percent of the sites received some type of media attention for their activities. The most common source of attention was the campus newspaper (46%) or other newspapers (37%). Campus radio or television (16%), other radio (15%), or other TV (8%) provided coverage at a smaller proportion of sites. The survey did not ask whether sites had sought media coverage, but a few site coordinators, including a couple from VA locations, volunteered that they had not publicized the program beyond their own institution.

This comment points up a more basic difference that emerges from the data, between sites whose primary sponsor was a college or university-based sponsor and other locations (analyses not shown in Table 1). Not surprisingly, planning teams for the 15 non-college sites were more likely to rely on social work practitioners and "others" and less likely to involve faculty and students. They were also much less likely to schedule other teach-in activities (only 21% did so compared to 56 percent of the college sites) or to attract any media attention (15% versus 71%). While they were about equally likely to participate in the teleconference on both days, they had significantly lower attendance on each day. They involved an average audience of 15 on February 6, compared with an average of 55 for the college sites. For the February 9 session, the comparative figures are 17 and 34. Unlike the college sites, however, their average attendance did not fall off between the two days.

The audience. In light of the fact that most teleconference sites were sponsored by social work programs and involved social workers in their planning, it is not surprising that the audience was largely composed of those with social work affiliations. As shown in Table 2, on both days about three-quarters of the audience members who completed evaluation forms were social work

Table 2. Teleconference Audience Characteristics		
Characteristic	Percent of February 6 Audience (N=1639-1735)[1]	Percent of February 9 Audience (N=1163-1189)[1]
Occupation or profession of respondent		
Social work student	54	43
Social work practitioner	18	24
Social work faculty	7	9
Other student	10	11
Other faculty	2	2
Other	9	11
Participated both days	NA	52
Participated in other conference-related activities	20	21
Participated in:[2]		
-Symposia or panels	7	11
-Special classroom activities	6	5
-Hunger banquet	6	6
-Other related activities	5	5
Involved in teleconference or teach-in planning	6	8

1. Number of respondents varies somewhat by analysis because of missing data.
2. Percentages do not add to 100 because respondents could select more than one category.

students, practitioners, or faculty.[4] The remaining fourth of the audience evaluations came from other students, other faculty, or people who selected the "other" occupation category. This "other" group is very diverse, including many persons identifying themselves as counselors,

[4]In this and subsequent tables that show audience information, we do not combine responses for the two days, even where the questions asked were identical. We felt it would be misleading to do so, because some audience members attended both days and completed the form twice. Combining the responses would thus involve some duplication.

nurses, or other human service professionals, as well as high school students, clergy, community volunteers, police officers, journalists, community organizers, victim advocates, and others.[5]

The audience makeup varied considerably by type of site (analysis not shown). First, the proportion of social-work affiliated respondents was higher at college or university sites (85%) than non-college sites (65%). And at campus sites, social work students were by far the biggest group of attendees on either day of the teleconference. In contrast, the non-college audiences were dominated by social work practitioners, had few faculty of any type in attendance, and no students.

A little over half (52%) the respondents who completed evaluations on Friday indicated that they had attended on Tuesday as well. If these respondents are reasonably representative of the total audience, this indicates that although there was considerable audience overlap between the two days, it was far from complete.

Table 2 also shows that about one in five of the respondents participated in other activities related to the teleconference. They were most likely to have attended or participated in symposia or panels, but over five percent checked off classroom activities, the hunger banquet, or other activities. Fewer audience members at the non-college sites participated in related activities, but these sites were less likely to offer them.

A small percent of the evaluations (6% on Tuesday and 8% on Friday) came from persons who had participated in planning the teleconference activities at the host site.

Reactions to the teleconference program. Both the site coordinators and the audience members were asked to rate the program on various scales. The results are shown in Table 3. First, they were asked to give an overall reaction to the program. Table 3 shows that the audience reactions were strongly positive, with Tuesday's mean at 5.8 on a seven-point scale and Friday's at 5.7. The median, or mid-point of all respondent ratings was 6.0, indicating that responses are skewed to the high end of the scale. In fact, this is readily apparent from the distribution of ratings shown in the table. Just three to four percent of the audiences awarded the program a rating of three or less, while 66 percent of the Tuesday respondents and 60 percent of the Friday respondents chose the top two rating points. On this item only, site coordinators were asked to provide their assessment of the audience reaction, not their personal reaction. Their average assessment of audience reactions is very similar to that of the audiences themselves.

---

[5]We suspect that some of the human service professionals could have classified themselves as "social work practitioners," but either overlooked the category or felt it was not an adequate description of their professional role. Therefore, it is probable that the figures in Table 2 understate the proportion of social work practitioners among the audiences and overstate the "other" group.

Table 3. Site Coordinator and Audience Assessments of Teleconference				
Assessment of Teleconference	February 6		February 9	
	Percent of Site Coordinators (N=107-112)[1]	Percent of Audience (N=1754-1848)[1]	Percent of Site Coordinators (N=97-108)[1]	Percent of Audience (N=1179-1251)[1]
Overall reaction (Scale of 1 to 7, 7=Extremely happy with it)[2]				
-1 to 3	3	3	6	4
-4 to 5	29	31	31	36
-6	41	36	44	34
-7	28	29	19	26
Average overall reaction rating[2]	5.9 (6.0)	5.8 (6.0)	5.6 (6.0)	5.7 (6.0)
Content rating (Scale of 1 to 10, 10=Excellent)				
-1 to 3	2	2	4	2
-4 to 6	13	16	24	20
-7 to 8	34	34	36	35
-9	30	20	24	19
-10	21	28	12	23
Average content rating[3]	8.2 (9.0)	8.1 (8.0)	7.5 (8.0)	7.9 (8.0)
Format rating (Scale of 1 to 10, 10=Excellent)				
-1 to 3	2	2	4	3
-4 to 6	24	20	27	22
-7 to 8	33	35	37	35
-9	23	20	19	18
-10	18	23	13	22
Average rating[3]	7.6 (8.0)	7.9 (8.0)	7.4 (8.0)	7.7 (8.0)
Coordinators indicating that program met their expectations	90	NA	77	NA
Respondents indicating that the interactive portion of the Friday session:				
-Was effective	NA	NA	75	83
-Was interesting	NA	NA	82	90

Table 3. Site Coordinator and Audience Assessments of Teleconference				
Assessment of Teleconference	February 6		February 9	
	Percent of Site Coordinators (N=107-112)[1]	Percent of Audience (N=1754-1848)[1]	Percent of Site Coordinators (N=97-108)[1]	Percent of Audience (N=1179-1251)[1]
-Provided a fair and adequate chance for sites to submit comments	NA	NA	78	41[4]
-Provided good continuity with Tuesday	NA	NA	88	91[5]

Notes
1. Number of respondents varies somewhat by analysis because of missing data.
2. For site coordinators, the rating represents their appraisal of the audience reaction, rather than their own reaction.
3. The first number shown represents the arithmetical mean or average. The number in parentheses is the median, or the number that represents the middle observation when all values reported are ordered from smallest to largest. In contrast to the mean, the median is not affected by extreme values.
4. A very large proportion of audience respondents, 46 percent, indicated they were "not sure."
5. Based on 630 respondents, or 52 percent of audience, who indicated that they attended both sessions.

Table 3 also includes separate ratings of program content and format from site coordinators and audience members, this time on a 10-point scale. Once again, we see a pattern of high average ratings, skewed toward the positive end of the scale. On Tuesday, site coordinators and audience members awarded the content a mean rating of 8.2 and 8.1 respectively, while rating the format 7.6 and 7.9 respectively. On Friday, the corresponding figures are 7.5 and 7.9 for content and 7.4 and 7.7 for format.

Overall, Tuesday receives slightly higher mean ratings than Friday and content receives slightly higher mean ratings than format. However, it would probably be unwise to attach great significance to these fractional differences. The median ratings are 8.0 on all measures, except for a 9.0 on the site coordinator's rating of Tuesday content.

At the Friday session, our survey also asked both site coordinators and audience members what they thought of the interactive portions of the session. A substantial majority found them effective (75% of the site coordinators, 83% of the audience) and interesting (82% and 90%). Over three-fourths of the site coordinators (78%) also thought there was a fair and adequate chance for sites to submit comments for the interactive portion. Only 41 percent of the audience thought so, with a larger proportion, 46 percent, saying they were not sure. Presumably, many audience members were not familiar enough with the mechanics of the interactive portion to judge. Of those who attended the Tuesday and Friday sessions, about nine out of ten thought there was good continuity between the two broadcasts.

Finally, we asked only the coordinators if the program met their expectations. Ninety percent said it did on Tuesday, while 77 percent said it did so on Friday. The small number of site coordinators who said the program did not meet expectations volunteered a variety of reasons, the most common being that the program did not provide enough information about specific solutions or programs that had been successful in other locations. Others complained that the program had not been interactive enough or that the Friday broadcast had not used enough examples and feedback from the sites participating in the teleconference. A couple of respondents were clearly disappointed that their site's contribution was not included in the Friday session. A few merely said that the Friday program had not added much, or had spent too much time on a "pep rally for social workers." Overall, the comments suggest that for some people at least, the Tuesday telecast had built up expectations that the Friday session did not fulfill.

Besides looking at overall ratings, we explored whether there were significant differences in reactions from those of different occupational/professional groups, those who had been involved in conference planning, and those who had participated in other activities. First, we found that those with social work affiliations consistently rated the conference somewhat higher than those with other backgrounds. For example, on February 6, on social work respondents awarded average ratings of 8.2 for content and 8.0 for format respectively, compared with 7.8 and 7.6 for non-social work respondents. The gap in ratings is somewhat wider for the February 9 ratings, with the social work group awarding an average of 8.1 and 7.9 for format and content respectively, and the non-social work group awarding 7.3 and 7.1.

Similarly, those involved in planning gave more favorable ratings than those who had not been involved, with absolute differences in average ratings between planners and non-planners ranging from .4 to .9 depending on the item. Finally, those who had participated in other events besides the teleconference and members of the Friday audience who had participated in the Tuesday session also gave higher ratings. Average ratings differed .3 to .5 points between groups, depending on the item.[6]

It seems plausible that those who helped plan the event, who participated in complementary events, or who attended on both days may have started out more favorably disposed to this type of programming. However, the experience of involvement itself might also have boosted their audience ratings. Our data cannot distinguish between these two possibilities.

It also appears that social work background had a moderating effect on some of these other influences. This can be seen in Table 4. Among those with social work affiliations, ratings were only slightly higher for those who participated in other events or attended on Tuesday as well as Friday. However, for the non-social work respondents the differences were more substantial. For non-social workers, the rating gaps between those who attended other events and those who did not ranged from .8 to 1.5. In fact, the average ratings for non-social workers who attended

---

[6]All differences were statistically significant, with all values of F attaining a p-value of .001 or smaller.

other events were almost as high and sometimes higher than the averages for any social work group. Among the non-social workers in the Friday audience, the ratings gap between those who had attended on Tuesday and those who had not was also wider, ranging from .7 to 1.1 points on the scale. This pattern suggests that although overall, the teleconference was most favorably received by social workers, there were enthusiasts among the non-social work group as well. We should also emphasize, that regardless of group or subgroup, ratings were concentrated on the positive end of the scales.

Table 4. Relationships Between Audience Ratings and Background Characteristics

Rating Scale	Social Work Background[1] (N=823-1224)		Non-Social Work Background[2] (N=257-341)	
	Participated in other activities	Did not participate in other activities	Participated in other activities	Did not participate in other activities
Overall reaction, Feb. 6 (Scale of 1 to 7)	6.0	5.8	6.2	5.4
Content, Feb. 6 (Scale of 1 to 10)	8.4	8.1	8.5	7.7
Format, Feb. 6 (Scale of 1 to 10)	8.1	7.9	8.6	7.5
Overall reaction, Feb. 9 (Scale of 1 to 7)	5.8	5.9	6.1	5.1
Content, Feb. 6 (Scale of 1 to 10)	8.2	8.0	8.5	7.1
Format, Feb. 6 (Scale of 1 to 10)	8.0	7.8	8.1	7.0
	Attended Tuesday	Did not attend Tuesday	Attended Tuesday	Did not attend Tuesday
Overall reaction, Feb. 9 (Scale of 1 to 7)	5.9	5.7	5.7	5.0
Content, Feb. 6 (Scale of 1 to 10)	8.2	7.9	8.0	6.9
Format, Feb. 6 (Scale of 1 to 10)	8.0	7.8	7.7	6.8

1. Includes social work faculty, social work students, and social work practitioners. Ns vary because of missing data.
2. Includes other faculty, other students, and "other" respondents. Ns vary because of missing data.

Interest in violence and development curriculum content. We also used the surveys to explore whether site coordinators and audience members thought that the ideas and concepts in the teleconference should be incorporated into the social work curriculum. (See Table 5.)

Overall, the responses were strongly positive, although we should note that our survey could not determine which parts of the material evoked the most positive response. Eighty-five to ninety percent of the respondents felt that such content should be incorporated into the undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education curriculums respectively. Most of the others indicated that they were not sure, with three percent or less stating that it should not be incorporated.

Responses to the curriculum items were affected by profession or occupation, with those from outside the social work field more likely to indicate they were "not sure" or skipping the curriculum items entirely. When we weed out the non-social work respondents, proportions in favor of adding this type of material to the curriculum increase slightly, as shown in Table 5. The opinions of social work faculty, students, and practitioners are very similar, with the main difference being that non-faculty were more likely to select the "not sure" response.

A separate item asked the site coordinators whether their institutions would be interested in purchasing related curriculum materials for a small fee. Over half of the university or college sites (57%) said yes, while some others volunteered that they could not say without further information.

Table 5. Audience and Site Coordinator Views on Incorporating These Ideas and Concepts into the Social Work Curriculum

Type of Curriculum	Site Coordinators (N=106-111)[1]	February 6 Audience (N=1627-1660)[1]		February 9 Audience (N=1122-1137)[1]	
		All	SW only (N=1361)	All	SW only (N=900)
% in favor of adding to B.A. curriculum					
-Yes	89	85	88	87	90
-Not sure	6	12	9	10	7
-No	5	3	3	3	3
% in favor of adding to graduate curriculum					
-Yes	89	84	87	87	90
-Not sure	8	13	11	11	8
-No	4	3	3	3	3
% in favor of adding to continuing education curriculum					
-Yes	90	90	92	91	95
-Not sure	9	8	7	8	4
-No	1	1	2	2	1

1. Number of respondents varies somewhat by analysis because of missing data.

Site assessments of NASW materials and support. We asked the site coordinators a series of questions to determine how they felt about the help they received from NASW in putting on the conference. NASW's support was not financial; rather, it consisted of written materials and telephone consultation on both technical and programmatic issues.

As Table 6 shows, a substantial minority of sites (46%) had some technical difficulties with the broadcast. NASW's National Office provided a technical support number leading up to and during the broadcast. From the comments on the forms, it appears that in most instances the sites' problems were not severe--annoying perhaps (e.g., a snowy picture, some interference), but not incapacitating. Only seven site coordinators complained that they did not get adequate technical support for their problems. In one instance, the site lost the program for 40 minutes; in another, it appears that they had to give up on that day's broadcast. In both these cases and one other, the coordinator said they had tried to access NASW's support and could not reach anyone. In other cases, it appears that the site either resolved their problems locally or simply put up with them.

When it came to rating NASW's overall telephone support, the mean rating was 5.9 on 7-point scale, where 7 represented "extremely helpful." Many sites had no cause to use the telephone support. However, for those who did, the ratings clustered at the positive end of the scale, with 73 percent of the respondents choosing the ratings of six or seven. Note that the question did not distinguish between support from NASW's National Office and state or local chapters of NASW. While the National Office took the lead in publicizing the teleconference initially and remained the primary contact for many sites, some chapters, especially where there were Violence and Development Resource Centers, were quite active in promoting the teleconference effort.[7]

Ratings of the various materials distributed prior to the conference, including an organizing kit, a newsletter, briefing papers, posters and flyers to advertise the program, and an educational packet, all received mean ratings in the 5.5 to 6.0 range as well, and median ratings of 6.0 or above. These materials were all provided directly by the National Office, although the Resource Centers had contributed to the development of the briefing papers.

On a 10-point scale where 10 equals excellent, the adequacy of information from NASW received a mean rating of 8.3 and the timeliness of information received a mean rating of 7.2. Median ratings of adequacy and timeliness were 9.0 and 8.0 respectively. A number of sites added comments to their forms indicating that they could have used the information from NASW earlier. (Project staff confirm that mailing of their final information packet took place about 10 days before the first teleconference, having been delayed by a major snowstorm that paralyzed the Washington, D.C. area.)

---

[7]Resources Centers were established at the California, Florida, Minnesota, New York City, Ohio, and Oregon Chapters during the first year of the Violence and Development Project. The Ohio and Oregon Chapters headed up consortia which also included representatives of the Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan chapters in the Midwest and Idaho and Washington in the Pacific Northwest.

Table 6. Site Coordinator Assessments of NASW Materials and Other Support for Teleconference		
Characteristic	Sites	
	Number (N=109-117)[1]	Percent
Sites reporting technical difficulties		
-Neither day	63	54
-One day only	40	34
-Both days	14	12
Sites that felt they did not get adequate technical support for their technical problems	7	14[2]
Rating of NASW telephone support (Scale of 1 to 7, 7=Extremely helpful)[3]		
-1 to 3	5	6
-4 to 5	17	21
-6	19	24
-7	39	49
Average rating of NASW telephone support[4]	5.9 (6.0)	
Average rating of NASW Materials (Scale of 1 to 7, 7=Extremely helpful)[4]		
-Organizing Kit	6.0 (6.0)	
-Stop Violence Newsletter	5.5 (6.0)	
-Briefing papers	5.8 (6.0)	
-Posters & fliers	5.8 (6.5)	
-February 6 educational packet	5.7 (6.0)	
Average rating of overall information provided by NASW (Scale of 1 to 10, 10=Excellent)[4]		
-Adequacy of information	8.3 (9.0)	
-Timeliness of information	7.2 (8.0)	

Notes
1. Number of sites varies somewhat by analysis because of missing data.
2. Percentage based on 52 sites that reported technical difficulties and responded to this item.
3. Percentages based on 80 sites that used telephone support.
4. The first number is the arithmetical mean or average. The number in parentheses is the median, or the number that represents the middle observation when all values reported are ordered from smallest to largest. In contrast to the mean, the median is not affected by extreme values.

Further reactions to the teach-in/teleconference effort. Many respondents to the site coordinator and audience surveys volunteered additional comments about the teach-in/teleconference effort or the follow-up they had planned. Random samples of these comments are appear in Appendix B. The comments are predominantly positive in tone, confirming the quantitative findings. Telephone interviews conducted with site coordinators of eight randomly selected sites also revealed overwhelmingly positive reactions to the program. Amongst the plaudits, a number of the respondents of all types offered constructive feedback. There were a few recurrent themes, some of which have already been touched upon elsewhere in this report:

- A desire for more information about practical applications and solutions.
- A feeling that the program had tried to cover too many topics or speakers or was too general.
- A concern that the Friday broadcast had been more suitable for social workers than for other audiences.
- A desire for a more strongly interactive format.
- A need for a longer planning time and earlier distribution of materials.

The telephone interviews with the site coordinators shed some light on a couple of other aspects of the teach-in/teleconference. All those interviewed (by chance, all of them university-based) reported that the program had been a relatively low-cost endeavor. Respondents reported that the downlink facilities were readily available at their location and they paid little or no fee to use them. Photocopying had been the most significant expense, but none found it prohibitive. The majority had not found it burdensome to plan either, but there were a couple who disagreed.[8]

It also was interesting that several telephone respondents expressed some regrets about how they had managed the program. Three respondents said that they wished they had scheduled teach-in events (or more of them) in connection with the program. One specifically felt that a hunger banquet would have been a valuable addition. Two coordinators also said that they would get students more involved in the planning if they were to do another teleconference. In most cases, these respondents suggested that allowing plenty of lead time would be important to making the most of such opportunities. Seven of the eight respondents said without hesitation that they

---

[8]Unfortunately, we do not know much about sites that considered participating in the teleconference and decided not to go ahead. Our only information comes from 28 evaluation forms received from recipients of V&D materials who did not serve as site coordinators. Of these 28 respondents, six reported that their area considered holding the teleconference and decided against it. Only one of the six mentioned cost as a factor in not going ahead, along with lack of time. Four of the others mentioned lack of suitable facilities, another also mentioned lack of time, and two said that the dates were inconvenient.

would be happy to do another such teleconference. The eighth said she would recommend participation to her dean but she herself would be reluctant to coordinate it again it conflicted with her responsibilities for other special programs.

Finally, several of the site coordinators interviewed by phone reported some concrete results from the teach-in/teleconference. Four respondents of the eight respondents expected to use or were already using some of the V&D materials in their classes. Another reported that some students had re-played the tapes and had used some of the materials in papers they had written. She also noted that teach-in presenters were planning to use excerpts of the tapes with their students. Two respondents also commented that the program had gotten students to adopt new, more institutional perspectives on violence and development issues. Finally, one coordinator from a university's continuing education program expected some positive fall-out from the fact that the program had united a number of faculty from diverse programs who shared common interests.

Summary of findings

We received survey responses from 123 site coordinators, representing an estimated 52 percent of all teleconference sites, and 9132 audience evaluations, representing an estimated 63 percent response rate for the sites that returned forms. At these sites alone, we found that the program reached a substantial audience and often was supplemented by locally planned activities.

- The teleconference reached a primary audience of at least 5729 people on the first day and 3403 on the second day. The audience was primarily made of social work students, practitioners, and faculty. However, about one-fourth of the attendees were affiliated with non-social work programs or worked in other capacities.

- Site coordinators and audience members alike gave the program high ratings for both format and content on both days. In general, respondents with social work affiliations gave the program higher ratings than non-social work respondents, but the latter group included some who gave the program very high ratings.

- About nine out of ten respondents felt that the concepts and ideas incorporated in the teleconference should be incorporated in undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education social work curricula.

- At least 658 people were involved in the planning process at the 99 sites who reported on their planning team. Social work faculty and students were the groups most likely to be involved.

- Over half (52%) of the sites scheduled some other activities in connection with the teleconference. About one in five of the audience members indicated that they participated in one or more of these activities.

- At least 900 people participated in hunger banquets.

- A minority of site coordinators said the program had not met their expectations in some way, most often because it had not focused enough on solutions, had not been interactive enough, or had not shown enough of the teach-in activities during the Friday session.

- By and large, the site coordinators were quite satisfied with the support that they received from NASW in putting together the teleconference. They gave high ratings to the materials, the telephone support, and the overall timeliness and adequacy of information. Timeliness ratings were weakest (although still positive), reflecting dissatisfaction in some quarters with the fact that some materials were shipped so close to the time of the conference.

There are some indications that the program reached other audiences or will do so in the future.

- 60 percent of the sites received some media attention.

- Two-thirds (67%) of those who taped the broadcasts plan to show them again, and a fourth (26%) anticipate some form of follow-up to the conference activities.

- Telephone interviews with a small sample of site coordinators indicate that there have already been some concrete outcomes of the program, especially in the form of V&D materials being adopted for classroom use.

- Over half the sites expressed interest in purchasing curriculum materials related to the broadcast.

Appendix A. Teleconference Evaluation Forms

1. Host Site Coordinator's Evaluation Form
2. Audience Evaluation Form--February 6, 1996
3. Audience Evaluation Form--February 9, 1996

Host Site Coordinator's Evaluation Form
Social Workers and the Challenge of Violence Worldwide: Satellite Video Teleconferences

Please complete the following information after the videoconference(s) on February 6 and 9 have taken place. Some of the following questions ask for facts about your site, others for your opinions. Your opinions will be treated as confidential. In our reports, opinions or comments will be presented in statistical or other forms that protect the identity of the respondents.

Mail or fax the completed form to:

National Association of Social Workers
Attention: Violence & Development Project
750 First Street, NE, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20002-4241
Phone: 202-336-8273
Fax: 202-336-8311

I. Identifying Information

1. Name of Site Coordinator _____
   Title _____
   Organization _____
   Street Address _____
   City, State, & Zip Code _____
   Telephone _____ Fax _____

2. What institution/department sponsored the videoconference(s)?
   Institution(s) _____
   Department(s) _____

II. The Videoconferences

Attendance & participation

3. Did your site participate in:
   1 Both videoconferences
   2 February 6 only
   3 February 9 only
   4 Neither one [*please explain:*]

   _____
   _____
   _____

4. How many people attended the conferences?
   _____ # attending February 6
   _____ # attending February 9

5. Could your space accommodate all those who wanted to attend?
   1 Yes
   2 No
   Comments [*optional*]:

   _____
   _____
   _____

6. If your videoconference was based at a college or university campus, did any other colleges or institutions participate?
   1 No
   2 Yes [about how many others?_____]

Assessment of videoconference on FEBRUARY 6

[*Note that there are separate sections for February 6 and 9. Please respond for the date(s) on which your site participated.*]

__Check here if your site did not participate on February 6 and *skip to Question #11.*

7. Did the audience appear to like the program? [*Circle the number from 1 to 7 that best represent the reaction, where 1 = "No, did not like it at all" and 7 = "Yes, extremely happy with it".*]

Did not like it at all						Extremely happy with it
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please share any positive or negative feedback you received:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

8. Did this videoconference meet your own expectations?
   1 Yes
   2 No [***please explain***]:

   _____
   _____
   _____

9. Overall, how would you rate the content and format of the conference? [*Circle the number from 1 to 10 that best represents your opinion, where 1 = "Very poor" and 10= "Excellent".*]

	Very poor									Excellent
Content	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Format	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

10. Please rate the following speakers on each of the characteristics indicated. For each speaker, place a check mark (✔) in the appropriate box if a particular characteristic applies.

Speaker	Very interesting	Not very interesting	Very relevant to my work	Not very relevant to my work	Needed more time	Needed less time	I have no opinion
Ken Kusterer							
Geoff Canada							
Indira Koithara							
Donna DeCesare							
Barbara Majors							
Other [specify]:							
Other [specify]:							

Assessment of videoconference on February 9

__Check here if your site did not participate on this date and *skip to Question #16.*

11. Did the audience appear to like the program? [*Circle the number from 1 to 7 that best represent the reaction, where 1 = "No, did not like it at all" and 7= "Yes, extremely happy with it".*]

Did not like it at all						Extremely happy with it
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please share any positive or negative feedback you received:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

12. Did this videoconference meet your own expectations?
    1 Yes
    2 No [*please explain*]:

_____
_____
_____

13. Overall, how would you rate the content and format of the conference? [*Circle the number from 1 to 10 that best represents your opinion, where 1 = "Very poor" and 10= "Excellent".*]

	Very poor									Excellent
Content	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Format	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

14. Did you feel that the participatory, interactive portions of the Friday conference were:

	Yes	No	Not Sure
a. Effective?	1	2	3
b. Interesting?	1	2	3

15. Did you feel that your site had a fair and adequate opportunity to submit comments for the Friday broadcast?
    1 Yes
    2 No
    3 Not sure

16. Was there good continuity between the Tuesday and Friday broadcasts? Did the Friday session flow smoothly from what had occurred on Tuesday?
    1 Yes
    2 No
    3 Not sure

Assessment of planning, support, and materials provided by NASW's National Office and Staff

17. Did you have any technical difficulties during the broadcasts?
    1 No [*skip to Question #18*]
    2 Yes, February 6 only
    3 Yes, February 9 only
    4 Yes, on both dates
    If yes, please describe:

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

18. Did you receive adequate technical support with those problems?
    1 Yes
    2 No
    If no, please explain:

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

19. How helpful were the written materials provided by NASW? [*Circle the number from 1 to 7 that best represents your opinion of each item, where 1="Not at all helpful" and 7="Extremely helpful".*]

	Not at all helpful						Extremely helpful
a. The Organizing Kit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. "Stop Violence, Promote Development" newsletter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Briefing papers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Yellow posters & fliers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e. Packet of educational materials provided for February 6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

20. How helpful was the support that NASW provided over the telephone? [*Circle the number from 1 to 7 that best represents your opinion of each item, where 1="Not at all helpful" and 7="Extremely helpful".*]

Not at all helpful						Extremely helpful
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

__Check here if you did not use telephone support

21. How adequate and timely was the information you received from NASW? [*Circle the number from 1 to 10 that best represents your opinion, where 1="Very poor" and 10= "Excellent".]*

	Very poor									Excellent
Adequacy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Timing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

22. Overall, how do you rate the NASW National Office's work on the videoconference/teach-in effort? Please comment on any strengths or weaknesses of our approach.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

III. Related Activities: Planning, Teach-in, and Follow-up

Planning

23. Who planned the videoconference and/or teach-in activities? [*Circle all that apply*]
    1 Faculty from School of Social Work
    2 Faculty from other programs [specify:_____]
    3 Social work students
    4 Students from other programs [specify:_____]
    5 Social work practitioners [non-faculty]
    6 NASW chapter (local or state)
    7 Community organizations or their representatives
    8 Other [specify:_____]

24. Please estimate the number of people who were involved in the planning process_____.

Teach-in

25. Did your site schedule other activities/programs in connection with the videoconference?
    1 No [*skip to Question #26*]
    2 Yes

26. If yes, what kinds of activities?

	No	Yes	Approximately how many participated?
a. Hunger banquet?	1	2	
b. Special symposia or panel discussions?	1	2	
c. Special classroom activities?	1	2	
d. Other? [fill in]:	1	2	
e. Other? [fill in:]	1	2	

27. Did your program receive any media coverage on campus or in the community? [*Circle all that apply.*]
    1 No media attention
    2 Campus newspaper
    3 Campus radio/TV
    4 Other newspaper(s) [Which ones?_____]
    5 Other radio [What stations?_____]
    6 Other TV [What stations?_____]

28. Did your site videotape one or both of the videoconferences?
    1 No [*skip to Question #29*]
    2 February 6 only
    3 February 9 only
    4 Both

29. Do you plan to show the taped programs?
    1 No
    2 Not sure
    3 Yes
    If yes, to whom and when?

    _____
    _____
    _____

30. Are there any follow-up activities planned for the weeks or months following the videoconferences and teach-in?
    1 No
    2 Not sure
    3 Yes
    If yes, please describe:

    _____
    _____
    _____
    _____

31. Would you like to see the ideas and concepts covered in the videoconference incorporated into:

	Yes	No	Not Sure
a. The undergraduate curriculum in schools of social work?	1	2	3
b. The graduate curriculum in schools of social work?	1	2	3
c. Continuing education training?	1	2	3

Any comments on specific areas that should be emphasized?

_____
_____
_____
_____

32. Would your institution be interested in purchasing, for a minimal fee [*circle any that apply*]:
    1 A copy of the edited version of the Tuesday and Friday broadcasts
    2 Related curriculum modules designed for schools of social work

Thank you for your completing our questionnaire. If possible, please attach your teach-in schedule (if any) and copies of any news articles that resulted from your program.

To assist NASW and AID in future programming, our outside evaluator will be calling a sample of videoconference sites to learn more about their experiences with this program. Besides yourself, is there anyone else at your site that you would recommend for our evaluator to talk to?

Name _____
Title or Affiliation _____
Phone Number _____

Audience Evaluation Form
February 6, 1996
Social Workers and the Challenge of Violence Worldwide: Satellite Video Teleconferences

To assist us in improving future videoconferences, please complete the following anonymous questionnaire before leaving the session.

Videoconference Location _____

1. What was your overall reaction to the program? [*Circle the number from 1 to 7 that best represents your reaction, where 1 = "No, did not like it at all" and 7 = "Yes, extremely happy with it".*]

Did not like it at all						Extremely happy with it
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. How would you rate the content and format of the conference? [*Circle the number from 1 to 10 that best represents your opinion, where 1 = "Very poor" and 10 = "Excellent".*]

	Very poor									Excellent
Content	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Format	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. Please rate the following speakers on each of the characteristics indicated. For each speaker, place a check mark (✔) in the appropriate box if a particular characteristic applies.

Speaker	Very interesting	Not very interesting	Very relevant to my work	Not very relevant to my work	Needed more time	Needed less time	I have no opinion
Ken Kusterer							
Geoff Canada							
Indira Koithara							
Donna DeCesare							
Barbara Majors							
Other [specify]:							
Other [specify]:							

4. Would you like to see the ideas and concepts covered in the videoconference incorporated into:

	Yes	No	Not Sure
a. The undergraduate curriculum in schools of social work?	1	2	3
b. The graduate curriculum in schools of social work?	1	2	3
c. Continuing education for social workers?	1	2	3

5. Did you attend or participate in any teach-in activities related to the videoconference? [*Circle all that apply*]
   1 No
   2 Hunger banquet
   3 Special symposia or panel discussion
   4 Special classroom activities
   5 Other [please describe]:_____

6. Your primary occupation or profession
   1 Social work faculty
   2 Other faculty
   3 Social work student
   4 Other student
   5 Social work practitioner
   6 NASW staff
   7 Other [specify:_____]

7. Were you involved in planning the videoconference or teach-in activities?
   1 Yes
   2 No

8. We would appreciate any comments, positive or negative, that would help improve future programs:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you for your completing our questionnaire.

Audience Evaluation Form
February 9, 1996
Social Workers and the Challenge of Violence Worldwide: Satellite Video Teleconferences

To assist us in improving future videoconferences, please complete the following anonymous questionnaire before leaving the session.

Videoconference Location

1. What was your overall reaction to the program? [*Circle the number from 1 to 7 that best represents your reaction, where 1="No, did not like it at all" and 7="Yes, extremely happy with it".*]

Did not like it at all						Extremely happy with it
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. How would you rate the content and format of the conference? [*Circle the number from 1 to 10 that best represents your opinion, where 1="Very poor" and 10= "Excellent".*]

	Very poor									Excellent
Content	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Format	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

3. Did you feel that the participatory, interactive portions of the conference were:

	Yes	No	Not Sure
a. Effective?	1	2	3
b. Interesting?	1	2	3
c. Accessible to any site that wanted to participate?	1	2	3

4. Some places also broadcast a session on Tuesday, February 6. Did you attend the Tuesday broadcast?
   1 No [*skip to Question #6*]
   2 Yes

5. If you attended on Tuesday, was there good continuity between the Tuesday and Friday broadcasts? Did the Friday session flow smoothly from what had occurred on Tuesday?
   1 Yes
   2 No
   3 Not sure

6. Would you like to see the ideas and concepts covered in the session(s) incorporated into:

	Yes	No	Not Sure
a. The undergraduate curriculum in schools of social work?	1	2	3
b. The graduate curriculum in schools of social work?	1	2	3
c. Continuing education for social workers?	1	2	3

7. Did you attend or participate in any teach-in activities related to the session? [*Circle all that apply*]
   1 No
   2 Hunger banquet
   3 Special symposia or panel discussion
   4 Special classroom activities
   5 Other [please describe]:_____

8. Your primary occupation or profession
   1 Social work faculty
   2 Other faculty
   3 Social work student
   4 Other student
   5 Social work practitioner
   6 NASW staff
   7 Other [specify:_____]

9. Were you involved in planning the videconference(s) or teach-in activities?
   1 Yes
   2 No

10. We would appreciate any comments, positive or negative, that would help improve future programs:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you for your completing our questionnaire.

Appendix B. Sample of Comments on Teleconference Experience

I. Host Site Coordinators--10 percent random sample of all sites responding

1. From a Midwest university with 7 attendees each day (part of a statewide network of participating social work programs)/high ratings for program & NASW support/no local activities

   Audience comments: "[On Tuesday] Not enough time for some speakers."

   Overall comments: "The topic was interesting."

   Follow-up: plan to show the tape to students.

2. From a hospital with 5 attendees each day/very high ratings of program and support/no local activities

   Audience comments: "[On Tuesday] Most participants really enjoyed the program and liked the concept of videoconferences for social work education. Some participants felt the content was too general and would have liked more focus on issues of violence in the local community. [On Tuesday] All participants in today's program seemed to really enjoy the conference."

   Overall comments: "I though you did an excellent job in organizing the program and would like to see more. My only concern is that an NASW-sponsored conference was not automatically approved for CEUs--we would appreciate collaboration with our local NASW around this issue."

   Follow-up: none mentioned.

3. From an east coast school of social work with 85 attendees on Tuesday & 60 on Friday/high ratings of program, lukewarm ratings of NASW support/local activities included lectures, panels, and classroom activities

   Audience comments: "[On Tuesday] The reception from the satellite was fuzzy. Most participants were very impressed with the conference. [On Friday] Reception was better--we were very disappointed that we were not chosen to be an interactive site. We feel that we were misled up until a few weeks before the conference--we were told and we advertised the conference as being an interactive one. We worked very hard on organizing these events--we wanted an opportunity to have some active participation in the conference."

   Overall comments: "Good effort--good organization."

Follow-up: Tape will be reshown to students (already has been). "We had a meeting to debrief the conference. We plan to develop a video-library of the conference and lectures and maybe [hold] a meeting to have some interactive discussion."

4. From an east coast school of social work with 68 attendees on Tuesday & 35 on Friday/high to very high ratings of program and support/held post-conference discussion session

   Audience comments: "[On Tuesday] Surprise regarding connections between national and international situations. Wish for more knowledge regarding what to do to change things. [On Friday] liked suggestions for practice-related interventions, `what to do.'"

   Overall comments: "Well-prepared and well-conceived. Excellent staff support and materials."

   Follow-up: Plan to show tapes to "students who were unable to attend because of field placements. Later this semester or maybe next semester [will show] in macro practice class."

5. From a southwestern school of social work with 35 attendees on Tuesday and 20 on Friday (noted that there were other activities that conflicted with broadcast)/no rating of Tuesday broadcast, high ratings of Friday and NASW support/held special symposia or panel discussion

   Audience comments: "[On Friday] Hispanic representation on panel was missing."

   Overall comments: "Good work."

   Follow-up: Plan to show tape again. "Will explore possibilities of introducing international perspectives in [university's] core undergraduate curriculum and in the M.S.W. curriculum. To a limited extent, some individual faculty are engaged but more formal attempts need to be made."

6. From a southeastern school of social work and criminal justice with 17 attendees on Tuesday and 5 on Friday/very high ratings of program and support/no local activities

   Audience comments: None mentioned.

   Overall comments: "Excellent!!!"

   Follow-up: Plan to show tapes to undergraduate and graduate social work classes.

7. From a southwestern social work department with 10 attendees on Friday (could not resolve technical problems on Tuesday)/high ratings of program and support/no local activities

   Audience comments: None mentioned.

Overall comments: "Very well done and organized."

Follow-up: Plan to show tapes again.

8. From a Midwestern school of social work, working in collaboration with a public television station, 55 attendees on Tuesday and 36 on Friday/very high ratings program and support/many local activities, including hunger banquet, panels, special classroom activities, other videos

   Audience comments: "[On Tuesday] Most evaluations were very positive. One suggested a 15 minute break. Three said more local discussion and one said more local relevance. Two said: more specific topics. One said it was boring and only liked the poem. One wanted more on women and world development. Faculty comments were very enthusiastic. [On Friday] We had a question selected. The audience [was] excited and proud about this."

   Overall comments: "Thank you. We need a full year (now that I've done it once) to prepare properly. I could use more ideas about how to involve others--how to develop enthusiasm for the project. How about a video from National of the program planners discussing their ideas, vision. Then I could show it to students, NASW chapter, faculty, etc....about 6 months to 1 year before event?"

   Follow-up: "I would love to [show the taped program again]."

8. From a New York City site that hosted 400 attendees from several universities on Tuesday/very high ratings of program, low rating of NASW support for timeliness/held hunger banquet

   Audience comments: "[On Tuesday] Several schools would like a copy of the videotape for use in orientation programs. Everyone felt it was professionally done and `upbeat' about problem-solving."

   Overall comments: "Because [packet of educational materials] did not arrive in timely fashion, we were unable to effectively distribute more detailed information."

   Follow-up: "We would certainly like a copy of the videoconference and would be interested in using it."

9. From a Midwestern school where the program was offered by the social work and continuing education departments, 34 attendees on Tuesday and 19 on Friday/high ratings of program and low ratings of support/held meeting with NASW as part of local effort

   Audience comments: None mentioned.

   Overall comments: "We received the final packet (with black & white picture of Kuralt) too late to use for anything."

Follow-up: Not sure.

10. From a southeastern school of social work with 25 attendees on Tuesday and 15 on Friday/moderate to high ratings of program and support/no local activities

    Audience comments: None mentioned.

    Overall comments: "Well done."

    Follow-up: Plan to show the taped programs.

11. From an eastern social work program with 50 attendees on Tuesday and 21 on Friday/neutral to lukewarm ratings of program, mixed ratings of support/held special symposia or panel

    Audience comments: "[On Tuesday] Session #1 [was] too broad a topic to deal with in such a short time period. [On Friday] Students were more positive. Content was more narrow and specific."

    Overall comments: None.

    Follow-up: None planned.

12. From a Midwestern program sponsored by and education television station, with 12 attendees on Tuesday and 20 on Friday/high to very high ratings of Tuesday, somewhat lower on Friday, high ratings of support/no local activities

    Audience comments: "[On Tuesday] Many people enjoyed the conference, but said the technical difficulties were extremely frustrating. [There were] technical difficulties, interruptions, continually every 6-8 minutes. But it was so interesting that no one walked out of the conference. [On Friday] More than half of the audience thought the conference was interesting. Many of the audience members thought the conference was geared toward social workers only, instead of including non-social workers. They would have like some examples of what the average person could do to help."

    Overall comments: None.

    Follow-up: None planned.

II. Audience Members on Tuesday, February 6--2.5 percent random sample

The sample included 37 respondents, 23 of whom--62 percent--offered some comments or suggestions about the teleconference.

From social work students

"This program spoke directly to my heart. Just yesterday, I struggled with feeling overwhelmed, frustrated and powerless because the problems that we face are so global and pervasive. Attending this conference was a shot in the arm. I needed to rejuvenate my fire for social justice."

"I enjoyed the many ways that you all covered issues about violence, particularly the poets. I think these varying views aid in putting feeling into the topic vs. just using statistics. It was also very nice to hear perspectives of people in differing backgrounds and nationalities."

"It was great."

"Videoconference was very interesting. A lot of important facts and opinions were portrayed by the panel."

"This was very good."

"[Liked the] ...poet."

"Excellent and inspiring program. Loved the poetry."

"I appreciated the variety of forms of presentation--artwork, poems, etc. Fascinating to hear people speak from all over the world!"

"Incredible. Perhaps too many folks. I enjoyed the foreign scholars from developing nations. The U.S. issues are already familiar to me. Perhaps a moderator of color--Charlene Hunter Gault?"

"I feel like we just brushed the surface in so many important areas--I'm hoping the follow-up teleconference will be able to delve deeper into the experience and knowledge that makes these panelists more than just another voice out there."

"I was very familiar with issues discussed. I would have liked to see more answers. Is anyone doing anything about violence in different countries? Has there been any kind of forum internationally? In other words, where can I sign up?"

"This was a good video presentation! It needed to have a break--it was a little long. What about rural social work?"

"Maybe [have] a small break."

"Suggestions: include more vignettes; have call-ins."

From social work faculty

"All speakers--I wanted to hear more from all of them. Fewer speakers and more depth would have been more helpful than the format utilized."

From social work practitioners

"Wonderful--we need more of these!"

"Would like more of this type of program. Let's just make it the beginning of many more."

"People arriving late and being seated throughout the videoconference was annoying. I'm not sure what can be done about the problem. Everything else was done well. Thank you. (The classroom activity was informative.)"

"Violence comes in many varieties and this talk on violence had a wide focus. Narrow the focus [to] sense of community, development of resources and people, role of work in violence related to interpersonal relationships."

"I believe most educational curricula need more community organization classes. I would like to see more realistic and practical applications discussed. Everything sounds great in theory, but give more specifics on how to implement these principles into practice."

From other faculty

"I'm not a social worker. Overall, a very well designed and produced videoconference."

From other students

"Should have fewer speakers and more time for each of the speakers."

From other attendees

"Excellent but poor PR ahead of time. Information about this conference did not reach key leaders that could have real impact. For instance, how about direct PR to churches and ministers in high violence areas. Also, school faculty. Also, medical personnel, i.e., emergency care and hospital ER, caregivers who are impacted by violence, and social groups, crisis service, child service and rape and Hospitality House and crime people, police, juvenile agencies, etc., etc." [From respondent with medical/law background]

III. Audience Members on February 9--3% random sample

The sample included 37 respondents, 17 of whom--46 percent--provided comments or suggestions on the program.

From social work students

"If I had known about Tuesday, I would have come. A lot of statements made sense and were very good. This would be effective maybe on a weekend so that others don't worry about class. And would also have enough time for input afterwards. Maybe come up with a plan of action for community in [respondent's city]. For example, a hunger banquet here in [university]."

"We should do more of these. Very informative."

"This would probably have been better served by utilizing the entirety of the day in both sessions, allowing for breaks to move around, and time to discuss thoughts and ideas with peers."

"The breakup of the conference into two days made it difficult. I could only attend one day. I would have liked to have seen the other session."

"It was very good. I appreciated the slant on international issues. It seemed that it was still a little theoretical in approach. What about the rest of the violence in the U.S.? If the answers truly lie within the community and social workers need to enable people to empower themselves and people in communities, what are some more of the models? What are more of the problems? (How defined.) what are some of the solutions and sources of inspiration?"

"[Suggest] more interaction from the audience; there were a limited number of call-ins. Some sort of certificate of participation for attendance of the conference."

From social work faculty

"Link ideas and concepts to USAID funded examples, real world problems, and NASW/CSWE educators!"

"The Tuesday program was very interesting, exceptional, and included good variety. Today's program was talking heads, repetitive. The program was adequate."

From social work practitioners

"It was extremely stimulating and worthwhile. It helped to validate and rekindle my commitment to work for long-term change."

"I liked the concrete examples that were given for social workers to be involved with and help to empower communities and to work with others as a team. The discussion did become long and drawn out--discussion became more meaningful to those who were [on the panel] than the viewers."

"Generally very well done. There seemed little discussion on violence and much discussion on economic-educational and related racial problems."

"Some members of the panel were less understandable. Articulation and slow speech should be stressed. With this kind of material, time to absorb is important."

From other students

"I think it was a very powerful tool and I would like to see it used on (edited) video in classrooms. Guidance vs. empowerment limiting might be a future issue. Would like to have seen more statistics and ways to combat on a more individual basis. Technical difficulties on both days left skips in the program causing the audience to miss portions."

"Good format for discussion--more like a seminar than a lecture. Interesting to hear others' thoughts immediately, and not afterwards in written form."

"The teleconference was excellent. The topic was timely and relevant. There were not enough activities. Need more representatives to speak out about social work in rural American and particularly the Northwest. Some of us don't work on the East coast."

"Why were criminal justice majors asked to attend this?"

From other attendees

"I just appreciated the conference since I'm involved in empowerment and working directly with youth." [From an "urban missionary"]