

Youth Engagement Training Project

Workshop Evaluation Report

**Prepared by
Meg Morrison & Urmila Chandran
November 18, 2005**

Content	Page Numbers
Executive Summary	04
1. Background	05
2. Data Collection	05
3. Data Analysis	06
4. Results of Data Analysis	06
4.1 Participant Responses on Various Aspects of the Day One Workshop	06
4.2 Participant Responses on Various Aspects of the Day Two Workshop	09
4.3 Workshop Format	12
4.4 Availability of Time to Complete Workshop Activities	13
4.5 Ability to Support Projects	14
4.6 What Participants Liked About the Workshop	15
4.7 What Participants Liked Least About the Workshop	18
4.8 Satisfaction with the Workshops	26
4.9 Recommending the Workshops	27
4.10 Workshop Information and Youth Tobacco Issues	28
4.11 Next Steps	28
4.12 Intention to Start a Project	29
5. Significant Lessons Learned	31
6. Conclusion	32

Tables

Table 1: Number of participants who attended the workshop at each location and the number of evaluation forms that were completed and returned	06
Table 2: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day One in Toronto	07
Table 3: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day One in Petawawa	07
Table 4: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day One in Thunder Bay	08
Table 5: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day One in Chatham-Kent	09
Table 6: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day Two in Toronto	10
Table 7: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day Two in Petawawa	10
Table 8: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day Two in Thunder Bay	11
Table 9: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day Two in Chatham-Kent	12
Table 10: Overview of participant responses about workshop format	13
Table 11: Overview of participant responses on time availability for workshop activities	13
Table 12: Overview of participant responses about ability to support projects based on workshop	14
Table 13: Overview of participants' indication of level of satisfaction with the workshops	26
Table 14: Overview of participants' likelihood of recommending the workshop to another youth-serving organization	27

	Page Numbers
Table 15: Overview of participants' indication of usefulness of the workshop with youth tobacco issues	28
Table 16: Overview of participants' next action step post-workshop	29
Table 17: Participants' intention to start a project	30
Table 18: If marked "Yes", then estimated timeline indicated by participants	30
 Appendix	
Workshop Evaluation Form	33

Executive Summary

The Youth Engagement Training Project's "Train-the-Trainer" workshops were held successfully at four regional locations in Ontario – Toronto, Petawawa, Thunder Bay and Chatham-Kent. Attendance at Toronto, Thunder Bay and Chatham-Kent was excellent with registrations running into waiting lists. Overall, the training reached about 256 people across the province. Although Petawawa witnessed fewer participants, the workshops still resulted in the initiation of real-time projects among most participants. Workshop topics were (1) **Making Change Work in Youth-Serving Agencies** (Day One) and (2) **Youth Action Guide: Community-Based Smoking Prevention** (Day Two). All participants were given a workbook – one each on the two workshop topics, which they could take back to their organizations.

The overall feedback from all the four set of workshops was very positive. Most participants appreciated the free training and the travel subsidies, without which some organizations could not have attended the training. Participant responses especially around the workshop content, workbooks, workshop activities, and small group work were mostly positive. Certain suggestions and comments made by the participants were also incorporated into the subsequent workshops, thus tailoring each workshop to participant needs as far as possible.

Participants were also given the opportunity to write about things that they liked least about the workshops. Some of the responses around ice breakers and small group work seemed to have people on both sides – some liking the activities and some disliking them. The concern about Day One not being about youth engagement especially from participants at the Toronto workshops was allayed to an extent in subsequent workshops where participants were given a more detailed description of the what Day One and Day Two composed of (prior to starting the workshop on Day One). Perhaps, even the project title could have been rephrased to also include organizational change.

It was however, encouraging to note that a majority of the participants indicated that they would recommend the workshops to other youth-serving organizations, and quite a few participants intended to start a project based on the workshop topics – some of them in the next one month.

The workshop evaluations highlighted few significant lessons to be learned while working with youth and while organizing such workshops in the future. For example, there was unanimous agreement among the participants (especially in Petawawa) that workshops should not be held during weekends. It is also speculated that this could have been the biggest factor for the low attendance. Secondly, an online registration process should involve not more than two clicks for the registration to be completed. In addition, when workshops promote group attendance from organizations, the registration process should be set up to handle group registration. A third significant lesson is to mix youth and adults up (in the workshop) in such a way that there is at least one adult who could direct the youth in a group. Finally, the workshops seemed to work well when considerable numbers of youth are involved along with youth advisers and coordinators.

The following evaluation report presents more detailed information about participant responses on various aspects of the workshops along with information about what they liked and disliked about the workshops. Overall, the workshops were very well received and attended and greatly appreciated by most participants. It is hoped that the lessons learned from these workshops will be used to inform next steps and future training.

1. Background

The Youth Engagement Training Project (YETP) is an initiative of TeenNet, University of Toronto, funded by Health Canada and managed by The Health Communication Unit (THCU). The overall objective of the project is to increase local youth tobacco action in Ontario with a specific focus on small, urban, rural and northern communities by training Ontario youth-serving organizations to build the capacity of Ontario youth and community organizations to engage in local tobacco control activities. One of the main activities in achieving this objective is the “Train-the-Trainer Workshop Series.”

As part of the “Train-the-Trainer Workshop Series”, two-day workshops were held at four regional locations in Ontario in September and October 2005. The workshop topics were (1) Making Change Work in Youth-Serving Agencies (conducted on Day One) and (2) Youth Action Guide: Community-Based Smoking Prevention (conducted on Day Two) at all four locations. The workshop schedule was as follows:

Toronto (hosted by Toronto Public Health) – September 27 and 28, 2005

Petawawa (hosted by CFB Petawawa) – October 1 and 2, 2005

Thunder Bay (hosted by Thunder Bay District Health Unit) – October 13 and 14, 2005

Chatham-Kent (hosted by Chatham-Kent Public Health Unit) – October 17 and 18, 2005

The workshops involved a combination of lecture and individual and group activities. All participants were also given a set of the “*Making Change Work in Youth-Serving Agencies*” and “*Youth Action Guide: Community-Based Smoking Prevention*” workbooks to take back, at the workshops.

2. Data Collection

The evaluation data were collected at the end of each workshop day at every location. The evaluation forms were distributed to all participants on each day of the workshop, and participants were requested to complete and return the forms before leaving. Overall, about 216 completed forms were returned from a total of 256 participants, thus giving a high response rate of 84 percent. Moreover, in Thunder Bay and Chatham-Kent, the youth participants did not fill out the evaluation form on Day One as they attended a different meeting (more details are provided further). So, the actual response rate is even higher – almost 94 percent.

The evaluation form mostly consisted of closed-ended questions, but also included few open-ended questions to get a deeper insight into participant reactions and feelings about the workshops. Please see the appendix for a copy of the workshop evaluation form.

Table 1: Number of participants who attended the workshop at each location and the number of evaluation forms that were completed and returned

Workshop Location		Number of Participants	Number of Forms Returned
Toronto	Day 1	39	34
	Day 2	38	32
Petawawa	Day 1	10	10
	Day 2	9	9
Thunder Bay	Day 1	38 (including 14 youth)	24
	Day 2	38	35
Chatham-Kent	Day 1	39 (including youth)	27
	Day 2	45	45
Total		256	216

3. Data Analysis

The evaluation data were entered into Excel spreadsheets. A separate spreadsheet was created for each workshop at all four locations. Data analysis involved both quantitative and qualitative analysis depending on the nature of the response.

Note: Hereafter, the workshop on “Making Change Work in Youth-Serving Agencies” will be referred to as “Day One Workshop” and the workshop on “Youth Action Guide: Community-Based Smoking Prevention” will be referred to as “Day Two Workshop.”

4. Results of Data Analysis

4.1 Participant Responses on Various Aspects of the Day One Workshop

All participants on both days of the workshops were asked to rate the quality and usefulness of the workbook, workshop exercises and activities, and the workshop as a whole on a five-point rating scale, where “1” was taken to mean very low quality and usefulness, and “5” was taken to mean very high quality and usefulness. Ratings for the quality of the workshops were also obtained for these items: workshop planning and promotion, length of session, registration process, name tags, food and refreshments, room and venue. In addition, participants who attended the Day Two workshop were also asked to rate the quality and usefulness of case studies on the same five-point rating scale.

In Toronto, about 34 evaluation forms were completed and returned. As Table 2 indicates, most participants gave a rating of “4” that is, “high quality” for the quality and usefulness of the organizational change workbook, workshop activities and the workshop as a whole. Most participants also gave a similar rating for planning and promotion, length of the workshop session, registration process, food, room and the workshop venue.

Table 2: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day One in Toronto

Evaluation Item	Quality					Usefulness				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Workbook	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (15%)	16 (47%)	13 (38%)	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	7 (21%)	15 (45%)	9 (27%)
Workshop exercises/activities	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	5 (15%)	19 (58%)	6 (18%)	0 (0%)	3 (10%)	7 (23%)	17 (55%)	4 (13%)
Workshop as a whole	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	5 (15%)	18 (53%)	8 (24%)	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	9 (28%)	13 (41%)	7 (22%)
	Planning and promotion		0 (0%)	1 (3%)	8 (24%)	15 (45%)	9 (27%)			
	Length of session		0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (21%)	18 (53%)	9 (26%)			
	Registration process, name tags		0 (0%)	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	10 (29%)	20 (59%)			
	Food and refreshments		0 (0%)	2 (6%)	7 (21%)	13 (38%)	12 (35%)			
	Room		0 (0%)	3 (9%)	9 (26%)	17 (50%)	5 (15%)			
	Venue		0 (0%)	1 (3%)	6 (18%)	20 (59%)	7 (21%)			

Table 3 presents the results of about 10 participant responses. Similar to the Toronto ratings, most participants at the Petawawa workshop leaned towards a rating of “4” for the usefulness of the workbook, workshop activities and the workshop as a whole. The quality ratings were slightly mixed. The workbook, workshop as a whole, length of session and food received very high quality ratings from most participants. A rating of “4” was the most favourite for items such as workshop activities, planning and promotion, and the registration process.

Table 3: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day One in Petawawa

Evaluation Item	Quality					Usefulness				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Workbook	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (56%)	4 (44%)
Workshop exercises/activities	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (56%)	4 (44%)
Workshop as a whole	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (40%)	6 (60%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	4 (44%)	4 (44%)
Planning and promotion	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	6 (60%)	1 (10%)					
Length of session	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	5 (50%)					
Registration process, name tags	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)					
Food and	0	0	1	3	6					

refreshments	(0%)	(0%)	(10%)	(30%)	(60%)
Room	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)	5 (56%)	1 (11%)
Venue	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	5 (50%)	3 (30%)

Similar to Toronto and Petawawa, most participants at Thunder Bay gave ratings of either “4” or “5” for the quality and usefulness of all the workshop-related items except for registrations, which recorded “3” as the second highest score. More detailed explanations and reasons for such moderate scores will be discussed later.

Table 4: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day One in Thunder Bay

Evaluation Item	Quality					Usefulness				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Workbook	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	7 (29%)	16 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (17%)	10 (43%)	9 (39%)
Workshop exercises/activities	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	15 (63%)	7 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (9%)	10 (45%)	10 (45%)
Workshop as a whole	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	10 (42%)	13 (54%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (9%)	10 (43%)	11 (48%)
Planning and promotion	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (17%)	11 (48%)	8 (35%)					
Length of session	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	13 (54%)	11 (46%)					
Registration process, name tags	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	4 (17%)	3 (13%)	15 (63%)					
Food and refreshments	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	8 (33%)	14 (58%)					
Room	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	10 (48%)	8 (38%)					
Venue	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (13%)	11 (48%)	9 (39%)					

As the case with the other three locations, participant responses in Chatham-Kent on quality and usefulness for all workshop-related items were very positive – the average score consistently being higher than 4. Please see Table 5 for more details.

Table 5: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day One in Chatham-Kent

Evaluation Item	Quality					Usefulness				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Workbook	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (11%)	11 (41%)	13 (48%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (12%)	8 (31%)	15 (58%)
Workshop exercises/activities	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	16 (59%)	10 (37%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	13 (50%)	12 (46%)
Workshop as a whole	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (11%)	12 (44%)	11 (41%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (15%)	9 (35%)	12 (46%)
Planning and promotion	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (23%)	10 (45%)	7 (32%)					
Length of session	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	9 (33%)	16 (59%)					
Registration process, name tags	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	10 (37%)	14 (52%)					
Food and refreshments	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (33%)	18 (67%)					
Room	0 (0%)	3 (12%)	2 (8%)	10 (38%)	11 (42%)					
Venue	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	12 (46%)	12 (46%)					

4.2 Participant Responses on Various Aspects of the Day Two Workshop

On Day Two of the YETP workshops in Toronto, participant responses were mixed. For example, a considerable number of participants (please see Table 6) felt that the quality and usefulness of case studies (used in the workshop), the youth action guide, the workshop exercises and the workshop as a whole were of high quality with a rating of “4.” Most participants also gave similar ratings to the quality of the planning and promotion and to the quality of food and refreshments. In fact, about 62% and 38% of participants felt that the registration process and the workshop venue were of very high quality respectively. However, most participants were split in their ratings on the length of the session while most participants gave a moderate rating for the quality of the room where the workshop was held.

Table 6: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day Two in Toronto

Evaluation Item	Quality					Usefulness				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Case studies	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (25%)	13 (46%)	8 (29%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (24%)	10 (40%)	9 (36%)
Workbook	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	19 (61%)	11 (35%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	18 (64%)	8 (29%)
Workshop exercises/activities	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (32%)	14 (45%)	6 (19%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	7 (23%)	12 (40%)	8 (27%)
Workshop as a whole	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	8 (26%)	16 (52%)	6 (19%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (21%)	16 (57%)	6 (23%)
Planning and promotion	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	5 (17%)	15 (50%)	7 (23%)					
Length of session	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	10 (31%)	10 (31%)	9 (28%)					
Registration process, name tags	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	4 (14%)	6 (21%)	18 (62%)					
Food and refreshments	0 (0%)	4 (13%)	8 (25%)	11 (34%)	9 (28%)					
Room	0 (0%)	3 (10%)	14 (45%)	7 (23%)	7 (23%)					
Venue	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	8 (25%)	10 (31%)	12 (38%)					

Participant responses at the Petawawa workshops were mostly positive with the average score being higher than 4.0 for all aspects of the workshop. In fact the popular opinion was that the case studies, youth action guide, workshop exercises and the workshop as a whole were highly useful. The only item that earned moderate scores was the registration process, which may have seemed challenging to some people.

Table 7: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day Two in Petawawa

Evaluation Item	Quality					Usefulness				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Case studies	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	4 (44%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	3 (33%)	5 (56%)
Workbook	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (44%)	5 (56%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)
Workshop exercises/activities	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (56%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (38%)	5 (63%)
Workshop as a whole	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
Planning and promotion	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2(22 %)	4 (44%)	3 (33%)					
Length of session	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (44%)	5 (56%)					
Registration process,	0	1	4	2	2					

name tags	(0%)	(11%)	(44%)	(22%)	(22%)
Food and refreshments	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (22%)	7 (78%)
Room	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)
Venue	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)

In Thunder Bay, most participants indicated that the youth action guide was of very high quality and usefulness. The quality of the registration process, length of the session and the room all recorded a very high quality rating by a majority of participants. However, the case studies recorded average scores of 4.03 and 3.74 for quality and usefulness respectively – possibly because some groups worked on real time projects instead of the case studies that were distributed. The most popular scores for the rest of the items were around “4.”

Table 8: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day Two in Thunder Bay

Evaluation Item	Quality					Usefulness				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Case studies	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (23%)	15 (58%)	5 (19%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	9 (36%)	9 (36%)	4 (16%)
Workbook	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	10 (37%)	12 (44%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	0 (0%)	10 (40%)	12 (48%)
Workshop exercises/activities	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (27%)	13 (50%)	6 (23%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (35%)	8 (35%)	7 (30%)
Workshop as a whole	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (22%)	13 (48%)	8 (30%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	4 (17%)	12 (50%)	7 (29%)
Planning and promotion	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	4 (16%)	16 (64%)	4 (16%)					
Length of session	0 (0%)	4 (15%)	7 (26%)	7 (26%)	9 (33%)					
Registration process, name tags	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	4 (15%)	8 (31%)	12 (46%)					
Food and refreshments	3 (11%)	5 (19%)	3 (11%)	9 (33%)	7 (26%)					
Room	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	6 (24%)	8 (32%)	9 (36%)					
Venue	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	4 (15%)	12 (44%)	10 (37%)					

Similar to the Thunder Bay ratings, the youth action guide was rated to be of very high quality and usefulness by most participants at Chatham-Kent. Additionally, as Table 9 indicates, the average scores for all items except for room and venue were consistently over 4.0. The most popular scores for the quality of the room and the venue were also quite high although the slightly lower average scores may have been due to the large number of participants in the room. As the room was part of the public health unit, there was no charge for rent, which saved monies to reimburse travel subsidies for most participants attending the Chatham-Kent workshops.

Table 9: Participant responses to various workshop-related items on Day Two in Chatham-Kent

Evaluation Item	Quality					Usefulness				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Case studies	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (23%)	13 (59%)	4 (18%)	0 (0%)	3 (14%)	3 (14%)	12 (55%)	4 (18%)
Workbook	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (11%)	8 (30%)	16 (59%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	6 (23%)	17 (65%)
Workshop exercises/activities	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	16 (59%)	8 (30%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (15%)	13 (50%)	9 (35%)
Workshop as a whole	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	10 (37%)	15 (56%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	9 (35%)	14 (54%)
Planning and promotion	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (15%)	11 (42%)	11 (42%)					
Length of session	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	6 (22%)	11 (41%)	9 (33%)					
Registration process, name tags	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	8 (30%)	16 (59%)					
Food and refreshments	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (35%)	17 (65%)					
Room	1 (4%)	3 (11%)	8 (30%)	12 (44%)	3 (11%)					
Venue	0 (0%)	3 (11%)	2 (7%)	15 (56%)	7 (26%)					

4.3 Workshop Format

All participants were also asked to indicate the extent to which they liked the format of the workshops. Ratings were obtained on a five-point scale, where 1 was taken to mean “did not like it at all” and 5 was taken to mean “liked it a lot”. The workshop format involved a combination of lecture, individual and small group work, interactive exercises, and few energizers. As the below table indicates, the responses were quite positive with “4” being the most common response across all locations. This means that participants at all four locations liked the format of the workshops quite a bit. No participant indicated not having liked the workshop format at all.

Table 10: Overview of Participant Responses about Workshop Format

Workshop Location		1 ("did not like it at all")	2	3	4	5 ("liked it a lot")
Toronto	Day1	0 (0%)	4 (12%)	5 (15%)	21 (62%)	4 (12%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	8 (26%)	17 (55%)	5 (16%)
Petawawa	Day 1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (70%)	3 (30%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (67%)	3 (33%)
Thunder Bay	Day 1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	11 (46%)	12 (50%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	4 (15%)	12 (44%)	10 (37%)
Chatham-Kent	Day 1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	18 (67%)	8 (30%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	3 (11%)	13 (48%)	8 (30%)

4.4 Availability of Time to Complete Workshop Activities

Participants were questioned about the amount of time they felt was available to them to complete the workshop activities. Responses were recorded on a five-point scale where 1 was taken to mean "there was very little time", 5 was taken to mean "there was too much time", and 3 was taken to mean "just about right time". The summary of responses (please see Table 11) showed that participants at the Toronto and Chatham-Kent workshops felt there was just about the right time to complete the workshop activities. Those who attended the Petawawa workshops felt they had more than the just the right amount of time while participants at Thunder Bay felt they had just the right time to complete workshop activities on Day One and little more than that time on Day Two. No participant indicated having very little time.

Table 11: Overview of Participant Responses on Time Availability for Workshop Activities

Workshop Location		1 "there was very little time"	2	3 "just about right time"	4	5 "there was too much time"
Toronto	Day1	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	16 (47%)	13 (38%)	4 (12%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	15 (47%)	9 (28%)	5 (16%)
Petawawa	Day 1	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	3 (33%)	4 (44%)	1 (11%)
Thunder Bay	Day 1	0 (0%)	3 (13%)	11 (46%)	5 (21%)	4 (17%)

	Day 2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (22%)	16 (59%)	5 (19%)
Chatham-Kent	Day 1	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	14 (52%)	6 (22%)	5 (19%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	13 (48%)	10 (37%)	3 (11%)

4.5 Ability to Support Projects

Participant ratings were also obtained to assess the ability of the participant to support a project that was based on both workshop topics. This measure was obtained on a five-point scale where 1 was taken to mean “you feel most unable” and 5 was taken to mean “you feel most able”. An overview of participant responses indicates that participants at the Toronto, Thunder Bay, and Chatham-Kent workshops felt that they were quite able to support youth action and organizational change projects. Participants at Petawawa indicated feeling most able to support a youth action project and quite able to support an organizational change project. These scores set a positive base for the follow-up process.

Table 12: Overview of Participant Responses about Ability to Support Projects Based on Workshop

Workshop Location		1 “you feel most unable”	2	3	4	5 “you feel most able”
Toronto	Day 1	0 (0%)	3 (9%)	9 (26%)	17 (50%)	5 (15%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (22%)	15 (47%)	10 (31%)
Petawawa	Day 1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (70%)	3 (30%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (33%)	6 (67%)
Thunder Bay	Day 1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (29%)	12 (50%)	5 (21%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	3 (11%)	15 (56%)	8 (30%)
Chatham-Kent	Day 1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	16 (59%)	8 (30%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (11%)	15 (56%)	8 (30%)

4.6 What Participants Liked about the Workshop

In order to give participants a chance to communicate in their own words how they felt about the workshop, they were asked to list up to three things that they liked about both workshops. The analysis for this section has been outlined separately for both workshop topics.

Participant Responses on Day One (Making Change Work in Youth-Serving Agencies)

Toronto – September 27, 2005

In Toronto, there were three main themes that emerged from participant responses – small group work and discussion, workbook, and applicability of exercises. At least eight people commented that they liked the workshop activities that were done in small groups and the resulting interactive atmosphere. The workbook that was provided as a take-home resource and the practical exercises were also much appreciated. Other specific things that were liked about the workshop included the flow of the workshop and the facilitator.

“practical exercises; take-home resources; taking a plan back for our project that is very workable”

“small group work; interaction/ice breakers; discussion”

Petawawa – October 1, 2005

Responses in Petawawa were very similar to Toronto – the workbook and the process seemed useful, easy to follow, and practical; and the presenters were well-liked. Some groups in Petawawa even started working on real-time projects based on the process that was taught. The practice of giving handouts (that were copies of different exercises in the workbook) was validated as a good idea as it helped in keeping the main workbook unmarked. The host agency, CFB Petawawa was also complimented.

“Good use of lecture and working time; moved quickly; based on what we can do at our agency; not hypothetical; productive and have things already starting.”

“Most workshop participants face the same challenges as us; breaks down projects into easy, workable steps; flexible schedule”

Thunder Bay – October 13, 2005

In Thunder Bay, the youth were given the opportunity to attend a Tobacco 101 course facilitated by two youth specialists from Northwestern Health Unit. As the subject matter on organizational change is not very youth-oriented, this alternate arrangement seemed to work well in terms of keeping the youth engaged on Day One while the teachers and other public health staff attended the organizational change workshop. As evident from comments on Day Two, youth seemed to enjoy the Tobacco 101 course organized by the host organization.

Participants of the organizational change workshop at Thunder Bay, however, appreciated the resources along with the interactive activities such as icebreakers that helped participants network

with the others. Other key points that were well-liked included adherence to the agenda and the instructor's style of presenting information. There was one specific comment on the adaptability of the process to other projects, which was in fact a key point used to promote the workshops during the planning process.

"Enjoyed the interactive activities; activities kept members involved and focused; the opportunity to go through the entire book; staying on track"

"Instructor's style; relevance to job; adaptability of process to other projects; networking"

Chatham-Kent – October 17, 2005

Like Thunder Bay, the youth who participated in the Day One workshop at Chatham-Kent were given the opportunity to meet with the Mayor's Youth Council during the afternoon. However, a considerable number of participants (who attended the Day One workshop all day) endorsed the previously discussed points –

- (1) the interaction and creative sharing of ideas (resulting from group work),
- (2) the clear instructions and explanations provided by the presenter,
- (3) the usefulness of the workbook, handouts, and other workshop exercises,
- (4) the systematic pace of the workshop,
- (5) the applicability of the workshop process, and
- (6) the fun-filled icebreakers.

Some participants especially appreciated the diversity of the participant group (that also included youth) and the after-support service that could be availed by them.

"Speaker was very organized; great time allotted for group work; information is easily concertable to any organization"

"Dealing with a real issue that is catered to local needs; sharing of ideas across the room;; diversity of the group"

"The group interaction; the workbook - its nice to have a tangible item to take with us"

Participant Responses on Day Two (Youth Action Guide: Community-Based Tobacco Prevention)

Toronto – September 28, 2005; Petawawa – October 2, 2005

In Toronto and Petawawa, very similar to participant comments on Day One, things that were liked about the workshops included group interaction, workshop exercises (including case studies, community-mapping exercise, and goal-objective writing), and the facilitators. More specifically, there was a positive comment on the explanation of process and outcome objectives and the ideas for facilitating discussions. The real-time planning of projects in Petawawa was a very positive outcome for the workshops as a whole.

"My table, the workbook, walking through the book; clear cut exercises; the presenter very engaging, good facilitator; liked the level of interaction." – Toronto participant

“Workbooks - amazing tools; youth friendly lingo; the fact that a small group was accommodated re: time.” – Petawawa participant

“Didn't start that early in the morning; discussed a topic relevant to our centre; help discover possible solutions to the problems.” – Petawawa participant

Thunder Bay – October 14, 2005

At least 12 participants (also including youth) at Thunder Bay liked the aspects of group discussion and networking. Participants also appreciated the diversity of the group and the youth involvement in the process. In addition, a considerable number of participants indicated liking the following:

- (1) workbook and workshop exercises (including case studies, community-mapping exercise, the objectives game, and other interactive activities),
- (2) knowledge, presentation style, and flexibility of the facilitator, and
- (3) length and pace of the workshop.

There was more specific appreciation for the assistance provided in filling out the expense form and for the opportunity to work through every planning step of the case study or the real-time project.

“John and Alicia's presentation; meeting other youths; coming to the workshop and learn about tobacco” – youth participant

“How to approach teens more effectively; how people view their own communities as to where people gather to smoke; things that people find unpleasant about smoking and tobacco”

“Networking - having a diversified group of participants; having time to plan and ideas from others.”

“Take home workbooks; workshop exercises; interactive activities”

Chatham-Kent – October 18, 2005

Participants at the Chatham-Kent workshops commented on the (above) aspects indicated by participants at Thunder Bay in a positive way. Apart from the above aspects, other common things that were well-appreciated by several participants at Chatham-Kent included these:

- (1) opportunity to work on real-time projects,
- (2) applicability of process to specific projects in an organization,
- (3) interesting icebreakers,
- (4) food,
- (5) support in getting started on a project,
- (6) hands-on learning and
- (7) usefulness of networking and group work to name a few.

“Having youth present at the workshop to hear their thoughts; hands on learning; appropriateness”

“The presentations (ideas, steps, planning ,etc.); the group work/brainstorming; very organized”

“Group work; reporting back to group; facilitator continually roaming the room steering the discussion”

“Great workshop - practical, useful tools, information; very organized; supportive of youth”

4.7 What Participants Liked Least about the Workshops

Like the previous question, participants were then asked to list three things that they liked least about the workshop.

Participant Responses on Day One (Making Change Work in Youth-Serving Agencies)

Toronto – September 27, 2005

Day One in Toronto, *Making Change Work in Youth Serving Agencies* was the first workshop of the series and the first time the content of the workbooks had been presented in a workshop format. It was therefore a bit of a pilot. It was also the workshop with the most constructive criticism. Feedback from the participants was noted, and minor changes were made to the succeeding workshops based on participant ideas, suggestions, and criticisms.

1. Room and Food

Just over a quarter (26%) of the participants who responded to this question felt that the room set-up was not ideal and/or the food could have been better.

“Room set up in U shape to see everyone, lots of back turned”

“Have healthier breakfast options”

2. Pre-Workshop Organization - Subsidy Notification and Registration

Several participants felt they were not given enough notice that they would receive a travel subsidy.

“Shorter amount of time between registration and notification of travel subsidy. Four days notice does not give enough time to plan and bring a team for organizations with no funding”

A number of participants (17%) had difficulties registering for the workshops, particularly online.

“Online registration (needs to be more clear)”

One participant felt that it needed to be stressed to the participants prior to the workshop that they should have a change project in mind before coming. A couple of participants commented that the needs assessment form did not work (presume they mean online).

“Pre-test thing was confusing”

3. Content

Not enough focus on youth engagement

There was a lot of feedback about the content of the workshop. Many participants did not feel that *Making Change Work in Youth Serving Agencies* was focused enough on youth engagement. It appears that many of the participants did not read or understand the description of the two days. This workshop and workbook were not supposed to be youth engagement – focused, but rather focused on changes that need to happen on an organizational or structural level, before youth engagement in tobacco can take place. At subsequent workshops, a slide outlining the difference in content and focus of Day One and Day Two was added to the presentation, and a clear explanation was given for the same.

“I am unsure how this is about youth engagement! This seemed about organizational change and there is no focus on youth engagement research, principles or outcomes. Also, this process is actually not youth engagement if only adults are involved!”

“Did not discuss youth engagement (definition, core tenets, how to implement). Would have liked more direction of how to engage youth before undergoing a "change project”

Workshop aimed at youth centres and public health

There were also differing opinions about who the participants felt the workshop was aimed at. Some felt it was designed for youth centres; others felt it was better suited to public health unit personnel.

“Maybe the workshop should only be for public health staff (most relevant for us).”

“I did not feel this workshop was geared to youth programming; too much emphasis on ‘youth centres’.”

Work book exercises

Several participants felt that exercise two in the workbook was confusing. The facilitators totally agreed with this and restructured the exercises slightly for subsequent workshops. If the workbook gets updated in the future, it is strongly recommended that the given exercise is reviewed and edited.

“Ex.2 needs a lot of reworking to make it less confusing and to create better evaluation.”

“Ex. 2 was very confusing and unclear in usefulness.”

One participant also felt that the terminology used in the workbooks and workshop was too youth centre – centric.

Ice breakers

Interestingly, there was one participant who disliked the ice breaker activities and then, there were others who would have liked more of them.

“Would have enjoyed more icebreakers”

More time to learn from other participants' experiences

A few participants commented that they would have liked to share more and hear about others experiences.

“Increased communication with other organizations”

4. Workshop Format

Agenda / timing

A few participants felt that the day was too long or that a later start would have been more convenient. (The agenda was set with an 8:30 am registration and refreshments, and a 9-4 workshop.)

“Length of session/place, maybe half day instead.”

“10 AM start time to avoid morning rush hour.”

Small group work

Several participants would have liked the groups to be mixed up more, others felt that it would be useful for the small groups to be structured with people who have similar roles.

“Perhaps vary the groups periodically to work with two varieties of different participants”

“Put common people in groups”

Reporting back to whole group on small group work

A few participants felt that the reporting back to the whole group was a bit repetitive and redundant. The facilitator changed this for the other workshops.

“Sharing of case studies could be facilitated so it is not as redundant”

Interactivity

A couple of people felt the day could have been more interactive.

“It could be more interactive”

Petawawa – October 1, 2005

The Petawawa workshop consisted of a small group of 11 participants who were very positive about the workshop. Many of the participants (45%) said they could not think of anything they did not like about the workshop. It was clear from those that did give feedback that the main criticism of the workshop was that it was held on a weekend. Other comments were about the confusion with the registration process and the problems with accommodation. However, nothing negative was said about the actual content of the workshop or the format.

1. Weekend Not Ideal

One half of the participants who gave feedback on this question said they did not like coming to the workshop on a weekend, and it is speculated that this may have been the reason for lower attendance in Petawawa compared to other workshop locations, as Petawawa was the only weekend workshop.

“Timing - non-weekend”

“Not on weekend”

2. Registration Confusion

A third of the participants who provided feedback on things they disliked about the workshop felt that the registration process was confusing. This is a significant lesson learned as it would help inform future registration processes.

“Registration was a bit confusing”

3. Accommodation

One participant would have like to be made aware of the accommodation options earlier, while another did not like how the Base accommodation had their group spread out, rather than in rooms close together.

“Made aware of accommodations earlier”

“Our group was in different rooms in different ends of hallway”

Thunder Bay – October 13, 2005

In Thunder Bay, several participants did not respond to this question or responded by saying there was nothing they disliked about the workshop. From the available responses, the following four themes emerged.

1. Time to do small group activities

The main issue participants had was not having enough time to do the small group activities. The facilitator acknowledged this on Day Two and was more generous with time.

“Need more time to do small group work”

2. Room

A couple of people commented that the room was noisy and hard to hear in.

“Room - unfortunately there is a very noisy air conditioner just above our table - hard to hear the quieter people!”

3. Workshop Organization – Attendance and Scheduling

One participant felt that it would have been better if more people came from her community so that she had a group to continue working with on the project.

“I would like to have more schools/groups represented from my community so we could continue the project.”

Another person commented that it would have been better if the workshop was not scheduled on a Friday.

“Perhaps not scheduled for a Friday afternoon.”

4. Content of Workshop and Workbooks

A few participants who gave feedback felt that the workshop did not have enough focus on youth engagement. Others felt the workbook needed some language changes to reflect youth-focused organizations, not just youth centres.

“Take out the word centre and put in youth-focused organization”

Another participant felt that the language in the workbook was very open to different interpretation while yet another participant would have liked to see more movement between the small groups. This was something that did happen on Day Two.

Chatham-Kent – October 17, 2005

Overall, participants at Chatham-Kent had very few dislikes about the Day One workshop. Those who did raise issues, raised many of the same issues that others brought up at the previous workshops. The following four themes emerged.

1. Time to do small group activities

Like participants in other locations, some participants at Chatham felt that there was not enough time allocated on Day One for small group activities.

“More time to discuss group items”

2. Room and Food

A few participants commented that the venue in Chatham was too small, and the square tables were not very conducive to good small group work.

“Too small of a room”

3. Workshop Organization – Attendance and Scheduling

One teacher felt that Monday was not the best day for teachers to attend. It was also suggested that promotion through the school boards would have been useful.

4. Content and Format - Workshop and Workbooks

Few participants had suggestions for improving the content of the workshops and workbooks. These included focusing more on schools and student involvement with sample projects and incorporating more advanced planning content. One person suggested that the small groups be divided based on similar projects and more emphasis be placed on the action steps.

Participant Responses on Day Two (Youth Action Guide: Community Based Smoking Prevention)

Toronto – September 28, 2005

Day Two in Toronto, *Youth Action Guide: Community Based Smoking Prevention*, was the second workshop of the series and the first time the content of the Youth Action Guide book had been presented in a workshop format. Like Day One, it was therefore a bit of a pilot. Again, feedback from the participants was noted, and minor changes were made to the subsequent Day Two workshops. The participants were asked to list 3 things they disliked about the workshop. Responses fell into four major themes with several sub-themes.

1. Room and Food

Similar to Day One, many participants felt the layout of the room was not ideal for the workshop and that there could have been more food.

2. Pre-Workshop Organization and Registration

A few participants felt that the needs assessment and registration process were a bit confusing.

“Improved registration”

Some participants from outside of Toronto would have liked more information about accommodation close to the venue prior to coming.

“Provide to those who will be coming to the workshop a list of hotels”

3. Workshop Content

Audience - Who is it aimed at?

Several participants were already familiar with the content, indicating that perhaps we should have recruited more frontline workers and less management level professionals and public health unit employees.

“Not convinced it was directed to right audience, this is pretty standard operating procedure for public health staff. Not convinced it warranted a day away from office”

Youth engagement and access

A few participants suggested that the workshop needed to include more information on how to access or engage youth.

“I was hoping to have some discussion around youth recruitment. While I appreciated the youth engagement activities once the project takes shape, I would have liked to have discussed motivating youth to get involved and take part in the first place (this can be very hard!)”

“Need more info on research about the steps and receptiveness/engagement of youth in pilot.”

4. Workshop Format

Agenda / Timing

The majority of the feedback about Day Two related to the workshop format and timing. Approximately, a quarter of the participants commented on this. Feedback included making the workshop shorter and combining some of the Day One and Day Two content where it is repetitive. Interestingly, there was argument for spending both less and more time on activities.

PowerPoint slides

A couple of participants felt the PowerPoint slides were repetitive. Others wanted hard copies of the slides so they could follow along and an indication of how the slides relate to the workbook.

“Indicate where in the workbook you are relating to the PowerPoint presentation”

Interactivity

A few participants suggested more interactive activities such as role plays.

“Include role play, strategies workers can use that when engaging youth, modeling”

Petawawa – October 2, 2005

The participants at Petawawa were a small group of ten people on Day Two and were very positive about the workshop. Similar to Day One, the main criticism of the Day Two workshop was that it was held on a weekend. Other comments included: confusions with registration; increased youth attendance; and lack of information about accommodation. No one had any dislikes about the actual content of the workshop or the format – *“all good by me”*.

“Not on weekend”

“More info after registration as to what workshop is about; logistics i.e. location registration (more room in TO)”

“Youth encouraged to come”

“Info on where to stay hotel wise up front”

Thunder Bay – October 14, 2005

Day Two in Thunder Bay was well attended by youth, about 14 young people participated. Several participants did not list any dislikes and instead used the space to reaffirm their pleasure with the workshop – *“very good workshops”*. Rest of the feedback fell into five main themes:

1. More youth involvement and independence

Despite the fact this was one of the largest youth representation of all the four workshop locations, the participants felt that more youth involvement would have improved the workshop.

“More input from youth rather than the group”

“Have more youth involved”

Because of time restrictions, the large group of youth (who chose to all work together on small group activities) were often prompted by the facilitator into making a decision and moving through the exercises faster as the rest of the participants were often waiting for them. This was something that the feedback shows the youth did not like. It was stressed to them that the workshop was about working through the process, not necessarily designing an actual project as this would take weeks. However, the youth were keen on using the time to develop a real project plan and therefore were often slower than the other groups. In hindsight, the youth group should have been divided into two groups with each group including an adult to lead them.

“Let the youth more independently, have more discussions not so much lecture [and] let youth make their own decisions.”

2. Room and Space

Few people disliked the room and/or the food.

3. Workshop Content

The bulk of the comments relating to content were about making the content more interactive.

“More games”

“The objective search activity [was] useful”

Only one person commented that the content felt repetitive between Day One and Day Two.

“Less repetition. Feels as though we were going through the same information”

4. Workshop Format

Timing and agenda

A couple of participants felt the days were too long, while a few others would have liked more time to work on their action plans.

Number of participants

Some participants felt that the group was too large to work through exercises effectively.

Group mix

Several participants suggested mixing up the groups more on Day Two, particularly mixing the youth with the adults.

The Youth Action Guide

A few participants felt the Guide needed some reorganization while others felt the workshop should follow the Guide more closely.

“Book needs some help (organization of material) as discussed.”

Chatham-Kent – October 17, 2005

The Day Two workshop in Chatham Kent was attended by 30 adults and about 10 youth. The facilitator mixed the youth and adults up in small groups in response to the observation and feedback in Thunder Bay where all the youth worked together. This was a more effective way for the small groups to work and allowed the adults to experience first hand how the Youth Tobacco Action process would work with youth. Feedback fell into five main themes:

1. Room and Food

There was negative feedback on the room being too small, hot and cramped. Almost half of those who responded (48%), had feedback related to the room.

2. Timing and Agenda

A third of respondents (33%), commented on the timing of the day and in particular the time allocated for working in small groups on activities. Interestingly, they were equally divided with one-half saying they wanted more time to work on activities in small groups and the other half wanting less time for activities.

3. Youth Involvement

A few participants would have like to have been able to bring more youth along to the workshop.

“The opportunity to have brought more youth had the timeframe for registration not been rushed”

4. PowerPoint Slides

A few participants felt there were too many PowerPoint slides, while others wanted more information. A couple of people would have liked a hard copy of the slides to follow along with.

“Provide PowerPoint slides in hard copy to make notes as we go along”

5. Content

A couple of participants would have liked the content to be more complex and more specific to an organization.

4.8 Satisfaction with the Workshops

Participants were requested to record their level of satisfaction with the workshops. Responses were once again obtained on a five-point scale, where 1 was taken to mean “very unsatisfied” and 5 was taken to mean “very satisfied” with the workshop. Participants at the Toronto, Thunder Bay, and Chatham-Kent workshops indicated being quite satisfied with both workshops. Participants at Petawawa indicated being quite satisfied with the organizational change workshop and very satisfied with the youth action guide workshop. There was only one participant at Thunder Bay who indicated bring very unsatisfied with the youth action guide workshop.

Table 13: Overview of participants' indication of level of satisfaction with the workshops

Workshop Location		1 “very unsatisfied”	2	3	4	5 “very satisfied”
Toronto	Day 1	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	9 (26%)	19 (56%)	2 (6%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	11 (34%)	13 (41%)	5 (16%)
Petawawa	Day 1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (44%)	5 (56%)
Thunder Bay	Day 1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (9%)	10 (45%)	10 (45%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (23%)	19 (54%)	8 (23%)
Chatham-Kent	Day 1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	17 (65%)	6 (23%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	3 (11%)	2 (7%)	13 (48%)	9 (33%)

4.9 Recommending the Workshops

Participants were asked to indicate if they would recommend the given workshop to another youth-serving organization. Results are summarized in Table 14. The responses were very positive with the majority of participants (in some cases, even the whole group) indicating that they would recommend the given workshop to other youth-serving organizations. The lower scores in Toronto on Day One may have resulted from a misunderstanding of the workshop topic and different participant expectations. However, a description of both workshop topics was provided in the workshop promotional material and project website, and in the workshop package that was sent out to all participants prior to the workshop.

Table 14: Overview of participants' likelihood of recommending the workshop to another youth-serving organization

Workshop Location		“Yes”	“No”	“Maybe”
Toronto	Day 1	23 (68%)	2 (6%)	9 (39%)
	Day 2	23 (72%)	0 (0%)	9 (28%)
Petawawa	Day 1	10 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
	Day 2	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Thunder Bay	Day 1	21 (88%)	0 (0%)	3 (12%)
	Day 2	28	0	7

		(80%)	(0%)	(20%)
Chatham-Kent	Day 1	23 (88%)	0 (0%)	3 (12%)
	Day 2	41 (91%)	0 (0%)	4 (9%)

4.10 Workshop Information and Youth Tobacco Issues

In order to understand the utility of the two workshop topics, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which the processes taught at the workshops could help their organization with youth tobacco issues. Responses were recorded on a five-point scale where 1 was taken to mean “very low degree” and 5 was taken to mean “a great degree”. Participant responses to this question were quite mixed (please see Table 15). For example, most participants at the Thunder Bay and Chatham-Kent workshops marked a “4” while a “3” was more common for the organizational change workshops in Toronto and “4” more common on Day Two. In Petawawa, most participants recorded a “4” on Day One while most participants on Day Two indicated that the four step process (on Day Two) could help their organization with youth tobacco issues to a great degree.

Table 15: Overview of participants’ indication of usefulness of the workshop with youth tobacco issues

Workshop Location		1 “very low degree”	2	3	4	5 “a great degree”
Toronto	Day 1	1 (3%)	7 (21%)	13 (39%)	8 (24%)	2 (6%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	10 (32%)	15 (48%)	3 (10%)
Petawawa	Day 1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)
Thunder Bay	Day 1	1 (4%)	3 (13%)	6 (26%)	11 (48%)	2 (9%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (21%)	17 (50%)	9 (26%)
Chatham-Kent	Day 1	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	7 (30%)	11 (48%)	4 (17%)
	Day 2	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	5 (20%)	11 (44%)	6 (24%)

4.11 Next Steps

An important activity of the youth engagement training project is the follow-up module that is built into the project as a service offered to all project participants. It is hoped that participants would start and implement a project based on both or one of the workshop topics. The last couple of questions were asked to get a better understanding of what participants intended to do after the workshop.

First, participants were asked to indicate what their next step would be when they went back to their organization after their workshop. The evaluation form provided three closed-ended choices to incite action steps, and also provided an open-ended option for participants to communicate any other plans they had in mind. Participants were also allowed to check more than one option.

As Table 16 indicates, most participants indicated discussing the workshop outcomes with their colleagues or their managers. A stronger inclination to use the workshop lessons to discuss a project was also shown by quite a few people who intended to plan a meeting to discuss starting a project based on the given workshop. Another notable point is that more participants planned on discussing a youth action project vis-à-vis an organizational change project.

Table 16: Overview of participants’ next action step post-workshop

Workshop Location		“Talk to my colleague about the workshop”	“Talk to my manager about the workshop”	“Plan a meeting to discuss a project based on ‘this’ workshop”
Toronto	Day 1	19	22	9
	Day 2	17	20	9
Petawawa	Day 1	8	7	5
	Day 2	9	6	6
Thunder Bay	Day 1	13	16	9
	Day 2	22	16	14
Chatham-Kent	Day 1	13	13	17
	Day 2	22	16	27

A considerable number of participants who indicated having other plans at all four locations implied that they would start a project or put a plan (worked on at the workshop) to action once they got back to their organization.

More specifically, other action steps that certain participants intended taking after they got back to their organization included these: (1) talking to youth about using the process, especially the youth action guide, (2) share the workshop process and information with their team, and (3) use the workshop tool to guide processes in the organization and in other groups such as youth councils and school-based committees.

Apart from the above ideas, certain participants at the Thunder Bay workshops also indicated sharing the workshop process with community partners to ensure consistency in process and language.

4.12 Intention to Start a Project

Then, participants were asked to indicate their intention to start a project based on a workshop. Timelines were provided as options if their intention was positive; barriers to action were solicited for negative intentions; and reasons were explored if the participant was undecided.

It is very encouraging to note from Table 17 that a considerable number of participants; in fact more than half the attendees at all four locations intend to start a project based on both or one

workshop(s). At Petawawa, although the number of attendees was very moderate, all the participants indicated that they would start a project – an outcome that could effectively meet the overall project objectives. The other key point that logically flows from Table 16 is the increased number of positive answers for starting a youth action project vis-à-vis an organizational change project.

Table 17: Participants’ Intention to Start a Project

Workshop Location		“Yes”	“No”	“Undecided”
Toronto	Day 1	17	3	14
	Day 2	21	0	10
Petawawa	Day 1	10	0	0
	Day 2	9	0	0
Thunder Bay	Day 1	16	4	5
	Day 2	27	1	6
Chatham-Kent	Day 1	21	2	3
	Day 2	39	0	3

As shown by Table 18, a one – two month period seems to be the preferred timeline to start a project by most participants. It is particularly interesting to note that several participants who attended the Chatham-Kent workshops indicated starting a youth action project the week after the workshop was held. This information could be very useful in planning the follow-up consultations.

Table 18: If marked “Yes”, then estimated timeline indicated by participants

Workshop Location		Next week	Two weeks	One month	Two months	Over two months
Toronto	Day 1	1	2	7	5	2
	Day 2	-	-	7	10	2
Petawawa	Day 1	3	2	1	2	-
	Day 2	1	2	2	2	-
Thunder Bay	Day 1	1	4	10	-	1
	Day 2	4	4	10	5	2
Chatham-Kent	Day 1	1	3	5	8	1
	Day 2	12	3	10	9	1

Barriers

Another encouraging point to note (please see Table 17) is the relatively small number of participants who may not be starting any projects based on the workshop(s) they attended. A barrier in starting a project especially in Toronto and Petawawa was the limited decision-making authority. Common barriers expressed by attendees of the Thunder Bay workshops included workload resulting from ongoing projects and pre-planned projects, and pending input from “to-be-hired” youth advisors. More specifically for the organizational change project, the lack of authority to make organizational changes was cited as a barrier.

Reasons given for not starting a project by participants of the Chatham-Kent workshops included present workload and uncertainty in getting the organization interested in a project.

Reasons for Uncertainty

Participants who indicated uncertainty in starting a project were also asked to cite reasons for the same. For attendees of the Toronto workshops, the common reasons for being unsure about starting both or either project involved uncertainty in the applicability of the topic to the organization structure, role limitations, management and team decisions, and funding and timeline issues. However, at least three participants indicated that the workshop lessons could be incorporated into their existing projects. One participant even commented that the process could be used to support a youth action project for the wider community if the time was available. In general, the reasons for being undecided about starting a youth action project seemed very similar to the responses obtained for the Day One workshop.

The common reason for being undecided about starting a project based on the workshop topic(s) for attendees of Thunder Bay and Chatham-Kent workshops seemed to be the lack of time. Other specific reasons cited by participants at Thunder Bay for being uncertain about starting an organizational change project included decisions of the senior management and the needs of the community.

5. Significant Lessons Learned

As the above evaluation report indicates, the YETP workshops ran very successfully and were very well attended by participants from all over Ontario. It has been repeatedly acknowledged that certain organizations welcomed the free training and the free project support in the post-workshop phase. Several youth-serving organizations may not have been able to attend the workshops if they weren't given certain travel subsidies. In fact, several youth-serving organizations that have contacted TYPS (Town Youth Participation Strategies) have provided very positive feedback about the workshops and the process that was followed on each workshop day.

However, as always, there was also some constructive criticism from which the following significant lessons emerged.

- **Workshop Timing:** It is strongly recommended that weekends be avoided to run workshops as it impedes attendance. Participants seemed to prefer workshops that are held during the week. Even in terms of the length of the workshops, it was suggested that the workshop on Day Two could end early so that commuters could reach home in comfortable time.
- **Order of Workshops:** It was a good idea to run the organizational change workshop on Day One and the youth engagement workshop on Day Two as it seemed to flow well in that order. However, certain repetitive information can be either deleted or replaced.
- **Workbook Revision:** From the feedback obtained from participants and from the actual experience of running both organization change and youth action processes for the first time in a workshop format, it is clear that both workbooks need some revisions if there is a future opportunity to do so.
- **Online Registration Process:** Online registration forms can be very useful if they are set up with a two-click method of completing the registration.

- **Sufficient Notice about Travel Subsidies:** It may have been more convenient to participants if they were informed about the status of their travel subsidy applications well in advance so that they could arrange for accommodations. This could be especially significant where group attendance is involved as arrangements have to be made for the entire group.
- **Group Mix:** Although youth may want to sit together in one group, facilitators should insist to split the groups up in such a way that every youth group also includes an adult who could provide the youth with the guidance to move the group along with the pace of the workshop.
- **Workshop Audience:** Although the workshop promotional materials included public health units as an audience along with youth-serving organizations and youth, it may serve well to specify that the workshop processes may be good learning opportunities for front line staff in public health units as opposed to senior-level staff.
- **Request for Evidence:** An interesting point that emerged during the workshops was the request to read the research that resulted in the processes followed by the workbooks and consequently the workshops. There were few requests to see the evidence backing the processes and the related literature. Some participants believed that such research could promote increased community and youth buy-ins for the action projects. So, a possible next step (if there is the opportunity) could be to present the research that has guided the development of the two workbooks.
- **Project Title:** The project title “Youth Engagement Training Project” seemed to confuse some participants about the content of the workshops. Several participants (especially in Toronto) where the first set of workshops was held thought that the workshop on Day One would encompass youth engagement. In order to avoid this confusion in subsequent workshops, participants were provided with a clear explanation of what each workshop topic involved. However, if this project is continued in the future, it is strongly recommended to rephrase the title to include the aspect of organizational change.

Conclusion

The workshop evaluation data has been very useful in identifying participant needs and “best steps” to promote future workshops. The main objective of the youth engagement project was to empower youth-serving organizations in youth action by providing them with the skills to successfully engage youth in tobacco action projects. It was very encouraging to note that the training sessions were also attended by organizations that were involved with issues other than tobacco. Also significant is the feedback obtained from some of these organizations that felt that the process taught at the workshops was in fact “*applicable to any organization.*”

Following the training that was provided, it is hoped that the participant organizations do obtain the time and resources to start and implement an action project – the process facilitated by the workbook that they took back from the workshop and the free consultation and support that they could receive up to March 2006. A point to note is that there may be more youth action projects resulting from the workshops as opposed to organizational change projects. It is also hoped that the significant lessons that emerged from the YETP workshops inform future training opportunities.

Youth Engagement Training Project (YETP)

Workshop Evaluation Form

Please take a few extra minutes to let us know what you thought of the workshop. The input you provide will help us know how well we are meeting your needs, and how we can do better.

Please rate the following aspects of the workshop. In the first column we ask that you rate the quality of each item. In the second column we would like you to tell us how useful you believe each item may prove to be in your current or proposed work. For each, please use a five-point rating scale where 1 is taken to mean “very low” quality or usefulness and 5 is taken to mean “very high” quality or usefulness.

EVALUATION ITEM	QUALITY	USEFULNESS
Case studies	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Workbook	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Workshop exercises/activities	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Workshop as a whole	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Planning and promotion	1 2 3 4 5	
Length of session	1 2 3 4 5	
Registration process, name tags	1 2 3 4 5	
Food & Refreshments	1 2 3 4 5	
Room	1 2 3 4 5	
Venue	1 2 3 4 5	

2. Please rate how much you liked the format of the workshops. 1 is taken to mean “did not like it at all” and 5 is taken to mean “liked it a lot”.

1 2 3 4 5

3. Please rate the time availability to complete the activities. 1 is taken to mean “there was very little time”, 5 is taken to mean “there was too much time”, and 3 is taken to mean “just about the right time.”

1 2 3 4 5

4. Please rate your ability to support a project that is based on this workshop. 1 is taken to mean “you feel most unable” and 5 is taken to mean “you feel most able”.

1 2 3 4 5

5. Please list up to three things you liked about the workshop.

6. Please list up to three things you would change about the workshop.

7. Please rate your level of satisfaction with the workshop. 1 is taken to mean “very unsatisfied” and 5 is taken to mean “very satisfied”.

1 2 3 4 5

8. Will you recommend this workshop to another youth-serving organization? Please check the circle.

- Yes
- No
- Maybe

9. Please rate to what degree this process will help your organization with youth tobacco issues? 1 is taken to mean “very low degree” and 5 is taken to mean “a great degree.”

1 2 3 4 5

10. What is the next step that you plan on taking after going back to your organization? You may check more than one circle.

- Talk to my colleague about the workshop.
- Talk to my manager about the workshop.
- Plan a meeting to discuss a project based on this workshop.
- Other: Please specify.

.....

11. Do you intend starting a project based on this workshop? Please check the circle.

- Yes - How soon? (Please circle one.)

next week two weeks one month two months

- No - Why not? Please state barriers.

.....

- Undecided - Please state reasons.

.....

Thank you for taking the time to provide us with this important feedback.