



Mojave Listed Mammals Symposium:

February 21-22, 2016

Evaluation Summary



Final participation number: 57 (including guest speakers)

Number of Responses to Evaluation: 12

Please evaluate the workshop by answering the questions below. A rating of 5 is highest, best, or most and 1 is lowest, least, or worst except for rating on registration cost.

1) To what extent were your personal/professional objectives satisfied?

N=12, Average 4.58 (range 3-5)

Comments:

Loved learning about the vole

Great opportunity to learn the newest, latest info from the people that are on the ground doing the work.

Good variety of perspectives (students/researchers, Agency reps, long-term experts)

2) To what extent did the classroom environment contribute to the learning experience?

N=12, Average 4.22 (range 3-5)

Comments:

Other than abstracts, no course handouts; but I didn't feel any were needed

Issues with the clicker were distracting

Kinda cold

The variety of perspectives from speakers led to good conversations and opportunity to think about conservation issues and possible management approaches in new ways

TWS Response: In the future, please don't wait for the evaluation to tell us about "clicker issues" and room temperature! On the former, we can talk with presenters, but I suspect that some of these issues were related to the very large (60 megabyte and larger) PowerPoints.

3) To what extent did the course materials contribute to the learning experience?

N=9, Average 4.1 (range 3-5)

Comments:

5 (if that includes PowerPoint PDF)

Looking forward to checking out MGS literature compilation

TWS Response: PowerPoints (in PDF format) should be available in a few weeks.

4) To what extent were the objectives stated in the promotional literature or those stated at the beginning of the symposium satisfied?

N=12, Average 4.67 (range 3-5)

Comments:

Would have been nice if more specific info provided on individual talks was posted prior to symposia

TWS Response: Titles and abstracts were posted about 2 weeks before the event; that's not ideal, but pretty good...

5) To what extent did the symposium contain significant and current intellectual or practical information?

N=12, Average 4.83 (range 4-5)

Comments:

Would have liked to see more MGS talks, but I think they were probably not as abundant because of (tomorrow's) TAG meeting

It was great to hear M. Matoq's genetic tissue sample results for MGS. Very up-to-date research results that were presented

Some excellent, thorough speakers

6) How would you rate the registration fees for the symposium? (5 = Too High, 1 = Too Low)

N=8, Average 3.5 (range 3-5) [reminder: our target for this question is 3 or "about right"]

TWS Response: Seems like we were about right. Remember to take advantage of early registration AND member registration rates whenever you can...

7) I would like to suggest the following topics for workshops/conferences:

Regional water management and how that affects wildlife management

Other special status small mammals that are declining in populations, e.g. LA PM, PPM, Tehachapi PM

Anything else you'd like to say?

Comments:

Appreciate offering contact info on presenters to engage in follow-up questions/coordination