



Arizona State Public Health Laboratory System Assessment Participant Evaluation Results

Thank you to everyone that provided feedback, we appreciate and take your suggestions seriously.

Utility of Meeting:

- Stated objectives of meeting were met.....
- Dialogue was useful.....
- I support the efforts being made.....
- Next steps are clear.....
- Meeting was a good use of my time.....

POOR		GOOD		SUPERB
1	2	3	4	5
		4	19	9
		2	20	16
		1	10	19
	4	10	14	3
		6	19	7

Meeting Arrangements:

- Advance notice of the meeting.....
- Meeting Room Accommodations.....
- Advance materials for meeting were useful.....
- Advance materials were received with time to review.....

POOR		GOOD		SUPERB
1	2	3	4	5
	1	7	11	14
		2	14	16
1		10	10	10
1	2	8	11	10

Flow of Meeting:

- Started on time.....
- Clear objectives for meeting.....
- Agenda followed or appropriately amended.....
- Facilitation was effective.....
- The “right” people were at the meeting.....

POOR		GOOD		SUPERB
1	2	3	4	5
		3	9	19
		6	14	12
		2	10	18
		4	11	17
	3	6	16	7

- Would you participate in this process again?.....
- Do you see this as a helpful tool and process?.....

YES	NO
32	
32	

What worked:

- Commitment from people; communication
- Good to allow feedback about ASL, their work and how to improve
- Open discussion
- This evaluation was good – exposed things even we can work on
- Everything – nicely done
- The time limit at times is restrictive, but it did keep things moving and the program will help for the future
- Communication
- Breaking up the day and topics in groups
- The format and wide selection of participants
- Discussion
- Small groups for discussion/breakout sessions
- Group discussion
- Breakout sessions and having lots of groups represented
- It was a good knowledge event
- Good groups

What could be improved:

- A diversity of participants within each group could have been better
- Nothing please take suggestions and apply it
- Just keeping having these
- Need more upper management response
- Have similar workshops in the future to monitor progress made and to define new objectives and goals
- Communication
- Maybe doing the same activity but for each separate lab type
- Electronic media
- A little confusion between state lab system and state lab
- Audio/visual
- The groups focused on the PH Lab primarily, less on the “system” as defined in the handouts
- Consistent background information
- Distribute material ahead of time
- Be more clear on plan of what will be done with feedback
- Some of the groups may have rated too high
- Groups had great breadth of knowledge but may have been too broad
- Have knowledge of our specific areas, hard to rate others you know little about

General:

- ES10 – seemed like more of an internal function, not much value added with external partners
- If funded tool and process are helpful
- Don't agree with SPHL system and chronic disease tracking at this time
- Look forward to seeing the report

- Technology not good in room
- Rooms were warm
- Next steps/outcomes are unclear. They are stated but lacked specifics