

Program Evaluation

Quality of program materials (as evidenced by relevance, substance and readability)

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
9	12	0	0	0	0	4.4

Effectiveness of the discussion leader: Knowledge of subject matter

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
16	5	0	0	0	0	4.8

Effectiveness of the discussion leader: Presentation skills

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
13	8	0	0	0	0	4.6

Effectiveness of the discussion leader: Enthusiasm for the program

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
21	0	0	0	0	0	5.0

What characteristics did you appreciate most in the Discussion Leader? Suggest ways he/she could improve his/her effectiveness.

She was very enthusiastic and informative. I would recommend covering more technical information in the morning as opposed to the afternoon sessions in order to guarantee the information is understood and absorbed. Some of the more relevant information was covered late in the afternoon when everyone's attention span was dwindling.

She was very receptive to our questions and kept the group engaged through multiple team building exercises.

Leader mixed in group discussions/activities well during presentations.

I appreciated the instructor's enthusiasm and ability to encourage people to participate.

Melissa was very enthusiastic about the material being covered, which made it easier to stay focused.

I liked her energy.

She was very energetic which was helpful.

She is very knowledgeable and enthusiastic. Nothing to suggest in terms of improvement. She was great.

She was very good at ensure the class was participating in all areas and it was hands on and not so much a lecture.

She was very enthusiastic and kept the group on track.

Good energy, made discussion interactive

I appreciated her enthusiasm about the discussion topic and her efforts to bring everyone's participations.

She was very enthusiastic and engaging. Her energy lever did not waiver over the 3 days of training which was very refreshing.

Melissa had great enthusiam and kept my attention throughout the training.

She was very easy to talk to one-on-one and it was also easy to answer open discussion questions without feeling bad for wrong/different answer.

She had a lot of enthusiasm which made it more interesting.

High energy, entertaining, knowledgeable, kept group interested,

Her enthusiasm on the subjects

Very upbeat and engaging

Her enthusiasm was welcomed and got the group participating regularly.

I liked her participative teaching style.

Program Evaluation

Please describe any other observations or recommendations that you may have about the program

Melissa was a great presenter that worked hard to keep the group engaged in the program material.

Nothing noted

N/A.

I cannot think of any recommendations.

The program felt very level-appropriate.

None.

None noted

The program overall was great and provided a lot of opportunities for me to "connect the dots" on several audit areas.

More time devoted to technical issues and risk assessment procedures would be preferred.

Overall, the program was useful. I was hoping for more time on modifying audit programs based on what we learned about risk-based auditing.

More in-depth and diversified discussion topics

Using computers did not prove to be helpful to me for this training.

n/a

Very audit focused. I enjoyed the personal development parts

None, it was very well done

Enjoyable program, I learned a lot and Melissa was a very good instructor.

None noted

Number of months you have been in public accounting:

	<u># Responses</u>
37 - 48	6
49 - 60	5
Less than 36	4
Over 60	6

Topical Evaluation

Fraud and Estimates: Rating

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
5	15	1	0	0	0	4.2

Fraud and Estimates: Time Spent

	<u># Responses</u>
OK	20
Too Much	1

Entry Level Controls: Rating

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
3	17	1	0	0	0	4.1

Entry Level Controls: Time Spent

	<u># Responses</u>
OK	19
Too Little	1
Too Much	1

Risk Assessment and Responding to Risks: Rating

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
7	14	0	0	0	0	4.3

Risk Assessment and Responding to Risks: Time Spent

	<u># Responses</u>
OK	18
Too Little	2
Too Much	1

Financial Statements: Rating

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
4	12	5	0	0	0	4.0

Financial Statements: Time Spent

	<u># Responses</u>
OK	15
Too Little	6

Responding to Assertion: Rating

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
6	12	3	0	0	0	4.1

Responding to Assertion: Time Spent

	<u># Responses</u>
OK	20
Too Little	1

Topical Evaluation

Communication: Rating

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
12	9	0	0	0	0	4.6

Communication: Time Spent

	# Responses
OK	16
Too Much	5

Business Etiquette and Networking: Rating

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
10	10	1	0	0	0	4.4

Business Etiquette and Networking: Time Spent

	# Responses
OK	15
Too Little	5
Too Much	1

Leadership and Motivating Team Members: Rating

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
9	12	0	0	0	0	4.4

Leadership and Motivating Team Members

If you rated topics low, indicate any that were not relevant to your needs:

Fraud and Estimates,Entry Level Controls,Risk Assesment and Responding to Risks,Financial Statements,Responding to Assertion,Communication,Business Etiquette and Networking,Leadership and Motivating Team Members
 Responding to Assertion,Leadership and Motivating Team Members
 Risk Assesment and Responding to Risks

If you rated topics low, please indicate any that were too elementary:

Fraud and Estimates,Financial Statements
 Leadership and Motivating Team Members
 Risk Assesment and Responding to Risks,Financial Statements

If you rated topics low, please indicate any that were too advanced:

Topical Evaluation

Observations about the course:

Overall, the course was relevant to my practice in public accounting.

Solid subject matter and presentation. Double check and make sure material is not presented also during other AGN Level trainings.

I thought the course did a good job of mixing both technical topics and soft skills.

Everyone in the class seemed to stay engaged in the topics much more so than I have noticed in past trainings.

About half of time focused on communication, leadership skills and etiquette. I felt like it should have been only 1/4 of focus. At my level, I need to really ingrain the reasons for risk assessment and how much is too much documentation and how much is not enough documentation. Other than that, it was wonderful.

Well-designed.

Very well done.

Good coverage of "soft skills"

Course was useful, time was spent well.

Most of learning materials were redundant from previous courses and did not have much advanced (or new) topics.

The topics were fine, I felt the review of audit planning was extremely elementary, it has been covered in other levels extensively.

Level 4 was the first training that I felt met my needs. Levels 1-3 seemed to not meet my needs as far as what was expected of me at my firm. However, Level 4 was very beneficial to me individually.

All subject matter was good and relevant, but I felt that too much time was spent on the leadership section, particularly the personality tests and exercises

Very well done

Overall solid course. Nice mix of technical topics and other skill sets (i.e. leadership, networking, etc.).

Please suggest any additional topics that would be relevant to someone at this state of their career:

Addressing new standards

Nothing noted

N/A.

I think all relevant topics were covered.

Conflict Management, Communicating 'Up'

Since laptops were brought, I believe a hands-on approach would have been beneficial with each participant completing forms, etc for an actual client. Some people learn better by actually completing the work.

Perhaps more overall discussion regarding each individual's concern re: public accounting and Firm policies.

Managing up to ensure as seniors we are working ot control managers and partners.

Audit program modification based on risks

- Financial statement disclosure requirements
- Accounting updates
- Working with supervisors

Topics appears relevant.

Presentation skills for board meetings

None noted.

Sunday Night

Quality of food/service

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
5	8	7	1	0	0	3.8

Facility

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
4	12	4	1	0	0	3.9

Comments

Nothing noted

Sunday night was enjoyable.

I think the food and room were both satisfactory.

The food was OK, would have been nicer if we had done some type of structured activity since it was a required event.

None.

Thank you for letting it be a networking dinner and not an "activity" dinner (i.e., icebreaker activities). I prefer a meet-and-greet and felt like the Sunday dinner was more "adult" and I appreciated it very much.

A group building exercise would have been helpful to get people out of their "clicks"

Enjoyed the dinner-only activity and having a chance to catch-up with past attendees.

None

The room for dinner was bigger than the room we were training in. We had to wait for a long time before we could eat outside of the room, which was not beneficial to people who were hungry and traveled all day.

It was VERY nice to not have to do team building activities on Sunday night.

No icebreaker. I think this would have been helpful to get to know everyone.

Nice meeting room, good food. No complaints.

Monday Night

Quality of food/service

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
1	6	4	7	3	0	2.8

Facility

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
2	7	10	2	0	0	3.4

Comments

Perhaps find a different venue other than the Bass Pro Shop restaurant.

A better restaurant should be selected for next year.

Group said fish and shrimp were enjoyable. Chicken and steak were not satisfactory.

I thought the facility was quite unique.

The food was not very appetizing, but the service was fine.

The food was horrible. We were placed in small room with warm temperature atmosphere. However, the Bass Pro Shop part was nice.

Nice place. Steak was a little dry.

No comments

Foods (esp. main entrees & desserts) were mediocre at best.

We had to wait a long time before we could eat, and it felt as if we were stuck at the restaurant. We spent 3 hours there, it made for a long unenjoyable evening.

Dinner was terrible at BassPro Shop!

Service was good, food was below average

Solid dinner. Although maybe something in the city would be preferred for those traveling into Denver from other locations...just a thought

Evaluation of Facility

Meeting Room

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
4	11	4	2	0	0	3.8

Sleeping Room

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
10	9	1	0	1	0	4.3

Group Meals

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
5	7	6	3	0	0	3.7

Refreshment Breaks

5	4	3	2	1	0	Avg
10	10	1	0	0	0	4.4

Suggest ways to improve the administration of the program:

Nothing noted

Better location. Group tried to network (i.e. go out for an adult beverage) and could not get transportation back to the hotel in the local area.

I cannot think of any ways in which the administration of the program could be improved.

The meeting room was a bit cramped for the size of the class, especially considering that there were several group exercises that required you to be up and moving around the room.

Choose a larger room.

Since laptops were required, more space for each participant would have been nice. We felt a little tight on space.

None noted. I liked the hotel and would stay there again.

None. Very well done

More breaks would have been nice - there were points when alot of people were leaving the room to go to the bathroom, get a drink, etc.

More frequent but short breaks (5-10min break every hour).

The room was not big enough for the group, and we were constatnly tripping on wire for computers that were useless and a distraction.

Breakfast at the facility left A LOT to be desired. Lunch had a good variety of food. However, the quality just was not there.

None

None noted.