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Introduction

MSU-ADVANCE TRACS project is in its second year of implementation. This mid-year evaluation report covers TRACS activities from July through November 2013, including: two workshops, two Equity-Advocates trainings, and a boot-camp focused on grant proposal writing. These activities address TRACS’s Objective 1: “Transform the culture of the MSU-Bozeman campus” by implementing sustainable strategies, programs, and policies that allow diverse faculty to flourish”, and Objective 3: “Broaden the participation of women faculty in STEM/SBS”. In addition activities’ outcomes will contribute to the achievement of the second objective on “Foster psychological need support for women STEM/SBS faculty”.

The workshops were offered face-to-face to faculty and staff of the MSU-Bozeman campus. The workshop “Hastening Diversity at MSU” was conducted by Dr. JoAnn Moody, Diversity on campus, on September 17-18, and was offered in a number of sessions, each geared to a different TRACS stakeholder group. “Examining the Bias that Bind Us” workshop was conducted by Dr. Toni Schmader, University of British Columbia, on October 25, and was open to the MSU community. The Equity Advocates training was offered twice to accommodate the schedule of two groups of faculty Advocates, right before and after the Schmader workshop. The training was facilitated by TRACS project’s directors and MSU Human Resources affiliated personnel. The Grant Writing Boot Camp was offered to MSU-Bozeman STEM and SBS faculty. The camp was facilitated by Micaela Young, staff of ADVANCE-TRACS, and it took place during the span of six weeks, from September 16 through October 18. The results presented in this report are derived from quantitative and qualitative data. The methods of data collection included surveys (with Likert-type and open-ended questions), face-to-face interviews, and field observations. The surveys were developed in collaboration with ADVANCE-TRACS external evaluator, Dr. Mariko Chang.

This report is organized in the following way: The first section focuses on the workshops, the second section addresses the Equity Advocates trainings, while the last section presents results of the Grant Writing Boot Camp.
Section 1

Hastening Diversity at MSU Workshop

Focus: “practical ways to improve faculty and staff recruitment, retention, and mentorship, especially of under-represented women in science-related fields and underrepresented minorities in all fields.”

Format: Interactive discussion based on five handouts, “Rising Above Cognitive Errors” (typical biases in faculty searches, evaluation, and decision making); “Typical Lines of Resistance & Confusion Regarding Faculty & Campus Diversity” (practice statements); “Early-Career Faculty Group, Grinnell College” (case study); “Discussion Scenario: Faculty Search Process” (scenarios); and “Checklist for Hiring Department and Its Chair” (checklist). A three-hour workshop was presented to different constituency groups, including Equity Advocates, President’s Commission On the Status of University Women (PCOSUW), Developing Excellence in Academic Leadership (DEAL) group, and a session for Deans and Department Chairs.

Impact:

- Was attended by 91 faculty and staff: 26 STEM, 17 SBS, and 46 staff from administrative units (HR, OSP, Ac. Affairs, etc.) and faculty from other departments (Architecture, Music, etc.)
- Participants found most useful: the discussions (academic/staff views; welcoming new faculty); information on cognitive errors; scenarios; opportunity for self-discoveries; and applicability of the handouts.
- Participants suggested enhancing the organization and pace of the workshops; find more realistic search models; and differentiate workshop content for faculty and staff audiences.
- As a result of this workshop, participants will: apply the information to search committees; avoid rushed decisions; advocate for inclusiveness (lines of resistance); and be aware of self-biases.
- Participants were pleased with the opportunity to discuss equity/diversity issues regarding minority faculty recruitment and retention. One comment challenged the definition of “solo” faculty; and other comment shown skepticism of “differential treatment” of hires strategy.

Evaluation results were obtained from participant satisfaction surveys (see Appendix A) completed at the end of each session. The survey includes Likert-type and open-ended questions. The Likert questions included three category questions: about cognitive errors and organization dysfunctions; “solo” faculty; and workshop recommendation. Results are shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2.
Figure 1. Hastening Diversity Workshop results. Cognitive errors and dysfunctions of organizations.

Figure 2. Hastening Diversity Workshop results. “Solo” faculty and workshop recommendation.


Results were also analyzed by participant group to find common trends within a group. It is noticed that the Equity Advocate group was the most receptive of this workshop; while DEAL group was more critical of it. Although staff participants of DEAL, and PCOSUW groups acknowledged the relevance of this workshop, they expressed that greater benefits will happen if the workshop will be more specialized for faculty and non-faculty audiences.
Examining the Biases that Bind Us
Focus: triggering factors and effects of negative group stereotypes on academic performance and gender policies capacity to alleviate them.
Format: Lecture open to the MSU community; duration: one hour. This lecture was adjacent to Equity Advocates training.
Impact:
- Was attended by 50 faculty and staff: 11 STEM, 22 SBS, and 17 staff from administrative units (HR, OSP, Ac. Affairs, etc.) and faculty from other departments (Architecture, Music, etc.)
- Participants found most useful the organization of the talk, the presented research, and its content (stereotype threats, gender policies in workplaces, and parent’s role on children’s career perception) – “Identifying the role of fathers and males in the work force are important in shifting culture and future aspirations… cool stuff”, “true cognitive component of bias and how it leads to the phenomenon that people live up to the negative expectation”
- Participants suggested the presentation could benefit from: having handout with the cited references and specific terminology, allowing more time, having a short engaging activity, and provide real contexts for the research claims.
- As a result of this presentation, participants will: advocate for gender equity and anti-stereotype, self-monitor the influence of biases on their own perception of self, self-awareness of stereotype influence on “my cognitive thought and self-doubts”, self-monitor the effect of implicit biases in their interaction with their family – “I will continue to support my wife in domestic work (making dinner, doing dishes, etc.) as I see how it can improve possibly for my daughter to achieve more out in the career world”, interaction with colleagues – “Will work to get involved others, specially my Dean”, and will incorporate gender policies at MSU to improve the working climate and outcomes – “I will bring this concept up when discussing the importance of what we are doing with Advance and PCOSUW.”
- Participants were very engaged with the presentation and posed many follow up questions – “would be interesting to hear about stereotype threatening for men, especially as more men are becoming stay-at-home dads.” One comment challenged the used terminology and the implication that ST is highly important. One participant wished this session was recorded.

Evaluation results were obtained from participant satisfaction surveys (see Appendix B) completed at the end of the presentation. The survey includes Likert-type and open-ended questions. Results are shown in Figure 3.
Lessons Learned from Workshops

- **There is a great institutional momentum for cultural attunement.** This trend is reflected by the large number of participants in each of the three workshops, the acknowledgement of the need to discuss equity issues in a safe environment - “These discussions are not frequent on these topics” - and praising comments across workshops and audience groups - “Wonderful opportunity, thank you.” In particular the Equity Advocates group welcomed the opportunity to share stories about people’s experience with equity/diversity issues on campus.

- **Faculty and staff welcome opportunities to learn from each other.** “[most useful] Different view of academics vs. staff. Always good to hear another viewpoint.”

- **Workshops that present research are overwhelmingly welcomed** – “Good innovative results.”

- **Workshops that address different audiences have to explicitly reflect that in their content focus and resources** “I was challenged about the faculty focus, but I learned a great deal”. Handouts could include examples and case studies from both, faculty and staff communities. In addition it might be beneficial for the presenters to explore what the host institution has been doing in regard to equity/diversity prior to the visit to avoid redundancy. “Nothing new, but having issues made explicit was very helpful”
and minimize non-relevant examples “an in-house conversation would have been better.”

- **Preference for structured workshops.** Including a brief description of the format of the workshop in the invitation might be beneficial “I expected more lecture and less discussion.”
Section 2

Equity Advocates Training

Equity Advocates (EA) are MSU faculty and staff that serve the campus community by promoting and enhancing fairness, diversity, equity, and inclusiveness for all students, faculty, and staff. Equity Advocates are available to: 1) talk with people about their equity concerns and experiences in an informal, non-judgmental setting; and 2) promote the values of inclusion and diversity embodied in the President’s Commission on the Status of University Women, the MSU Strategic Plan, and the ADVANCE Project TRACS.

A total of fifteen Advocates attended the training sessions, in addition to TRACS Director and Co-Director, and two facilitators. These sessions focused on presenting very comprehensive material including language about Title IX, historical vignette of a litigation case at MSU, resources from the University of Wisconsin, research paper abstracts on the role of equity in academia, resources from “Hastening Diversity at MSU” workshop conducted by Dr. JoAnn Moody, and Equity Advisory material from other institutions. Dianne Letendre, Director of Institutional Equity, and Corky Bush, Former Director of Human Resources/Affirmative Action, focused on the role of the Advocates with respect of Title IX mandate, their responsibilities and report duties. Participants and facilitators shared experiences and analyzed potential scenarios. In both sessions participants’ questions were related to issues of trust between victims and Equity Advocates, victim’s confidentiality, empowering the victim, raising awareness of gender bias in workplaces, and procedural questions for reporting sexual harassments.

MSU-ADVANCE TRACS leadership emphasized the importance to form the Equity Advocate group as a way to support each other’s advocacy and gain confidence for being proactive and raising awareness into their workplace (including raising the awareness of department Heads or Supervisors, peers, and students). It was claimed that the success of Equity Advocates depends on dissipating a sense of isolation. TRACS is planning in a Winter gathering to share concerns and experiences as Equity Advocates.

During both sessions Equity Advocates received comprehensive resources to enhance their advocacy, gained historical, conceptual and procedural information about Title IX, and had a space to share previous experiences with victims and concerns regarding their workplace. A climate of trust and collaboration among participants was noticeable.
Section 3

Grant Writing Boot Camp (GWBC)

This program was offered to STEM and SBS faculty of MSU-Bozeman, with the purpose to "facilitate the production of a solid, review-ready grant proposal" in order to receive feedback grant facilitators. This program was offered during six weeks, from September 16, through October 18, and was organized in weekly two-hour sessions. During these sessions participants attended presentations of grant successful faculty to learn writing and procedural skills for developing competitive grant proposals, and eventually worked in smaller writing groups. The main topics included: writing proposal letters of intent, cultivating mentee-mentor relationships, assembling the project team, developing narratives and budgets, understanding of funding agency and university requirements, and the process of the grant review panel and responding to pane’s critiques.

The data presented in this section include field observations of two sessions (second and second to last), attendee’s survey, and interviews of three participants and boot camp facilitator; both surveys and interviews were used at the end of the program. The number of attendees that attended the observed sessions fluctuated such that the first observed session included 13 participants and the second observed session included 7 attendees. This is a very research-oriented group, with except of one participant that has a high teaching load. The structure of the sessions was similar for both observations, including a brief introduction of the boot camp facilitator, followed by invited speakers presentations. In both cases participants had opportunities to ask questions and “homework” was assigned at the end of the session for attendees to complete during the week.

During the first observation the facilitator presented information about early-career NSF grants and a search-engine for requests of proposals of major federal funding agencies. Then, participants shared each project focus and funding agency for imminent grant submission. These agencies include: Montana Space Grant Consortium, NSF, NIH, USDA-NIFA, and DoT. The invited speaker of this session talked about mentoring from both mentor and mentee perspectives. Participants asked a lot of questions about ways to engage mentors. Strategies that might help to recruit mentors were discussed. Participants “homework” was to write a letter to a mentor, and to develop a list of all the necessary steps to submit a grant proposal.

The second observed session was a multi-speaker session focused on successful grant submissions and grant opportunities at MSU. The speakers shared some insights about strategies that were conducive to success, such as recruitment of senior personnel for the project, developing a project summary, getting support letters on behalf of the project, using senior faculty and national and regional professional networks to set the project’s Advisory Board, and strategies for outcomes dissemination. Staff of the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) shared material and resources to assist grant writers and explained the concepts of indirect cost (IDC) and cost-sharing. In both observed sessions participants were very
engaged; most questions were related to issues of budget, “broader impact”, and collaboration.

Participants completed an online survey (see Appendix C) at the end of the GWBC program. Some of the survey questions were design to measure concepts of Self-Determination Theory, including autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Results of Likert-type questions (in a 7 points scale) are shown in Figure 4.

![Figure 4. Grant Writing Boot Camp Survey results.](image)

The GWBC was overall a positive experience for the participants. Participants felt they can express their ideas, gained confidence in grant writing, enjoyed working with other participants, and are more likely to apply for external funds. Participants would recommend the GWBC.

Based on the analysis of the open-ended questions, participants enjoyed the sessions that addressed practical information, such as: NSF submission process, writing letters of intent, using the critique of reviewers, and how to form a project team.

“Building a team. The practical advice was great. I wrote and sent out 2 letters of support for my grant after this workshop.”

The session that focused on budget preparation was perceived as less useful due to the complexity of the topic.

“Being completely new to the University, I needed more of a 101 version of how grants are administered, budget item descriptions, etc.”

Finally participants suggested improvements to the GWBC, such as: shorten the presentation times, have less speakers, and increase the interactive time spent in writing groups during the
sessions. It was perceived that the pace of the GWBC was too intense for attendees to complete the assignments.

“Move to an every other week format, given the other pressure of the academic term it was very challenging to keep up...”

Finally, one participant commented feeling overwhelmed by the emphasis on large NSF and NIH awards.

“I felt a lot of pressure to come out of the gate with a large, multi-investigator, multi-disciplinary, multi-million dollar grant -- and in my first semester, that's just not realistic. ...So my suggestion for improvement, based on my experience, would be to also encourage (or encourage more) of the small, pilot projects to start with. “

Based on the analysis of the surveys, three main ideas emerged upon which to conduct the interviews: 1) Tension between the time invested in the program and gains, 2) participant’s expectations, and 3) application and future plans in relation to the experience gained in the GWBC. Semi-structured Interviews were conducted at the end of the program. Three attendees were interviewed; all interviewees were from different STEM departments. The interviews took place on-campus and transcriptions were sent back to interviewees for subject check.

All interviewees stated that the time spent in the Grant Writing Boot Camp was well invested. One interviewee noticed the importance of face-to-face interactions

“You could get the information from a drop box, but the fact that the program was face-to-face provided a context for the information. Additionally, the 'social pressure' to attend face-to-face meetings helped motivate the participant to look into the information provided ahead of time."

Interviewees commented on the specificity of the program -mainly focused on NIH and NSF grant proposals- implying long-term, large projects and a more experienced audience in terms of grant writing

“Maybe it would be more helpful if we had a proposal drafted, or being the lead PI, or re-submitting something.”

“...being a new faculty and being my research very place-bound I still first need? to get to know the place before jumping into a new large project."

In terms of timing and the pace of the WGBC, it was proposed to break the program in every other week working sessions to allow participants to catch up with the “homework”. For example, organize the program such that in a session only information is presented and is followed by a session that focuses on discussion and delivery. The interviewees also commented on some overlapping among presentations of different speakers, and suggested that a closer coordination might contribute to a more effective use of time.

The purpose of the Writing Boot Camp was clearly articulated by the TRACS team, to “facilitate the production of a solid, review-ready grant proposal”. Yet, it was of interest to explore if participant’s expectations matched the purpose of the program. One interviewee

“was interested in meeting new people, learn about MSU resources, OSP, IRB, and all the GWBC program has to offer."
Interviewees expected a “flipped classroom” modality and wished more time for “hands-on,” application of information into proposal preparation, and peer interaction during the boot camp sessions.

“...maybe the phrase boot camp was a little misleading.”

“To have a lecture about it [budget preparation] was good, but now that I want to use this I have to re-learn the information”

Interviewees praised the formation of writing groups as an unexpected beneficial outcome. Participants with similar interests were placed in smaller writing groups, supporting each other’s proposal writing. Although this activity currently extends beyond the time period of the boot camp, it was organized during the camp and is very well received.

“One thing that was very good and I did not expect was the writing groups. These are very good; people are committed and want to continue.... it will be a great advertising thing”

Other interviewee continues working with the boot camp facilitator in one-on-one basis and finds this interaction extremely productive.

Regarding applying the lessons of the boot camp two interviewees commented of future partnerships with other faculty to explore common interests for proposal submission.

“The GWBC was OK to find partners by knowing people that do similar things and could work in the future. For example the people in the writing groups.”

The GWBC stimulated thinking on research questions.

“The GWBC was important because it makes me think about research questions, even if I did not reach the program deadlines thinking about the next step towards the final product [proposal] was important”

and encouraged participants to submit proposals to MSU’s internal calls.

“I will use start-up money to pilot ideas to then apply to internal grants.”

The writing groups resulted relevant to the interviewees, stimulating sustained writing habits

“The daily writing is helpful in my productivity; I will use the reason of grant proposal writing.”

The GWBC facilitator’s interview focused on two main questions: what would you do different? What did you like the most? The suggested changes were related to “make the format work better” in reference to the balance between presentations and writing activities during the boot camp session.

“Maybe gather with the presenters before the session to make sure they know about the time limit and the format of the boot camp.”

Provide more opportunities for interactions among participants

“...because they [attendees] come from different disciplines. I would encourage the work in groups to create that interdisciplinary community.”

Considering the time of the year when the GWBC will be offered again, possibly in March.

Considering the length of the session, and possibly “scale back the syllabus.”

Reviewing the expectations of out of WGBC work participants can realistically accomplish. Talk to faculty that would participate in the WBC but declined because was NSF and NIH focused “maybe expand the [the GWBC] to foundations.”
The facilitator likes the work she continues to do with five participants of the WGBC to develop grant proposals.

“submitting and meeting with other people indicates this [GWBC] was useful.”

She also enjoyed the contribution of the presenters

“The involvement of the facilitators [presenters] made the event because they provided their expertise.”

In addition, the facilitator wished to have TRACS administrative support to deal with the organization of GWBC hospitality. This could benefit the program because will allow the facilitator to focus solely in the organization of the GWBC sessions.

Interviewees, and facilitator comments agree in terms of the format of the sessions, the expected workload outside the GWBC sessions, and the specificity of the program towards NSF and NIH award programs.

**Lessons Learned from Grant Writing Boot Camp**

- **Make it interactive and provide opportunities for writing time during the sessions.** This change might imply: reduce the syllabus of the program, the number of invited speakers, and/or the length of the presentations.

- **Diversify the focus of the program.** Instead of focusing on NSF and NIH award programs include other federal (USDA, DoE, etc...), regional, and state agencies, and private foundations.

- **Set expectations that are feasible for new faculty.** Consider the time demand of the assignments outside the GWBC sessions by increasing the time between sessions. Consider the scope of the projects a new faculty might feel confident to pursue.

- **Be aware of the timing of the GWBC.** If possible, explore what time of the year is easier for faculty to fully participate in a grant-writing program.
Appendix A
Feedback Survey - September 17 & 18, 2013
"Hastening Diversity at MSU: A Workshop with Dr. JoAnn Moody"

Thank you for participating in today’s workshop. Please take few minutes to complete this evaluation survey. We appreciate your feedback!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A, Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Errors/Shortcuts (i.e., raising the bar, longing to clone) and Dysfunctions of an Organization (i.e., overloading/rushing, no ground rules)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today’s workshop increased my understanding of how cognitive errors, shortcuts, and/or organizational dysfunctions affect the evaluation of female and minority faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned strategies to increase faculty diversity in my department/unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to use today’s information to increase faculty diversity in my department/unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typical Experiences of “Solo” Faculty (i.e., heightened visibility, hostility, performance pressures, etc.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today’s workshop increased my understanding of experiences typically faced by “solo” faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned strategies to diminish stressors and penalties often experienced by “solo” faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to use today’s information to improve the climate for “solo” faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshop as a whole:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend this workshop to my colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What aspects of this workshop do you find **most** useful? Why?

2. What aspects of this workshop do you find **least** useful? Why?

3. Please provide an example of something you will do (or do differently) as a result of what you learned in today’s workshop.

4. Do you have any additional comments about the content or workshop format?
Dear Colleague,
Thank you for attending today’s presentation. Please take few minutes to complete this evaluation form. We appreciate your feedback!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The presentation increased my understanding of how unintended gender bias and/or cultural norms affect women STEM faculty</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Agree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Disagree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></th>
<th><strong>Not Sure, N/A</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am willing to use the information from today’s presentation to improve the climate for women faculty in my department/unit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I would recommend this presentation to my colleagues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What aspects of this presentation do you find most useful? Why?

What aspects of this presentation do you find least useful? Why?

Please provide an example of something you will do (or do differently) as a result of what you learned in today’s presentation.

Do you have any additional comments about the presentation?
Appendix C
General and final reflections of the Grant Writing Bootcamp

This six-week training aimed to help write review-ready grant proposal. Through this process you received information related to grant writing and submission, worked with a colleague, and had the opportunity to submit you proposal to a mock panel review and received feedback from grant successful facilitators. Please based on your experience at the Bootcamp answer the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I felt free to express my ideas and opinions during bootcamp</td>
<td>(Not at all true)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Some-what true)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Very true)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bootcamp increased my confidence in my ability to do well at grant writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really like the people I worked with during bootcamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel very competent in grant writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most days I feel a sense of accomplishment from the bootcamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider the people in bootcamp to be my friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of bootcamp, I am more likely to apply for external grant funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think bootcamp will have a positive impact on my career advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend bootcamp to my colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What session you liked the most? Why?
What session you liked the least? Why?

How the ADVANCE Grant Writing Bootcamp program can be improved?