

**March 2, 2009 ACE PIR
 MT Science Standards Level 1 by Zeiler &
 Stahley (29 attendees, 21 evaluations)**

Please rate the following using 5 for outstanding and 1 for poor:

NOTE: Bobbie Larson used her own evaluation form / attendance forms ... this is a combination of ACE and her forms

1. The **QUALITY** of the presentation was:

5 9/21 = 42%	4 12/21 = 58%	3	2
1			

2. The **ORGANIZATION** of the presentation was:

5 13/21 = 62%	4 8/21 = 38%	3	2
1			

3. The **SCOPE** or **COVERAGE** of the presentation was:

5 6/21 = 29%	4 15/21 = 71%	3	2
1			

4. The presentation **CONTENT** was: Did not correspond with other form

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5. The **Presenter(s)** was/were: Did not correspond with other form

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

6. My attendance at this presentation should prove to be:

Quite Beneficial		Not Beneficial
5 14/21 = 67%	4	3 7/21 = 33%
1		2

7. Things I liked best about the presentation:

- Hands on examples (2)
- Good amount given today
- Raised many questions

8. Things that could be improved:

More examples

Sometimes I get the feeling we need to teach inquiry, not science. What is the goal?

Give examples of MontCAS and inquiry based questions.

Support from OPI

The program needs more meat, less introduction. We had a full hour of intro and only 30 minutes of the actual inquiry method.

Give school lessons ... local workshops

9. Suggestions for future workshops:

Great job

More (2)