

Event Feedback From RosBREED Workshop at the American Society for Horticultural Science (ASHS) Annual Conference, August 4, 2010

This document contains a summary of evaluation data from the RosBREED workshop at ASHS 2010 in Palm Desert, CA. Survey forms were completed by 33 of the 65 workshop participants. Sample size for particular questions varies slightly. Project team leaders in the audience did not complete surveys, but some students who are involved in the project did complete feedback forms.

Who Attended the Workshop?

Participants were asked to identify the plant groups they work with, and their current professional role in horticulture. Most participants worked with Rosaceae, though 8 reported working with other plant groups. Most participants were research scientists, plant breeders, students or post-doctoral interns:

With which plant group(s) are you currently working?	4 Apple 10 Peach 5 Strawberry 0 Tart Cherry 1 Sweet Cherry 11 Other Rosaceae (3 Rose; 3 Raspberry; 1 Blackberry; 1 Pear; 1 Plum; 1 Ornamentals) 8 Other plants (2 Citrus; 2 Blueberry; 2 Tomato; 2 unspecified):
Please mark one box to indicate your role:	9 (27.3%) Professional plant breeder 3 (9.1%) Post-doc in plant breeding 8 (24.2%) Student 10 (30.3%) Research scientist 0 Pathologist or other related professional 1 (3.0%) Technical staff member 2 (6.1%) Other (1 Extension specialist; 1 hobby breeder)

How Were the Specific Workshop Topics and Sessions Rated by Participants?

All of the workshop sessions were viewed as relevant by a majority of participants, and the amount of time spent on each topic was viewed as “just right” by more than two thirds of the audience. In regard to the clarity and effectiveness of the presentations, 90 percent or more of participants viewed the sessions as “very effective” or “OK.” The session on socio-economic values and consumer preferences was seen as being too short by 21 percent of participants, and was viewed as “OK” by two thirds of participants and “very effective” by 24 percent; this session may have contained too much material for the time allotted:

Please rate each topic by circling an answer to each of the 3 questions to the right. Topic:		Is this topic relevant or important to your work?			Amount of time spent on topic was:			Was the presentation clear and effective?		
		No	Sort of	Yes	Not enough	Just right	Too much	Not very effective	OK	Very effective
A1	RosBREED Project Overview	3.6 %	25.0	71.4	3.4	89.7	6.9	3.4	34.5	62.1
A2	RosBREED Core Breeding Programs: Goals and Future Impacts	6.7	10.0	83.3	3.3	86.7	10.0	-	37.9	62.1
A3	Utilizing Socio-economic Knowledge of Stakeholder Values and Consumer Preferences to Inform Breeding	13.8	27.6	58.6	20.7	69.0	10.3	10.3	65.5	24.1
A4	Bridging the Chasm Between Genomics and Breeding: Enabling Marker-Assisted Breeding	3.0	18.2	78.8	6.1	81.8	12.1	3.0	36.4	60.6
A5	Transferring Marker-Assisted Breeding Capabilities to the Public and Private Community of U.S. Rosaceae Breeders	3.4	20.7	75.9	7.1	82.1	10.7	-	53.6	46.4

Note: N = 28 to 33 for these questions.

How was the Workshop as a Whole Rated by Participants?

Eighty percent or more of workshop participants moderately or strongly agreed that the content was consistent with the publicized description and that learning objectives were clearly stated and met.

Seventy-three percent moderately or strongly agreed that “there was a balance between theory and application.”

More than two thirds moderately or strongly agreed that they gained new knowledge applicable to their work, that they planned to apply what they learned, and that the RosBREED brochures that were distributed were useful:

	Please circle one number in each row to indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
B1	Content was consistent with the publicized description	3.3 %	3.3	3.3	10.0	40.0	40.0
B2	Learning objectives were clearly stated.	-	6.7	3.3	6.7	36.7	46.7
B3	Learning objectives were met.	-	9.7	-	3.2	48.4	38.7
B4	There was a balance between theory and application	-	3.3	6.7	16.7	43.3	30.0
B5	I gained new knowledge that is applicable to my work.	3.1	6.3	6.3	15.6	28.1	40.6
B6	I plan to apply what I learned.	3.3	10.0	3.3	13.3	36.7	33.3
B7	The handouts (RosBREED brochures) were useful.	-	4.8	9.5	19.0	47.6	19.0

Note: N = 30 to 32 for these questions except N = 21 for B7.

The technical level of the workshop was deemed to be “just right” by 83 percent of the audience; a few individuals found it to be too basic or too advanced:

B9	This presentation level was: (circle one answer only)	Way too basic 3.4 %	A little too basic 3.4	Just right 82.8	A little too advanced 10.3	Way too advanced -
----	--	------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------

Note: N = 29.

What Commendations and Recommendations Did Participants Offer About the Workshop?

Participants offered several general and specific positive comments about the workshop, as well as some recommendations for how the workshop might have been improved. These are listed verbatim below for questions C1 and C2:

C1	What was good about this event?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Good to hear the summaries.</i> ▪ <i>Great slides and organization.</i> ▪ <i>Nice overview, drilled down to details via specific examples.</i> ▪ <i>Stimulated new ways of using program.</i> ▪ <i>Good opportunity to see tools being developed by a highly funded SCRI project.</i> ▪ <i>Great speakers, coherent. Energy and interest on topic very high, which is contagious.</i> ▪ <i>Both this event and Monday's event provided a good overview of the RosBREED program. Also, the inclusion of the website link was most helpful.</i> ▪ <i>Great to get together!</i> ▪ <i>Very clear presentation. Great overview of the project.</i> ▪ <i>Sparked public awareness of RosBREED and showed breeders of other crops how they can get involved.</i> ▪ <i>Good overview of what different aspects of RosBREED are being covered with good examples of application.</i> ▪ <i>How to do research to integrate my own research with others.</i> ▪ <i>Presenting a good overview of the project with initial results.</i> ▪ <i>Lots of interaction with audience.</i> ▪ <i>The breeding methodology.</i> ▪ <i>To learn overview</i> ▪ <i>To introduce the whole project.</i> ▪ <i>Clear presentations.</i>
C2	What changes would have improved this event?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>More time for discussion and questions</i> ▪ <i>None I can think of. A challenge for the presenters was the preliminary nature of project results.</i> ▪ <i>Include some more basic vocabulary, or a primer, for people who may not be familiar with the terminology. Example: QTL. More simple animation/video. Simple visualizations are helpful and effective - more memorable.</i> ▪ <i>Increasing the number of handouts would be helpful.</i> ▪ <i>More info on phenotyping earlier in the discussion. Discussion of FlexQTL. Better tools for describing RosBREED to others.</i> ▪ <i>Extend the time for discussion, rather than bombard with too much information that we need time to understand.</i> ▪ <i>Sample sizes for socioeconomic data.</i> ▪ <i>Less promotion, more science.</i> ▪ <i>Practical application of state-of-the-art technology. For me most of the presentations were theoretical.</i> ▪ <i>It was a good mix. The program is getting off the ground and things are still coming together.</i> ▪ <i>Defined examples.</i>

What Did Participants Learn and How Will They Use This Knowledge?

When asked what new knowledge or skills they learned at the workshop, 7 participants noted the general overview of the RosBREED project and 6 participants mentioned the PediMap software.

When asked how they will use the knowledge gained, three individuals mentioned using a similar approach in other projects or for other plant groups.

Several other individual answers are included in the verbatim comments for question C3 and C4 below:

C3	What new knowledge or skills did you learn?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>How RosBREED really works.</i> ▪ <i>Updated knowledge on the status of work in RosBREED. How to get involved. How to get PediMap and what it can do.</i> ▪ <i>PediMap.</i> ▪ <i>Heritability units.</i> ▪ <i>That this will become very powerful in breeding programs.</i> ▪ <i>The existence and use of the PediMap program was new, and very interesting to me. To be able to use multiple populations and to compare and contrast them I feel would be most useful to the plant breeder.</i> ▪ <i>Progress in the research.</i> ▪ <i>I learned more about how PediMap works.</i> ▪ <i>PediMap.</i> ▪ <i>Increased comfort level with understanding the components of the project.</i> ▪ <i>Insufficient detail to be useful, except for PediMap demo, which was good.</i> ▪ <i>Overall program objectives and coordination for each crop.</i> ▪ <i>Some viewpoints for consumer surveys.</i> ▪ <i>A way of calculating priority. What information is or will be online at Rosbreed.org.</i> ▪ <i>The power of PediMap.</i>
C4	How will you use the knowledge and skills you learned?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Don't know yet.</i> ▪ <i>Imagine ways to expand citrus breeding community integration to move toward similar schemes to improve breeding efficiency. We've a much smaller community in citrus.</i> ▪ <i>In breeding program; developing a grant proposal.</i> ▪ <i>To promote MAS, MAB to build support from stakeholders and growers.</i> ▪ <i>I will use it as a springboard to learn more about the subject.</i> ▪ <i>We will be working to start a RosBREED-based program in blueberry.</i> ▪ <i>To inspire my work on RosBREED.</i> ▪ <i>While I am not a part of RosBREED, this gives me good ideas for future grants and collaborations.</i> ▪ <i>To refine our approach.</i> ▪ <i>In other crop groups.</i> ▪ <i>It is not developing for my Rosaceous crop. I will hope there will be opportunity for Rosa and RosBREED will help model the methodology for coordination and trait prioritization and utilization.</i> ▪ <i>Include it in our questionnaire.</i> ▪ <i>To understand literature on this topic.</i> ▪ <i>For data mining.</i>

Recommendations for Additional Training or Information

Four participants requested additional information or training on pedigree based analysis (PBA) including the PediMap and FlexQTL software. Four participants mentioned wanting more information about specific applications to plant breeding problems. Several other individual requests for theoretical or technical information are included in the verbatim comments for question C5:

C5	What kind of additional training or information about marker-assisted selection or breeding or other uses of genetic markers would be most helpful to you?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>More discussion about linkage disequilibrium and grouping of favorable and unfavorable alleles. Discussion about concerns or possible weaknesses of the approach. It was presented very positively, yet there are risks.</i> ▪ <i>FlexQTL software and finding M-T-L associations using PBA.</i> ▪ <i>Further training in PediMap.</i> ▪ <i>Info on how to set up a lab and get involved.</i> ▪ <i>Application to breeding, selection, seedling screening.</i> ▪ <i>More info on PediMap.</i> ▪ <i>I want to see progression as the project develops.</i> ▪ <i>Workshop using PediMap and hands-on use of SNP sets on other germplasm.</i> ▪ <i>Detailed analysis of software and applications.</i> ▪ <i>Survey of the basics of different markers.</i> ▪ <i>Disease resistance.</i> ▪ <i>Frost/freezing tolerance.</i> 	

Additional Participant Comments:

- *Good project!*
- *Thank you for a very well organized workshop.*