

## **2016 Annual Conference**

# Indianapolis, IN • November 9-12, 2016 SESSION EVALUATION RESULTS

## Achieving 100% Access to Justice Ethically: Professional Responsibility in New Service Delivery Models

SPEAKERS: Anne Sweeney, Tiffany Moore Russell and Eliza Q. Pérez-Ollin

## **Session/Speaker Evaluation**

## The session content was consistent with description in the agenda

| Choices             | Count | Percent |
|---------------------|-------|---------|
| 1 Strongly Disagree | 0     | 0%      |
| 2 2                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 3 3                 | 1     | 100%    |
| 4 4                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 5 Strongly Agree    | 0     | 0%      |
| Mean                | 3.00  |         |

## The session information will help me be more effective in my position.

| Choices             | Count | Percent |
|---------------------|-------|---------|
| 1 Strongly Disagree | 0     | 0%      |
| 2 2                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 3 3                 | 1     | 100%    |
| 4 4                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 5 Strongly Agree    | 0     | 0%      |
| Mean                | 3.00  |         |

## I can use the information I learned right away.

|   | Choices           | Count | Percent |
|---|-------------------|-------|---------|
| 1 | Strongly Disagree | 0     | 0%      |
| 2 | 2                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 3 | 3                 | 1     | 100%    |
| 4 | 4                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 5 | Strongly Agree    | 0     | 0%      |
|   | Mean              | 3.00  |         |

## Overall, the speakers for this session were knowledgeable.

| Choices             | Count | Percent |
|---------------------|-------|---------|
| 1 Strongly Disagree | 0     | 0%      |
| 2 2                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 3   3               | 0     | 0%      |
| 4 4                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 5 Strongly Agree    | 1     | 100%    |
| Mean                | 5.00  |         |



## **2016 Annual Conference**

# Indianapolis, IN • November 9-12, 2016 SESSION EVALUATION RESULTS

Overall, the speakers for this session were engaging.

| Choices             | Count | Percent |
|---------------------|-------|---------|
| 1 Strongly Disagree | 0     | 0%      |
| 2 2                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 3 3                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 4 4                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 5 Strongly Agree    | 1     | 100%    |
| Mean                | 5.00  |         |

The session met or exceeded my expectation.

| Choices             | Count | Percent |
|---------------------|-------|---------|
| 1 Strongly Disagree | 0     | 0%      |
| 2 2                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 3 3                 | 1     | 100%    |
| 4 4                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 5 Strongly Agree    | 0     | 0%      |
| Mean                | 3.00  |         |

The topics covered were relevant, interesting and timely.

| Choices             | Count | Percent |
|---------------------|-------|---------|
| 1 Strongly Disagree | 0     | 0%      |
| 2 2                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 3 3                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 4 4                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 5 Strongly Agree    | 1     | 100%    |
| Mean                | 5.00  |         |

The session was interactive with significant audience participation.

|   | Choices           | Count | Percent |
|---|-------------------|-------|---------|
| 1 | Strongly Disagree | 0     | 0%      |
| 2 | 2                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 3 | 3                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 4 | 4                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 5 | Strongly Agree    | 1     | 100%    |
|   | Mean              | 5.00  |         |

#### The handouts and materials were useful.

|   | Choices           | Count | Percent |
|---|-------------------|-------|---------|
| 1 | Strongly Disagree | 0     | 0%      |
| 2 | 2                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 3 | 3                 | 1     | 100%    |
| 4 | 4                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 5 | Strongly Agree    | 0     | 0%      |
|   | Mean              | 3.00  |         |



## **2016 Annual Conference**

## Indianapolis, IN • November 9-12, 2016 SESSION EVALUATION RESULTS

Audio-visual aids were used effectively.

| Choices             | Count | Percent |
|---------------------|-------|---------|
| 1 Strongly Disagree | 0     | 0%      |
| 2   2               | 0     | 0%      |
| 3 3                 | 1     | 100%    |
| 4 4                 | 0     | 0%      |
| 5 Strongly Agree    | 0     | 0%      |
| Mean                | 3.00  |         |

Approximately how many participants attended this session?

| Choices      | Count | Percent |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| 1 0 to 10    | 0     | 0%      |
| 2 11 to 25   | 0     | 0%      |
| 3 26 to 40   | 1     | 100%    |
| 4 41 to 60   | 0     | 0%      |
| 5 61 to 75   | 0     | 0%      |
| 6 76 or more | 0     | 0%      |
| Mean         | 3.00  |         |

Would you recommend this session for next year's conference agenda?

|   | Choices | Count | Percent |
|---|---------|-------|---------|
| 1 | Yes     | 1     | 100%    |
| 2 | No      | 0     | 0%      |
|   | Mean    | 1.00  |         |

Would you recommend this particular faculty for next year's conference?

|   | Choices | Count | Percent |
|---|---------|-------|---------|
|   | Yes Yes | 0     | 0%      |
| 2 | No No   | 0     | 0%      |
|   | Mean    | 0.00  |         |

#### Why or why not?

• Panel explained how they implemented programs in their jurisdictions but no explicit guidance on intolerant jurisdictions.

## What in particular about this session would you like us to know about and why?

• Panel was very knowledgeable & engaging. Experts on topics!

#### What are your overall impressions about the faculty at this particular session?

• Very intelligent panel. Enthusiastic.