

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

Building the Culture and Practice of Strategic Advocacy in Civil Legal Aid: Looking Intentionally at What Work We Do and How to Increase its Impact

SPEAKERS: Cathy Carr, David Udell, Yvonne Mariajimenez and Jon Laramore

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	0	0%
4 4	3	33%
5 Strongly Agree	6	67%
Mean	4.67	

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

	<u> </u>		
	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	1	11%
4	4	5	56%
5	Strongly Agree	3	33%
	Mean	4.22	

I can use the information I learned right away.

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	2	22%
4	4	3	33%
5	Strongly Agree	4	44%
	Mean	4.22	

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	1	11%
5 Strongly Agree	8	89%
Mean	4.89	



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	1	11%
4 4	2	22%
5 Strongly Agree	6	67%
Mean	4.56	

The session met or exceeded my expectation.

Choices	Count	Percent
1 Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2 2	0	0%
3 3	1	11%
4 4	5	56%
5 Strongly Agree	3	33%
Mean	4.22	

The topics covered were relevant, interesting and timely.

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	1	11%
4	4	1	11%
5	Strongly Agree	7	78%
	Mean	4.67	

The session was interactive with significant audience participation.

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	1	11%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	3	33%
4	4	1	11%
5	Strongly Agree	4	44%
	Mean	3.78	

The handouts and materials were useful.

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	3	50%
2	2	1	17%
3	3	1	17%
4	4	1	17%
5	Strongly Agree	0	0%
	Mean	2.00	



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	4	50%
4 4	2	25%
5 Strongly Agree	2	25%
Mean	3.75	

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	11%
4 41 to 60	1	11%
5 61 to 75	5	56%
6 76 or more	2	22%
Mean	1.89	

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

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Yes	9	100%
2	No	0	0%
	Mean	1.00	

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

Choices	Count	Percent
1 Yes	9	100%
No No	0	0%
Mean	1.00	

Why or why not?

- This session should be scheduled earlier send in a larger venue, in order to facilitate more attendance.
- It should have been bigger room with more time for discussion and interactive participate but faculty very good.

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

- Helps us think critically.
- It would have been good to focus on how we are defining strategic advocacy, the best part involved concrete examples.
- The EDS gave some good examples of how their programs use strategic advocacy.
- I wish there had been more opportunity for interactive discussion/maybe break up topics.



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

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

- Knowledgeable.
- Engaging, communicated effectively and practical knowledge.
- Overall good, part about young lawyers communicating with managers seemed off topic/not eight audience.
- Enjoyed hearing all more towards nuts & bolts information.