

Defender Caucus
Public Defenders as Reform Leaders

SPEAKERS: Jonathan Gradess, Stan German, Rosalie Joy, Adam Plotkin, Don Murphy

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	2	29%
5	Strongly Agree	5	71%
Mean		4.71	

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	0	0%
4	4	3	43%
5	Strongly Agree	4	57%
Mean		4.57	

I can use the information I learned right away.

Choices		Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	0	0%
4	4	2	29%
5	Strongly Agree	5	71%
Mean		4.71	

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	7	100%
Mean		5.00	

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	3	43%
5	Strongly Agree	4	57%
Mean		4.57	

The session met or exceeded my expectation.

Choices		Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	1	14%
4	4	2	29%
5	Strongly Agree	4	57%
Mean		4.43	

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	7	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	1	14%
4	4	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	6	86%
Mean		4.71	

The handouts and materials were useful.

Choices		Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	2	67%
3	3	0	0%
4	4	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	1	33%
Mean		3.00	

Audio-visual aids were used effectively.

Choices		Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	1	50%
2	2	1	50%
3	3	0	0%
4	4	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	0	0%
Mean		1.50	

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	17%
4	41 to 60	4	67%
5	61 to 75	0	0%
6	76 or more	1	17%
Mean		4.00	

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

Choices		Count	Percent
1	Yes	6	100%
2	No	0	0%
Mean		1.00	

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

Choices		Count	Percent
1	Yes	3	43%
2	No	4	57%
Mean		1.57	

Why or why not?

- Should rotate around the country.
- Better to spread speaker participation that said, everyone of today's panelists would be excellent.
- The nature of the topic and purpose of the meeting required new faces or have them speak elsewhere on a different topic - they're fine for that.
- Would like to hear follow-ups on how it's going and the different programs - but maybe some "new" reformers mixed in.
- They all good.
- This conference has already been scheduled.



2016 Annual Conference

Indianapolis, IN • November 9-12, 2016

SESSION EVALUATION RESULTS

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

- It is always interesting to hear practical experience and how it can be implemented.
- Vibrant, participatory; like focused on evaluation - building and need to scale back scope of prosecutions.
- Great to have "caucus" session that was really about/engaged the defenders in attendance, not just a talking at us panel.
- The conversation was stimulating.
- All is well.

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

- Very good. (2)
- Great variety of personalities, experiences and leadership - many types of leaders, many types of and approaches to reform!
- They knew their stuff.