



Defending the Masses: Demanding Justice in America’s Misdemeanor and Municipal Courts

SPEAKERS: Rosalie Joy, Ken Days, Dondell Patterson, Juanita Thurmon, Gilan Merwanji

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	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	8	100%
Mean		5.00	

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	0	0%
4	4	1	11%
5	Strongly Agree	8	89%
Mean		4.89	

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	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	9	100%
Mean		5.00	

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	9	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	1	11%
5	Strongly Agree	8	89%
Mean		4.89	

The session met or exceeded my expectation.

Choices		Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	0	0%
4	4	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	9	100%
Mean		5.00	

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	9	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	1	11%
5	Strongly Agree	8	89%
Mean		4.89	

The handouts and materials were useful.

Choices		Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	1	13%
4	4	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	7	88%
Mean		4.75	

Audio-visual aids were used effectively.

Choices		Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	0	0%
4	4	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	9	100%
Mean		5.00	

Approximately how many participants attended this session?

Choices		Count	Percent
1	0 to 10	0	0%
2	11 to 25	6	67%
3	26 to 40	1	11%
4	41 to 60	2	22%
5	61 to 75	0	0%
6	76 or more	0	0%
Mean		2.56	

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	8	100%
2	No	0	0%
Mean		1.00	

Why or why not?

- They were great.
- With a focus on a) maintaining the momentum, b) impacting the quality of justice for all clients in the municipal court and c) improving quality of public defense in other Atlanta & GA courts.
- I would recommend this because they gave real solutions to the problems the office had. Many legal aids could use this information.
- They did a great job.



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?

- Great to hear about this office and their success.
- We need more sessions like this!
- Uniquely valuable as example of the reinvention of an urban PD office.
- Very well thought out and informative.
- The constant was very informative.
- The speakers were very well informed and the subject matter was very useful.
- Very interesting presentation & impressive work one of the best session I've attended.
- Very engaging and dedicated to their work and improving representation of indigent defendants.

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

- Very knowledgeable & prepared.
- Impressed with faculty participation - engaging, able to articulate helpful into in tight time constraints.
- Extremely articulate, and demonstrate dedicated.
- They were all great, they were passionate and I would love to work with them.
- Very passionate about their material.
- Excellent!
- Knowledgeable, passionate, committed presenter.
- Very knowledgeable, outgoing & dedicated to their work and profession.