

## **2016 Annual Conference**

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

## Indicators, Indexing, and the Global and U.S. Access to Justice Movement

SPEAKERS: David Udell, Alicia Evangelides, James Gamble, Risa Kaufman, Allie Yang-Green, Peter Chapman

## **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	2	100%
Mean	5.00	

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

	<u> </u>		
	Choices Count I		
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	0	0%
4	4	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	2	100%
	Mean	5.00	

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

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	1	50%
4	4	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	1	50%
	Mean	4.00	

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

	, I		
	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	0	0%
3	3	0	0%
4	4	1	50%
5	Strongly Agree	1	50%
	Mean	4.50	



## **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	2	100%
5 Strongly Agree	0	0%
Mean	4.00	

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	1	50%
5 Strongly Agree	1	50%
Mean	4.50	

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	2	100%
	Mean	5.00	

The session was interactive with significant audience participation.

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	1	50%
3	3	0	0%
4	4	1	50%
5	Strongly Agree	0	0%
	Mean	3.00	

#### The handouts and materials were useful.

	Choices	Count	Percent
1	Strongly Disagree	0	0%
2	2	1	100%
3	3	0	0%
4	4	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	0	0%
	Mean	2.00	



## **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	50%
4 4	1	50%
5 Strongly Agree	0	0%
Mean	3.50	

## Approximately how many participants attended this session?

Choices	Count	Percent
1 0 to 10	0	0%
2 11 to 25	2	100%
3   26 to 40	0	0%
4 41 to 60	0	0%
5   61 to 75	0	0%
6 76 or more	0	0%
Mean	2.00	

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

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

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

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

### Why or why not?

- Updates on your projects.
- There is lots of useful information here. Too much for a 1 90 minute session. Should be offered in parts 1 and 2.

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

• Dense but very useful information. Session requires more time.

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

- Over thoughtful presuming. Lots of useful information and references to additional resources.
- Extremely well informed.