

2016 Annual Conference

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

Legal Services Data in Context: Leveraging Public Data for Community Needs Assessments and Planning

SPEAKERS: James Scruggs, Sharon Kandris, Carlos A. Manjarrez, Jon Laramore and Nan Heald

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.

	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	

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.

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	



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	1	50%
5 Strongly Agree	1	50%
Mean	4.50	

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			
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 handouts and materials were useful.

	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

Audio-visual aids were used effectively.

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	

Approximately how many participants attended this session?

Choices	Count	Percent
1 0 to 10	0	0%
2 11 to 25	1	50%
3 26 to 40	1	50%
4 41 to 60	0	0%
5 61 to 75	0	0%
6 76 or more	0	0%
Mean	2.50	

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

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

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

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

Why or why not?

• Always good to see & hear LSC staff too.

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

• Availability of data from LSC.

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

- Dedicated, investment.
- Fantastic, great resources.