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

National
Legal Aid &
Defender
Association

Strategies for Successful Litigation on Language Access and Practical Solutions

SPEAKERS: Jesus Salas, Anisa Rahim, Tere Ramos

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	0	0%
4	4	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	2	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	1	50%
5	Strongly Agree	1	50%
	Mean	**4.50**	

National
Legal Aid &
Defender
Association

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	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	2	100%
	Mean	**5.00**	

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	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	2	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	1	50%
5	Strongly Agree	1	50%
	Mean	**4.50**	

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	0	0%
5	Strongly Agree	2	100%
	Mean	**5.00**	

The handouts and materials were useful.

	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

National
Legal Aid &
Defender
Association

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	1	50%
2	11 to 25	1	50%
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	**1.50**	

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?
- Knowledgeable presenters that had to overcome challenges of language access.

What in particular about this session would you like us to know about and why?
- It should have been advertised to farmworkers conference attendees. Low attendance show lack of awareness of this issue.
- Include other languages on panel. More representatives for work with communities who speak diverse languages.

What are your overall impressions about the faculty at this particular session?
- Experts at what they do with very practical strategies to offer.
- Great!