Your feedback is anonymous; no identifying information is collected or saved.

Conference Session (in alphabetical order; scroll to find the session for which you took notes)

Plenary: What Did We Learn?

Feedback about the session

RATE THE SESSION

Usefulness of preparation materials (e.g., readings)

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5
- ○ 6
- ○ 7
- ○ 8
- ○ 9
- ○ 10

Quality of session materials (e.g., handouts)

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5
- ○ 6
- ○ 7
- ○ 8
- ○ 9
- ○ 10

Quality of presentation/facilitation

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5
- ◉ 6
- ○ 7
- ○ 8
- ○ 9
- ○ 10

Your level of interest in the content covered

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

- ○ 6
- ○ 7
- ○ 8
- ◉ 9
- ○ 10

Degree to which your expectations were met

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5
- ○ 6
- ○ 7
- ○ 8
- ◉ 9
- ○ 10

Degree to which you would like to learn more about this topic or theme

- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ◉ 4
- ○ 5
- ○ 6
- ○ 7
- ○ 8
- ○ 9
- ○ 10

Assess the session using the SII Method of Assessment

Strengths (including why)

The trio of participant statements, public recording to summarize by the recorder, and rephrasing from the facilitator gives partiicpants the opportunity to align their own thoughts of the most important aspects of what is offered during reporting out.

Areas for Improvement (including how)

The facilitator gave public evaluative feedback (and/or unsolicited assessment) to a number of participants. Further, in several cases this feedback appeared to be about the performer rather than the performance. This significantly degrades the eagerness of participants to share and does not empower them but rather generates conflict and shuts down growth. The facilitator might generate a

Insight (including significance)

There was a great variety of participant contributions about what they learned that was most valuable. This is testament to a great number of highly effective sessions.

Last Update

2016-06-26 17:04:04

Start Time

2016-06-26 16:48:46

Finish Time

2016-06-26 17:04:04