

Overall Meeting Evaluations – 2010 (n=423)

(1=strongly disagree 5=strongly agree)

	Average	St. Dev.
I am confident that I can:		
Promote knowledge/awareness of successful EHDI implementation strategies.	4.33	0.78
Share current research and research models related to EHDI.	4.05	0.88
Improve cultural competence in working with children/families/communities.	4.08	0.84
Enhance and develop working relationships with various groups/agencies.	4.29	0.74
The conference content was relevant to my work.	4.45	0.83
The conference was effective in addressing current EHDI issues.	4.38	0.84
The information presented in Plenary Session I, by Teresa Caraway, was useful.	4.47	0.83
The information presented in Plenary Session II, by Arnold Noyek, was useful.	3.43	1.12
The information presented in Plenary Session III, by Rachel Coleman, was useful.	4.61	0.78
The information presented in Plenary Session IV, by Harold Johnson, was useful.	4.09	0.96
The length of time of the conference was adequate for learning	4.27	0.85
The length of time available for networking with others was adequate	4.13	0.88
The process for obtaining Continuing Education Credits (CEUs) was easy to understand.	4.07	1.02
The pre-registration process was well organized.	4.64	0.71
The on-site registration process was well organized	4.67	0.68
Conference staff effectively answered questions and assisted participants.	4.63	0.69
The hotel meeting facilities were appropriate for the conference.	4.41	0.94
The conference provided adequate audio-visual equipment and technical support.	4.67	0.67

Average of all Presentation Evaluations		
(1 = Poor, 5 = Excellent)	Average	Standard Deviation
Overall Quality	4.44	0.27
Organization / Clarity of Presentation	4.47	0.28
Usefulness of Information	4.39	0.29
Relevance of Topic	4.54	0.28
Adequate Opportunity to Participate	4.25	0.37
Usefulness of Handouts / Support Materials / Slides	4.35	0.31

Poster Evaluations (n=644)		
(1=poor, 5=excellent)	Average	Standard Deviation
Overall quality of Poster presentation	4.51	0.67
Organization / clarity of the Poster	4.49	0.74
Presentation (how well the presenter conveyed info during the session)	3.90	1.68
Usefulness of information	4.45	0.78
Relevance of topic	4.58	0.66
Adequate opportunity to interact/engage with presenter(s)	3.51	2.00
Usefulness of handouts / support materials	2.44	2.33

2010 DSHPSHWA Meeting Evaluation

Chicago, Illinois

Feb. 28, 2010

Average

(1=Strongly Disagree,

5=Strongly Agree)

of Responses**1. Understanding the National Early Childhood Assessment Project**

The presenter was knowledgeable about the subject	4.80	46
The presenter's style was effective	4.57	46
The information will be useful to my work and goals	4.24	46
I would recommend this presentation to others	4.35	46

2. Partnership Update Presentations - HRSA/MCHB

The presenters were knowledgeable on the subject	4.81	47
The presenters' styles were effective	4.62	47
The information will be useful to my work and goals	4.72	47
I would recommend this presentation to others	4.68	47

3. Partnership Update Presentations – CDC

The presenters were knowledgeable on the subject	4.83	47
The presenters' styles were effective	4.72	47
The information will be useful to my work and goals	4.75	48
I would recommend this presentation to others	4.76	46

4. Partnership Update Presentations – ABA Update: Pediatric Certification

The presenters were knowledgeable on the subject	4.38	45
The presenters' styles were effective	3.89	46
The information will be useful to my work and goals	4.00	46
I would recommend this presentation to others	3.93	46

5. Partnership Update Presentations – ASHA Update

The presenters were knowledgeable on the subject	4.67	45
The presenters' styles were effective	4.53	45
The information will be useful to my work and goals	4.47	45
I would recommend this presentation to others	4.49	45

6. Partnership Update Presentations – AAA Update: Childhood Hearing Screening

The presenters were knowledgeable on the subject	4.03	32
The presenters' styles were effective	4.00	32
The information will be useful to my work and goals	4.00	32
I would recommend this presentation to others	4.07	30

7. DSHPSHWA Annual Business Meeting

The presenters were knowledgeable on the subject	4.47	45
The presenters' styles were effective	4.47	45
The information will be useful to my work and goals	4.27	45
I would recommend this presentation to others	4.23	44

8. Teleaudiology

The facilitators were knowledgeable about the topic.	4.71	7
The facilitators were effective in promoting discussion.	4.14	7
The information discussed will be useful to my work and goals.	4.43	7
I would recommend this be repeated next year.	4.43	7

Breakout Session: Family Support

The facilitators were knowledgeable about the topic.	4.88	8
The facilitators were effective in promoting discussion.	4.88	8
The information discussed will be useful to my work and goals.	4.88	8
I would recommend this be repeated next year.	4.88	8

Breakout Session: Data

The facilitators were knowledgeable about the topic.	4.75	8
The facilitators were effective in promoting discussion.	4.75	8
The information discussed will be useful to my work and goals.	4.75	8
I would recommend this be repeated next year.	4.75	8

Breakout Session: Quality Assurance

The facilitators were knowledgeable about the topic.	4.60	10
The facilitators were effective in promoting discussion.	4.20	10
The information discussed will be useful to my work and goals.	4.30	10
I would recommend this be repeated next year.	4.38	8

Breakout Session: Professional Development

The facilitators were knowledgeable about the topic.	4.50	6
The facilitators were effective in promoting discussion.	4.50	6
The information discussed will be useful to my work and goals.	4.67	6
I would recommend this be repeated next year.	4.50	6

Breakout Session: Did Not Specify

The facilitators were knowledgeable about the topic.	4.72	18
The facilitators were effective in promoting discussion.	4.42	18
The information discussed will be useful to my work and goals.	4.53	19
I would recommend this be repeated next year.	4.38	16

EHDI State Coordinator Meeting Evaluations (n=48)												
	Average	Standard Deviation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
(1=Not Useful, 5=Very Useful)												
"Take Home" messages from the 2010 National EHDI Conference	4.34	0.92										
The Power of Networking	4.17	0.91										
National Report Card for EHDI Programs	4.17	0.76										
New Resources Available from NCHAM	4.23	0.74										
Questions and Answers from MCHB and CDC	4.08	0.99										
"Strategies for Completing Diagnostic Evaluations before 3-months of age" Panel	4.23	0.72										
"Providing Effective Family Support Across all EHDI Components" Panel	4.21	0.72										
(1= Strongly Disagree, 5= Strongly Agree)												
The information provided was worth the time	4.49	0.66										
I learned new things that will improve our EHDI program	4.46	0.62										
The meeting was a good networking opportunity	4.48	0.73										
The meeting facilities were appropriate	3.94	1.08										
It would have been better to hold the meeting on the Sunday prior to the conference	3.16	1.58										
(Q 1) What was the best thing about the meeting?			22	8	1	1	3	-	-	-	-	-
(Q 2) What suggestions for improvement do you have for future EDHI coordinator meetings?			1	5	4	2	4	1	16	-	-	-
(Q 3) What topics would you like included during the state EDHI coordinators meeting in the future?			1	3	-	2	-	1	1	4	1	6
(Q 4) Additional comments/suggestions/observations			7	1	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-

Comments Key:

Q 1:

- 1=networking
- 2=sharing info
- 3=child abuse awareness
- 4=diversity in the training
- 5=miscellaneous

Q 2:

- 1=identify top 3 goals
- 2=provide lunch/ more time for lunch/affordable restaurants
- 3=bigger room
- 4=half day session
- 5=smaller groups
- 6=review grant requirements
- 7=miscellaneous

Q 3:

- 1=Security/HIPAA
- 2=Allowing each state to voice suggestions
- 3=Genetics/ referrals
- 4=Out of hospital births
- 6=Writing S.M.A.R.T. goals
- 7=Family support
- 8=New ideas
- 9=How audiologists are doing
- 10= miscellaneous

Q 4:

- 1=Speed dating was fun but too noisy
- 2=Free wireless during conference
- 3=Provide lunch
- 4=miscellaneous

Exhibitor Evaluations (n=22)

Question 1:

Most Important Reason Your Firm Came to EHDl:	# of Responses
Exposure	21
Leads/Sales	8
New Product/ Service	4
Maintain current clients	3
Get marketplace information	2
Competitors were there	1
Other	2

Question 2: Rate the Following: (1 = Excellent, 5 = Poor)

	Average	Standard Deviation
Leads gathered at the EHDl Conference (Quantity):	1.59	0.59
Leads gathered at the EHDl Conference (Quality):	1.64	0.58

Question 3: Rate the Following:

(1 = Unclear, 5 = Very Clear)

Clarity of instructions for shipping to and from conference	3.47	1.07
Clarity of pre-conference communications and info about exhibiting	4.29	0.85

(1 = Too Short, 3 = Just Right, 5 = Too Long)

Amount of time exhibits were open on Monday	4.05	0.89
Amount of time exhibits were open on Tuesday	3.20	0.70

(1 = Not Enough, 3 = Just Right, 5 = Too Much)

Space allowed for your exhibit	2.90	0.30
Traffic flow by your exhibit	2.71	0.46

(1 = Poor, 5 = Excellent)

Events Exposition's handling of shipments	3.53	1.13
---	------	------

Question 4:

Did you witness to any objectionable practices or display violations?	Yes = 2	No = 18
---	---------	---------

Question 5: (4 = Poor, 1 = Excellent)

Rate this year's conference compared to last year's	1.62	0.51
---	------	------

Question 6:

Would you recommend that your company exhibit next year?	Yes = 20	No = 1	Unsure = 1
--	----------	--------	------------

Question 7:

How satisfied were you overall?

1.73

0.46

Question 8:

Suggestions for improving future EHDl Conferences:

(1 response) Keep up the good working balancing oral/aural and sign/visual approaches

(3 responses) The exhibit hall was freezing, Catering in exhibit area was ridiculous - drinks were pulled very quickly and there was not enough

water stations/hot water for tea/coffee - which should be available all day!, Hotel snack shop was really expensive

(4 responses) Ability to pick preference for booths, Easier internet hook up at more affordable rate

(quoted \$250 for wireless access in exhibit area), Need an attraction to draw people to the back row,

Free internet for exhibitors, Pain meds (Tylenol, aspirin) available to exhibitors, manf. Forum in agenda

Question 9:

Did you present a breakout session in the exhibitor track?

Yes = 2

No = 16

Comments on Question 2:

(3 responses) The response was extremely positive!, This show has grown tremendously - not just in numbers but auditively as well,

Best EHDl Conference ever, Best show in past five years

Comments on Question 4:

(4 responses) There was one exhibit that played loud music with an obnoxious beat the entire time,

Photos of children at conference without parents' permission, Video was a little loud, No objectionable

practices per se but the exhibitor in the next booth had a video left on even when not present in the booth that gave surrounding booths volume and general disturbance issues

Comments on Question 6:

(1 response) Not Local

(1 response) Not Sure of benefit to travel cost ratio in another state (outside of IL)

Comments on Question 7:

(2 responses) Excellent, Wonderful, Professional job and organizational efforts

(2 responses) Monday was too long and Tuesday had very little traffic so there weren't a lot of reasons for staying, Tables being 3ft wide would be better

Comments on Question 9:

(3 responses) Small turnout, Needed a second wireless mic, Hope to next year

State Meeting Evaluations (n=199)

(1 = Excellent, 5 = Poor)

	Average	St. Dev.
1. The pre-conference materials (State Meetings Description and Pre-Conference Individual Reflection and Planning) helped me prepare for the EHDI Conference.	2.26	1.15
2. Conference participants from my state were in contact before the conference to discuss my state's EHDI system.	2.30	1.36
3. Participants from my state discussed the status of my state's EHDI system.	1.68	1.00
4. Participants from my state were able to establish several priorities for my state's EHDI system.	1.57	1.01
5. Participants from my state developed a plan of activities that included new information we gained from the workshops.	1.70	1.06
6. The organization, purpose, and activities for the State Meetings were clear and easy to follow.	1.84	1.10

of Comments:

98

Key to Comments:

Recommendations for next year's conference:

(7 responses) Email current goals, More info about meetings, List of attendees given out before the conference. Have small groups meet before the meeting to brainstorm.

(14 responses) Follow-up reporting/meeting to review before next year, Talk about how participants will be contacted,

Funding to help family members attend, Parents voices need to be taken seriously,

Provide more boards to write on/too many groups not enough boards, Use an electronic form for action plan

Equal representation of spec. ed./med./public health, Early Steps director should be present

(14 responses) Thanks, Great Job, Excellent, Groups came together and shared ideas

(4 responses) Keep evaluation sheet response sections consistent

(40 responses) Not very helpful, More time for workshops and collaboration, Better space to meet (w/ a table),

More structured, Clearer objectives, These groups were made up of the same people that already meet together,

Should meet with others that are from the same area but not the same state, Too early, More social, Should poll audience to see what they want to discuss,

Have alternatives to the meeting for states with fewer attendees, Use time to collaborate more with parents

(15 responses) Separate rooms for groups, Hard to hear

(3 responses) Have food and coffee, Host the event at a hotel closer to a variety of eateries, Healthy options during breaks

(1 response) No Action Plans, State EHDI already has action plans

Tele-Health Workshop Evaluation (n=30)

(1 = Poor, 5 = Excellent)

	Average	Standard Deviation
The physical facilities were appropriate for the workshop	4.18	0.72
The workshop was timely in terms of current EHDI issues	4.66	0.60
The workshop was adequately equipped with audiovisual equipment	4.76	0.43
Tim Patterson University of Toronto	3.57	1.08
Neile Sharpe, Minot State University, North Dakota	4.26	0.93
Todd Houston: Utah State university	4.52	0.81
Kathleen Watts: North Carolina EHDI Program	4.07	1.03
Dena Puskin: HRSA Carolina EHDI Program	4.17	0.91
Sandra Gabbard: University of Colorado	4.17	0.91
SWOT Working Session	4.04	1.06
Catherine Britain, Northwest Regional Tele-health Resource Center	4.00	0.85

Conference Attendees

(716
Total)

* Advocacy Group	37
* Audiologist	160
* Early Intervention Provider	126
* Family of a child with hearing loss	59
* Federal Agency	20
* Hospital/Birthing Center	57
* Local Health Department	8
* Medical Provider	11
* Non-Profit Agency	100
* Other, Please Specify:	145
* Part C Agency/Program	60
* State Education Agency	39
* State Health Department	145
* Student	55
* University	94
* Exhibitors	40
Total selections	1156