

Overall Conference Evaluations (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree)	2012 Data (n=475)			2011 Data (n=459)		2010 Data (n=423)	
	Median	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev
I am confident that I can promote knowledge/awareness of successful EHDI implementation strategies.	4.50	4.32	0.77	4.33	0.77	4.33	0.78
I am confident that I can share current research and research methods related to EHDI.	4.00	4.13	0.84	4.04	0.84	4.05	0.88
I am confident that I can improve cultural competence in working with children/families/communities.	4.00	4.07	0.85	4.01	0.84	4.08	0.84
I am confident that I can enhance and develop new working relationships with various groups/agencies.	4.00	4.28	0.78	4.31	0.79	4.29	0.74
The meeting content was relevant to my work or participation in the EHDI system.	5.00	4.49	0.77	4.48	0.72	4.45	0.83
The meeting was effective in addressing current EHDI issues.	5.00	4.41	0.83	4.44	0.74	4.38	0.84
The information presented in Pleary Session I, <i>Optimal EHDI Outcomes</i> , was useful.	5.00	4.49	0.77	4.11	0.95	4.47	0.83
The information presented in Plenary Session II, <i>News Media for Health</i> , was useful.	5.00	4.24	0.93	4.52	0.75	3.43	1.12
The information presented in Plenary Session III, <i>Writing While Deaf</i> , was useful.	5.00	4.16	0.98	4.50	0.78	4.61	0.78
The information presented in Plenary Session IV, <i>The Genome and EHDI</i> , was useful.	5.00	4.27	0.96	4.25	0.89	4.09	0.96
The State Stakeholder's Meeting time was useful for networking with others in my state/territory.	4.00	4.09	1.06	3.89	1.11	NA	NA
The length of the EHDI Annual Meeting was adequate for learning.	5.00	4.24	0.93	4.20	0.85	4.27	0.85
The length of time available for networking with others was adequate.	4.00	4.02	0.94	4.00	0.92	4.13	0.88
The process for obtaining Continuing Education Units (CEUs) was easy to understand.	5.00	4.10	1.06	4.11	0.99	4.07	1.02
The pre-registration process was well organized.	5.00	4.65	0.72	4.64	0.74	4.64	0.71
The on-site registration process was well organized.	5.00	4.69	0.66	4.65	0.75	4.67	0.68
Meeting staff effectively answered questions and assisted participants.	5.00	4.63	0.71	4.59	0.72	4.63	0.69
The hotel meeting facilities were appropriate for the EHDI Annual Meeting.	5.00	4.24	0.99	4.36	0.97	4.41	0.94
The meeting provided adequate audio-visual equipment and technical support.	5.00	4.50	0.77	4.64	0.67	4.67	0.67

Info for Plenary I (according to respective year)
 Info for Plenary II (according to respective year)
 Info for Plenary III (according to respective year)
 Info for Plenary IV (according to respective year)

Average Rating for Topical Session Evaluations (n=4016) (1=poor; 5=excellent)	2012 Data	2011 Data	2010 Data
	Average	Average	Average
Overall Quality	4.43	4.49	4.44
Organization / Clarity of Presentation	4.47	4.50	4.47
Usefulness of Information	4.42	4.44	4.39
Relevance of Topic	4.56	4.60	4.54
Adequate Opportunity to Participate	4.24	4.35	4.25
Usefulness of Handouts / Support Materials / Slides	4.36	4.37	4.35

Poster Evaluations (1=poor; 5=excellent)	2012 Data (n=263)		2011 Data (n=582)		2010 Data (n=644)	
	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev
Overall quality of Poster presentation	4.62	0.57	4.57	0.61	4.51	0.67
Organization / clarity of the Poster	4.59	0.62	4.56	0.64	4.49	0.74
Presentation (how well the presenter conveyed info during the session)	4.57	0.66	4.54	0.72	3.90	1.68
Usefulness of information	4.58	0.62	4.54	0.65	4.45	0.78
Relevance of topic	4.70	0.51	4.69	0.54	4.58	0.66
Adequate opportunity to interact/engage with presenter(s)	4.25	1.06	4.51	0.82	3.51	2.00
Usefulness of handouts / support materials	4.78	0.54	4.69	0.58	2.44	2.33

EHDI State Coordinator Meeting Evaluations How useful was the information provided during the following times: (1=Not Useful, 5=Very Useful)	2012 Data (n=62)		2011 Data (n=61)		2010 Data (n=48)	
	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev
Intro and What Will You Do Next Tuesday?	3.89	0.99				
EHDI Pals	4.16	0.81				
Hearing Screening in Early Childhood Programs	3.89	0.98				
EHDI and Home Visiting Programs	4.29	0.76				
Qs/As from MCHB and CDC	4.16	0.80				
Improving EHDI Websites	4.55	0.66				
www.ImproveEHDI.org	4.65	0.52				
Resources and Support from NCHAM	4.55	0.63				
Thinking about the entire meeting: (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree)	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev
The information provided was worth the time	4.47	0.72	4.47	0.73	4.49	0.66
I learned new things that will improve our EHDI program	4.61	0.52	4.38	0.74	4.46	0.62
The meeting was a good networking opportunity	4.16	0.94	4.17	0.76	4.48	0.73
The meeting facilities were appropriate	4.52	0.67	4.57	0.50	3.94	1.08
Would have been better Saturday prior to Conference	2.77	1.48	NA	NA	NA	NA

State Stakeholder Meeting Pre-Session Evaluations (1=Strongly Disagree; 5=Strongly Agree)	2012 Data (n=166)		2011 Data (n=196)		2010 Data (n=199)	
	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev
The pre-conference materials (State Stakeholders' Meeting Description and Pre-Conference Individual Reflection and Planning) helped me prepare for the EHDl Conference.	3.63	0.71	3.53	1.02	3.74	1.15
Participants from my state discussed the status of my state's EHDl system (goals, priorities, initiatives, etc.)	4.18	0.71	3.97	1.16	4.32	1.00
Participants from my state were able to determine which workshops would be most helpful for each participant to attend.	3.32	0.71	3.47	1.30	4.30	1.06
I was able to develop a plan to apply the new information that I learned at the conference to my state's EHDl system.	3.63	0.71	3.69	1.12	NA	NA
The organization, purpose, and activities for the State Stakeholders' Meeting were clear and easy to follow.	3.88	0.00	3.74	1.07	4.16	1.10

Exhibitor Evaluations	2012 (n=34)		2011 (n=16)		2010 (n=22)	
Most Important Reason Your Firm Came to EHDl:	# of Responses		# of Responses		# of Responses	
Exposure	27		15		21	
Leads/Sales	9		3		8	
New Product/ Service	3		2		4	
Maintain current clients	3		2		3	
Get marketplace information	0		2		2	
Competitors were there	1		1		1	
Other	1		1		2	
Rate the Following: (1 = Poor, 4 = Excellent)	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev
Leads gathered at the EHDl Conference (Quantity):	2.91	0.88	3.25	0.86	1.59	0.59
Leads gathered at the EHDl Conference (Quality):	3.19	0.69	3.44	0.63	1.64	0.58
Rate the Following: (1 = Unclear, 5 = Very Clear)						
Clarity of instructions for shipping to and from conference	4.11	0.96	3.14	1.46	3.47	1.07
Clarity of pre-conference communications and info about exhibiting	4.25	0.98	4.47	0.83	4.29	0.85
Rate the Following: (1 = Too Short, 3 = Just Right, 5 = Too Long)						
Amount of time exhibits were open on Monday	4.12	0.95	3.75	1.00	4.05	0.89
Amount of time exhibits were open on Tuesday	3.39	0.79	3.20	1.15	3.20	0.70
Rate the Following: (1 = Not Enough, 3 = Just Right, 5 = Too Much)						
Space allowed for your exhibit	2.79	0.60	3.00	0.37	2.90	0.30
Traffic flow by your exhibit	2.85	0.51	2.71	0.73	2.71	0.46
Rate the Following: (1 = Poor, 5 = Excellent)						
Shipping company's handling of shipments	3.82	0.91	3.27	1.19	3.53	1.13
Rate the Following: (1 = Worse, 2 = The same, 3 = Better):						
Rate this year's conference compared to last year's	2.18	0.59	2.50	0.52	1.62	0.51
Rate the Following: (1 = Not Satisfied, 4 = Extremely satisfied):						
How satisfied were you overall?	3.09	0.72	3.28	0.73	1.73	0.46
Would you recommend that your company exhibit next year?	Yes = 29	No = 1	Yes = 15	No = 0	Yes = 20	No = 1
			Unsure = 1		Unsure = 1	
Did you witness to any objectionable practices or display violations?	Yes = 2	No = 31	Yes = 2	No = 13	Yes = 2	No = 18
	Unsure = 3					

Supporting Families Without Bias II: Living it Organizationally (n=75) (1=poor; 5=excellent)	Average	Stan.Dev.
Hands and Voices Staff and Board Members		
Overall Quality	4.66	0.65
Organization / Clarity of Presentation	4.60	0.63
Usefulness of Information	4.61	0.72
Relevance of Topic	4.67	0.62
Adequate Opportunity to Participate	4.67	0.65
Usefulness of Handouts / Support Materials / Slides	4.49	0.74

Pediatric Hearing Aid Verification (n=17) (1=poor; 5=excellent)	Average	Stan.Dev.
Ryan McCreery, Karen Munoz, Diane Sabo, and Erika Blanchard		
Overall Quality	4.85	0.34
Organization / Clarity of Presentation	4.82	0.39
Usefulness of Information	4.85	0.34
Relevance of Topic	4.88	0.33
Adequate Opportunity to Participate	4.85	0.34
Usefulness of Handouts / Support Materials / Slides	4.68	0.47

Effective Transition from Part C to Part B-A Seamless System (n=22) (1=poor; 5=excellent)		
	Average	Stan.Dev.
National State Leaders Summit in Deaf Education		
Overall Quality	4.32	0.78
Organization / Clarity of Presentation	4.14	0.71
Usefulness of Information	4.41	0.91
Relevance of Topic	4.64	0.66
Adequate Opportunity to Participate	4.59	0.67
Usefulness of Handouts / Support Materials / Slides	3.86	1.11

EHDI and the Medical Home (n=25) (1=poor; 5=excellent)		
	Average	Stan.Dev.
Jack Levine, Rachel St. John, and Janet DesGeorges		
Overall Quality	4.56	0.62
Organization / Clarity of Presentation	4.47	0.78
Usefulness of Information	4.61	0.61
Relevance of Topic	4.94	0.24
Adequate Opportunity to Participate	4.94	0.24
Usefulness of Handouts / Support Materials / Slides	4.29	0.99

U. of Western Ontario Pediatric Audiological Monitoring Protocol (n=19) (1=poor; 5=excellent)		
	Average	Stan.Dev.
Marlene Bagatto		
Overall Quality	5.00	0.00
Organization / Clarity of Presentation	4.95	0.23
Usefulness of Information	5.00	0.00
Relevance of Topic	5.00	0.00
Adequate Opportunity to Participate	5.00	0.00
Usefulness of Handouts / Support Materials / Slides	5.00	0.00

Congenital Cytomegalovirus (CMV) Update Panel (n=28) (1=poor; 5=excellent)		
	Average	Stan.Dev.
Karen Fowler, Mark Schleiss, Janelle Greenlee		
Overall Quality	4.71	0.57
Organization / Clarity of Presentation	4.69	0.55
Usefulness of Information	4.85	0.37
Relevance of Topic	4.89	0.32
Adequate Opportunity to Participate	4.65	0.63
Usefulness of Handouts / Support Materials / Slides	4.41	0.86

IDEA Training for EHDI Professionals (n=31) (1=poor; 5=excellent)		
	Average	Stan.Dev.
Sharon Ringwalt		
Overall Quality	4.18	0.59
Organization / Clarity of Presentation	4.30	0.61
Usefulness of Information	4.32	0.59
Relevance of Topic	4.55	0.56
Adequate Opportunity to Participate	4.32	0.79
Usefulness of Handouts / Support Materials / Slides	4.10	0.98

Interdisciplinary Evaluation and Treatment of Children w/Autism Spectrum Disorders and Hearing Loss (n=39) (1=poor; 5=excellent)		
	Average	Stan.Dev.
Paul Carbone		
Overall Quality	4.72	0.46
Organization / Clarity of Presentation	4.79	0.41
Usefulness of Information	4.63	0.67
Relevance of Topic	4.68	0.66
Adequate Opportunity to Participate	4.37	0.63
Usefulness of Handouts / Support Materials / Slides	4.60	0.55

Delayed Onset of Hearing Loss in Children (n=65) (1=poor; 5=excellent)		
	Average	Stan.Dev.
Nancy Melinda Young and Lisa Weber		
Overall Quality	4.15	0.73
Organization / Clarity of Presentation	4.25	0.69
Usefulness of Information	4.15	0.85
Relevance of Topic	4.42	0.66
Adequate Opportunity to Participate	4.32	0.81
Usefulness of Handouts / Support Materials / Slides	3.91	0.98

EHDI 101 (n=84) (1=poor; 5=excellent)		
	Average	Stan.Dev.
Overall Quality	4.45	0.61
Organization / Clarity of Presentation	4.36	0.73
Usefulness of Information	4.44	0.70
Relevance of Topic	4.57	0.75
Adequate Opportunity to Participate	4.37	0.74
Usefulness of Handouts / Support Materials / Slides	4.34	0.94

Conference Attendees			
	2012	2011	2010
Total Meeting Registrants	924	863	716
Advocacy Group	37	56	37
Audiologist	105	193	160
Early Intervention Provider	95	137	126
Family of a Child with Hearing Loss	72	100	59
Federal Agency	6	29	20
Hospital/Birthing Center	41	52	57
Local Health Dept.	10	17	8
Medical Provider	38	64	11
Non-Profit Agency	85	113	100
Part C Agency/Provider	55	154	145
State Education System	37	50	60
State Health Dept.	113	64	39
Student	38	154	145
University	56	117	55
Other...	66	126	94
* Exhibitors	52	41	40
Total Participants Groups Specified	906	1467	1156