

Overall Conference Evaluations

(1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree)

	2011 Data (n=459)		2010 Data (n=423)		
	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev	
I am confident that I can promote knowledge/awareness of successful EHDl implementation strategies.	4.33	0.77	4.33	0.78	
I am confident that I can share current research and research methods related to EHDl.	4.04	0.84	4.05	0.88	
I am confident that I can improve cultural competence in working with children/families/communities.	4.01	0.84	4.08	0.84	
I am confident that I can enhance working relationships with various groups/agencies.	4.31	0.79	4.29	0.74	
The conference content was relevant to my work or participation in the EHDl system.	4.48	0.72	4.45	0.83	
The conference was effective in addressing current EHDl issues.	4.44	0.74	4.38	0.84	
The information presented in Plenary Session I, <i>Ten Years of EHDl</i> , was useful.	4.11	0.95	4.47	0.83	Info for 2010 Plenary I
The information presented in Plenary Session II, <i>It's All About Expectations</i> , was useful.	4.52	0.75	3.43	1.12	Info for 2010 Plenary II
The information presented in Plenary Session III, <i>The Medical Home and EHDl</i> , was useful.	4.50	0.78	4.61	0.78	Info for 2010 Plenary III
The information presented in Plenary Session IV, <i>EHDl and Family Support</i> , was useful.	4.25	0.89	4.09	0.96	Info for 2010 Plenary IV
The State Stakeholder's Meeting time was useful for networking with others in my state/region.	3.89	1.11	NA	NA	
The length of the conference was adequate for learning.	4.20	0.85	4.27	0.85	
The length of time available for networking with others was adequate.	4.00	0.92	4.13	0.88	
The process for obtaining Continuing Education Units (CEUs) was easy to understand.	4.11	0.99	4.07	1.02	
The pre-registration process was well organized.	4.64	0.74	4.64	0.71	
The on-site registration process was well organized.	4.65	0.75	4.67	0.68	
Conference staff effectively answered questions and assisted participants.	4.59	0.72	4.63	0.69	
The hotel meeting facilities were appropriate for the conference.	4.36	0.97	4.41	0.94	
The conference provided adequate audio-visual equipment and technical support.	4.64	0.67	4.67	0.67	
The Communitiversity activities provided valuable information. (n=105)	3.50	1.03			

Average Rating for Topical Session Evaluations (n=4031)

(1=poor; 5=excellent)

	2011 Data		2010 Data	
	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev
Overall Quality	4.49	0.25	4.44	0.27
Organization / Clarity of Presentation	4.50	0.25	4.47	0.28
Usefulness of Information	4.44	0.29	4.39	0.29
Relevance of Topic	4.60	0.23	4.54	0.28
Adequate Opportunity to Participate	4.35	0.33	4.25	0.37
Usefulness of Handouts / Support Materials / Slides	4.37	0.32	4.35	0.31

Poster Evaluations

(1=poor; 5=excellent)

	2011 Data (n=582)		2010 Data (n=644)	
	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev
Overall quality of Poster presentation	4.57	0.61	4.51	0.67
Organization / clarity of the Poster	4.56	0.64	4.49	0.74
Presentation (how well the presenter conveyed info during the session)	4.54	0.72	3.90	1.68
Usefulness of information	4.54	0.65	4.45	0.78
Relevance of topic	4.69	0.54	4.58	0.66
Adequate opportunity to interact/engage with presenter(s)	4.51	0.82	3.51	2.00
Usefulness of handouts / support materials	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)	2011 Data (n=61)		2010 Data (n=48)	
	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev
MCHB Home Visiting Program	4.25	0.85	NA	NA
MCHB Performance Reporting	4.39	0.80	NA	NA
Hearing Screening in Early Head Start	4.11	0.88	NA	NA
CDC Awardee Administrative Issues	4.25	0.86	NA	NA
Evaluating EHDI Programs	4.32	0.83	NA	NA
NICHQ Learning Collaboratives	4.19	0.79	NA	NA
Average Session Evaluation	4.25		4.20	
Thinking about the entire meeting: (1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree)	Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev
The information provided was worth the time	4.47	0.73	4.49	0.66
I learned new things that will improve our EHDI program	4.38	0.74	4.46	0.62
The meeting was a good networking opportunity	4.17	0.76	4.48	0.73
The meeting facilities were appropriate	4.57	0.50	3.94	1.08

State Stakeholder Meeting Pre-Session Evaluations (1=Strongly Disagree; 5=Strongly Agree)	2011 Data (n=196)		2010 Data (n=199)	
	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 EHDI Conference.	3.53	1.02	NA	NA
Participants from my state discussed the status of my state's EHDI system (goals, priorities, initiatives, etc.)	3.97	1.16	NA	NA
Participants from my state were able to determine which workshops would be most helpful for each participant to attend.	3.47	1.30	NA	NA
I was able to develop a plan to apply the new information that I learned at the conference to my state's EHDI system.	3.69	1.12	NA	NA
The organization, purpose, and activities for the State Stakeholders' Meeting were clear and easy to follow.	3.74	1.07	NA	NA
Average Evaluation	3.68		*4.11	

*Based on 2010 figures

Exhibitor Evaluations		2011 (n=16)		2010 (n=22)	
Most Important Reason Your Firm Came to EHDI:		# of Responses		# of Responses	
Exposure		15		21	
Leads/Sales		3		8	
New Product/ Service		2		4	
Maintain current clients		2		3	
Get marketplace information		2		2	
Competitors were there		1		1	
Other		1		2	
Rate the Following: (1 = Poor, 4 = Excellent)		Average	St Dev	Average	St Dev
Leads gathered at the EHDI Conference (Quantity):		3.25	0.86	1.59	0.59
Leads gathered at the EHDI Conference (Quality):		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		3.14	1.46	3.47	1.07
Clarity of pre-conference communications and info about exhibiting		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		3.75	1.00	4.05	0.89
Amount of time exhibits were open on Tuesday		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		3.00	0.37	2.90	0.30
Traffic flow by your exhibit		2.71	0.73	2.71	0.46
Rate the Following: (1 = Poor, 5 = Excellent)					
Shipping company's handling of shipments		3.27	1.19	3.53	1.13
Did you witness to any objectionable practices or display violations?		Yes = 2	No = 13	Yes = 2	No = 18
Rate the Following: (1 = Worse, 2 = The same, 3 = Better):					
Rate this year's conference compared to last year's		2.50	0.52	1.62	0.51
Would you recommend that your company exhibit next year?		Yes = 15	No = 0	Yes = 20	No = 1
Rate the Following:(1 = Not Satisfied, 4 = Extremely satisfied):		Unsure = 1		Unsure = 1	
How satisfied were you overall?		3.28	0.73	1.73	0.46

Pacific Rim Pre-Session Evaluations (n=22) (1=poor; 5=excellent)	2011 Data	
	Average	St Dev
Overall quality	4.62	0.59
Organization / clarity of the Presentation	4.71	0.56
Usefulness of information	4.73	0.55
Relevance of topic	4.77	0.43
Adequate opportunity to participate	4.73	0.55
Usefulness of handouts / support materials/PowerPoint Slides...	4.52	0.75

Medical Home Pre-Session Evaluations (n=38) (1=poor; 5=excellent)	2011 Data	
	Average	St Dev
Overall quality	4.61	0.48
Organization / clarity of the Presentation	4.70	0.46
Usefulness of information	4.70	0.51
Relevance of topic	4.80	0.39
Adequate opportunity to participate	4.80	0.39
Usefulness of handouts / support materials/PowerPoint Slides...	4.35	0.64

Language and Brain Development Pre-Session Evaluations (n=52) (1=poor; 5=excellent)	2011 Data	
	Average	St Dev
Overall quality	4.20	0.85
Organization / clarity of the Presentation	3.99	0.93
Usefulness of information	4.34	0.74
Relevance of topic	4.45	0.67
Adequate opportunity to participate	4.23	0.89
Usefulness of handouts / support materials/PowerPoint Slides...	3.84	1.22

IDEA for Professionals Pre-Session Evaluations (n=8) (1=poor; 5=excellent)	2011 Data	
	Average	St Dev
Overall quality	4.63	0.74
Organization / clarity of the Presentation	4.38	0.92
Usefulness of information	4.25	1.04
Relevance of topic	4.50	0.76
Adequate opportunity to participate	4.88	0.35
Usefulness of handouts / support materials/PowerPoint Slides...	4.63	0.52

IDEA for Parents Pre-Session Evaluations (n=10) (1=poor; 5=excellent)	2011 Data	
	Average	St Dev
Overall quality	4.90	0.32
Organization / clarity of the Presentation	4.90	0.32
Usefulness of information	4.90	0.32
Relevance of topic	5.00	0.00
Adequate opportunity to participate	5.00	0.00
Usefulness of handouts / support materials/PowerPoint Slides...	5.00	0.00

ECHO Pre-Session Evaluations (n=37) (1=poor; 5=excellent)	2011 Data	
	Average	St Dev
Overall quality	4.65	0.54
Organization / clarity of the Presentation	4.86	0.35
Usefulness of information	4.70	0.62
Relevance of topic	4.78	0.67
Adequate opportunity to participate	4.76	0.49
Usefulness of handouts / support materials/PowerPoint Slides...	4.89	0.32

Cultural Competence Pre-Session Evaluations (n=10) (1=poor; 5=excellent)	2011 Data	
	Average	St Dev
Overall quality	4.90	0.32
Organization / clarity of the Presentation	4.80	0.42
Usefulness of information	4.90	0.32
Relevance of topic	5.00	0.00
Adequate opportunity to participate	5.00	0.00
Usefulness of handouts / support materials/PowerPoint Slides...	4.80	0.42

**Using IT Applications for EHDI
Pre-Session Evaluations (n=24)**

(1=poor; 5=excellent)

2011 Data

Average St Dev

Overall quality	4.61	0.78
Organization / clarity of the Presentation	4.42	0.72
Usefulness of information	4.55	0.80
Relevance of topic	4.88	0.34
Adequate opportunity to participate	3.96	0.98
Usefulness of handouts / support materials/PowerPoint Slides...	4.05	1.43

Conference Attendees

2011

2010

Total	863	716
* Advocacy Group	56	37
* Audiologist	193	160
* Early Intervention Provider	137	126
* Family of a child with hearing loss	100	59
* Federal Agency	29	20
* Hospital/Birthing Center	52	57
* Local Health Department	17	8
* Medical Provider	64	11
* Non-Profit Agency	113	100
* Other, Please Specify:	154	145
* Part C Agency/Program	50	60
* State Education Agency	64	39
* State Health Department	154	145
* Student	117	55
* University	126	94
* Exhibitors	41	40
Total Groups Marked	1467	1156