

PRESENTER'S EVALUATION ONLY

Please indicate your presentation format: Paper Panel Poster Workshop

39 **18** **7** **6**
(56%) **(26%)** **(10%)** **(8%)**

From a speaker's perspective, please score the overall organization and administration of the conference.

Poor					Tremendous
1	2	3	4	5	
1	1	6	23	31	
(1%)	(1%)	(10%)	(37%)	(51%)	

Comments:

- I was listed as not being in attendance when I was...
- Some sessions were more or less smooth...due to presenters. I don't know how to help this.
- Daphne was terrific and accommodating.
- Nice to have Q&A after each paper unless presenters discuss open conversation beforehand. My experience of group Q&A of all presenters was dominated by one presenter.
- All worked well.
- Very good. The abstracts could have been available to help general selection or to gear presentations.
- Everything went very smoothly, but perhaps less concurrent sessions or a bit more time per session would have been better.
- 70 minutes for 2 panels with 4-5 speakers is too short to allow meaningful presentation and then discussion.

Please score the quality of communication between conference organizers and yourself.

Poor					Tremendous
1	2	3	4	5	
0	2	8	18	35	
(0%)	(3%)	(13%)	(28%)	(56%)	

Comments:

- Daphne was responsive and we had a "glitch" with our power-point beforehand and it was handled well.
- Very accessible
- I did a poster presentation. What I thought I was asked to do wasn't what happened, but all worked out ok in the end.
- Best ever.

- Always available, prompt, helpful.
- Good-I had schedule constraints and had to request changes, which were a bit complicated but worked out over time.
- The organizing staff was very responsive, organized, and professional.
- Daphne was very responsive and informative.
- Know what was going on. The changes in the program were a bit unnerving, but it all worked out.
- Great
- 'Panel' was not clear to me. (format)
- Several requests for materials already submitted.

Please score the call for abstracts, abstracts review and acceptance process?

Poor			Tremendous	
1	2	3	4	5
0	2	5	28	26
(0%)	(3%)	(8%)	(46%)	(43%)

Comments:

- "Call" took longer than expected after discussion to merge conferences.
- Second fine.
- Even at a difficulty from technical problems, it was handled very well.

From a speaker's perspective, please score the conference facilities made available to you.

Poor			Tremendous	
1	2	3	4	5
0	1	4	20	38
(0%)	(2%)	(6%)	(32%)	(60%)

Comments:

- It became standing-room only and chairs were needed; also screen came down too low so text could not be seen by those sitting in the back (Stevens Room)
- Excellent support
- Very nice- well organized
- Thank you so much for handling the posters. That was really a great help.
- I presented in the Arlington Clubs-if only all rooms were so beautiful.
- Beautiful facilities.
- One of my favorite forums for a conference.

- I really liked the room-we were able to move the chairs to make it a lot more intimate for the discussion.
- Making the clickers potentially available to presenters especially for workshops, opens up opportunities for interaction.
- The host even brought a white board for me.
- Location of rooms, toilets, etc. unclear.
- Not enough space for people to sit.
- Facilities were exceptional.
- Wow!

Would you consider presenting at a future ICCEC/ISCB event and/or recommending to colleagues?

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Maybe
58	4	1
(92%)	(6%)	(2%)

Comments:

- Would need more time- ethics analysis takes time to develop facts, address process, elicit responses, and come to a satisfactory conclusion.
- The content of the conference was very poor. I did not get valuable feedback. It is not worth coming again. I also didn't learn anything new. It was very disappointing.
- Only if they meet your excellent organizational standards.
- This was my first ICCEC meeting. It has a different feel than ASBH.
- Too narrowly focused in ethics of cases in hospitals in developed countries.
- Too many concurrent sessions; presenting to a very formal audience appears wasteful.

Other Comments:

- Wonderful conference!!
- Thank you-you had much work to do, but very well organized.
- The poster sessions were confusing. I am unclear why they were posters and not papers since presenters were asked to 'present' them. I think a traditional poster session would be better... the practice of holding questions until the end of the papers was particularly problematic.
- Excellent leadership of John Tuohey. Congratulations.
- A thousand thanks to Daphne Rosenbaum for her tremendous efforts to accommodate the presenters! Great conference!
- Thanks to John Tuohey and staff-excellent!
- Our tech guy suggests showing posters on TV screens rather than paper. He feels this is cheaper and of course easier than carrying a poster.

- Thanks to our departmental chairman for organizing our panel from Taiwan and getting funding. Over the long run, more immediate contact is needed for Asia and the U.S. too, it takes time and effort to develop. More hospital-based ethics is may continue this.
- Thank you!
 - As a presenter, I think it's better to provide printed abstracts to the conference delegates so they can make their informed decisions about which session to attend. I prefer the sessions to be grouped by themes. I prefer Q&A immediately after each speaker, not leaving all the Q&A until after all the presentations...Using clickers better? Can ask where people are from by region (n. America, central and S. America, Europe, Asia, Africa). Can do sub-question votes, eg (ask only Americans <very litigious society> to vote on the questions) and (then ask only non-Americans to vote).
- Thanks!
- Should have questions after each presentation rather than waiting until all have presented.
- Great job. I liked having many topics within the same session, good idea! Locals were very hospitable and helpful.
- Great conference.
 - With regards to organization, abstracts with similar themes needed to be grouped.

Thank you for completing this evaluation.