

ALBERTA FOUNDATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE JUSTICE
“The Society for Administrative Tribunal Training”
SUMMARY OF JUNE 1, 2006 CONFERENCE EVALUATION
(45 forms filled)

1. What made you attend this Conference? Please check all that apply.

# who said Specific Speaker(s)*	8
# who said specific topic(s)**	14
# who said training sessions	26
# who said exploration of current issues in the field	27
# who said networking opportunities	20
# who said other (please specify)***	8

- * Slater, Greckol, 3 judges, panel (pm), plenary # 2 speakers, James Casey
- ** credibility, administrative law, dealing with difficult presenters, assessing credibility, literacy, Charter issues and tribunals, investigations, current trends, learning about AFAJ and tribunals, giving evidence,
- *** General interest in Admin Justice, always an opportunity to learn!, materials, tribunal work is a continued learning curve, work related need, new panel member (want to learn about and/or understand Admin Justice, general introduction to the AFAJ, general information.

2. Please rate the overall content value of the sessions:

	# said Excellent	# said Above Satisfactory	# said Satisfactory	# said Not Satisfactory	# said Poor
Plenary #1 - Importance of Administrative Tribunals in the Access to Justice	16	15	8		
Dealing with Troublesome Presenters	13	7	3		
Assessing Credibility	13	15	7	1	
Investigations-Process & Reporting	6	7	2		
Literacy Awareness	8	1	3		
Plenary #2 - Current Trends in Administrative Law	24	8	1		

Comments:

- Plenary #2- too rushed (Rating: Excellent)
- Plenary #1- very academic (Rating: Satisfactory)
- Assessing Credibility- didn't know this was two (2) parts (Rating: Satisfactory); another- did not know (realize?) that this was a two part session (Rating: Above Satisfactory).
- Assessing Credibility- not organized, G. Campbell did not present, just handouts, presenter missing and not the topic. (Rating: Satisfactory)
- Assessing Credibility- W. Tilleman was excellent. The continuation of session 1 to session 2 should have been announced. Handouts were in short supply and not centrally located. The "Questions & Answer" presentation style of Glenda Campbell in the afternoon session somewhat ineffective. (Rating: Satisfactory)
- Investigations- this session was very helpful to re-iterate the process. It was very good examples of different businesses using the same process. (Rating: Above Satisfactory)
- Dealing with Troublesome Presenters- could have used a whole day! (Rating: Excellent)

3. Please rate your overall content experience at this conference:

Overall Conference	# said Excellent	# said Above Satisfactory	# said Satisfactory	# said Not Satisfactory	# said Poor
	28	13	3		

4. What would you recommend for inclusion in future conference packages?

- Opportunity to attend all sessions
- Perhaps some related to health profession act panels/tribunals
- Excellent packages- thanks for such a great book!
- Same format- very effective
- Anything relevant to Admin Law
- Longer sessions in dealing with troublesome presenters and assessing credibility.
- Better confirmation- I didn't receive one.
- More on current trends
- Change the binder so we don't get the same on every year.
- Comparison of Alberta Tribunals (ie) numbers, hearings, etc., current packages were excellent, copies of cases referenced by speakers?
- Nothing it was a good package.

5. What suggestions do you have for improvement of this conference?

- Would have been nice to know that assessing credibility was a consecutive session (1 and 2).
- Allow attendees to view all plenary sessions. Rotate between Edmonton and Calgary like workshops. How about a trade fair where each tribunal has a booth with info and materials.
- Have some aboriginal input and knowledge, they are excellent, tribunals work suck as healing circles.
- I would have like to attend all 4 concurrent sessions, maybe run 2 in the am and 2 in the pm.
- Maybe quick intro of conference delegates at beginning (go around the table); hand outs onto tables.
- Longer breakout sessions.
- I would like to have attended $\frac{3}{4}$ sessions, 2 wasn't enough.
- Assessing credibility needs to only be one time period.
- Keep on with the variety of credible speakers.
- Shorter coffee breaks- 1 more session.
- Longer plenary sessions.
- Would have liked to have attended ALL presentations.
- An excellent job as always!
- Have AGM @ end of the day, after networking and meeting the executive. Gives a better opportunity to seek nominations from floor.
- Visual aids.
- Citation list, reference list, biblio. From speakers. If not available at conference, post on Website.
- Last session- time should have been allowed for questions after each speaker.
- Have last three speakers (@2:45pm) do their own sessions for 1 hour. There is not enough time for them and they are interesting. Perhaps a two-day conference. Too much break time, need to use that time for sessions. Unfortunate concurrent sessions at the same time, would like to hear more than two. Have general meeting at 5pm so others can leave.
- Receiving an agenda prior to the conference would be helpful. Upon registration no info received about Friday's workshop. AGM seems very much pre-determined and feels like wasted time for general membership/ Make two separate events or allow for registration at 9am after the AGM. Also the session on credibility was a full day so those who joined at 1pm were at a loss. This should have been CLEARLY advertised.
- Coffee/network breaks are too long. Less plenary and less break time would allow for 3rd session.

6. Are there any topics or themes you would recommend for future seminars?

- Decision writing- tribunals.
- Yes- a session on mediation as well as continuing with speakers such as Justice Slatter, Bill Shores and James Casey- excellent and interesting speakers.
- Aboriginal issues and relations.
- Tribunal member performance evaluations, chairing procedures, current cases in Admin Law, demo of tribunal information systems, a sampling for tribunal decisions.
- Decision writing exercises, decision making process, talk about teamwork on panel and conflicts that arise on panels between members/chairs, how to keep questions relevant, weighing evidence.
- Panel of three is good for variety and information.
- Bias- panel or witness
- Aboriginal issues (first nations and metis).
- Its ALL good.
- Court of Appeals, who do they look for when an appeal is filed.
- Evaluating tribunal processes,

7. How did you learn about the Conference?

# who said brochure/direct mail	27
# who said website	3
# who said AFAJ courses	3
# who said other (please specify*)	13

- * work / colleague x 4
- From my board
- Board of directors
- Deborah Howes
- Employer
- Secretariat office
- Office staff
- Agency members
- MSAT office/ administration

8. Do you have any suggestion for additional promotion of the seminar?

- Send mailer to government ministries and boards
- Ask tribunals if they could have a link on their website to the foundations website.
- Advertising in the newspaper?
- Send brochure email to all boards in province and invite Board chairs to participate.
- In the case of corporate membership, it would be helpful for email notices to individuals.
- Material to all Alberta Tribunals.

Other Comments

- Robin Carr did an excellent job on his presentation/ He gave a clear and concise presentation. Barry was a very good speaker. Preeti at times was a little too soft spoken.
- Unaware assessing credibility was continuation from am.
- Will there be a certification for completion of a set number/topics/ etc. of the AFAJ courses? – Martha Miller
- Excellent speakers. Thought the variety of perspectives on the panel was great.
- Excellent conference- a huge “thanks” for such a professional event!