Evaluations of Pre-Conference Workshop
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November 14, 1988

TO: 1988 POD Conference Presenters

FROM: Kay Herr
Local Committee

Enclosed you will find the evaluations of your pre-conference workshop or small group presentation at our 1988 POD conference. We hope these are of benefit to you. Should you be one of several presenters for a session, we request you forward this evaluation information to the others as we are only sending it to you.

The conference was quite successful if we judge by informal remarks and our formal evaluations. Many aspects must come together for a conference to be successful and productive for the participants, and certainly the key element is the quality of our presentations. We believe we have a very high level of expectation and performance at our POD conferences and are very proud of our presenters. And grateful! Heartiest thanks to you for your willingness to give of your time, energy, and expertise for our members.

Hope to see you again next year!

These obviously did not copy too well. But they are all spectacular!

Thanks again for your involvement in this program. I found it helpful in my work with the Mass. Faculty Development Consortium.

I hope that your semester is going well...and that you have a good holiday.
Each small group presentation is being evaluated by five randomly selected participants. We request your cooperation in filling out the evaluation immediately after the session and depositing it in the evaluation box provided in the hallway. Thank you!

Name of speaker(s)/presentation: .................................................................

Excellent [ ] Good [x] Average [ ] Fair [ ] Poor [ ]

Comments: ...........................................................................................

--

Name of speaker(s)/presentation: .................................................................

Excellent [x] Good [ ] Average [ ] Fair [ ] Poor [ ]

Comments: ............................................ more excellent

--

Name of speaker(s)/presentation: .................................................................

Excellent [x] Good [ ] Average [ ] Fair [ ] Poor [ ]

Comments: ............................................ lack of information from different
Each small group presentation is being evaluated by five randomly selected participants. We request your cooperation in filling out the evaluation immediately after the session and depositing it in the evaluation box provided in the hallway. Thank you!

Name of speaker(s)/presentation: [Handwritten: Noting, Attan, Cawsley, Wright, Childe]

Excellent [X] Good [ ] Average [ ] Fair [ ] Poor [ ]

Comments: [Handwritten: Gave a good overview of several different styles]

[Handwritten: of Regional Consortium]

---

Each small group presentation is being evaluated by five randomly selected participants. We request your cooperation in filling out the evaluation immediately after the session and depositing it in the evaluation box provided in the hallway. Thank you!

Name of speaker(s)/presentation: [Handwritten: Holton, et al.]

Excellent [X] Good [ ] Average [ ] Fair [ ] Poor [ ]

Comments: [Handwritten: Surprised that the systems program]

[Handwritten: represents... ]