

27. I-5. Based on the content of the institute, I am able to (1=Strongly disagree, 5=Strongly agree):

	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Rating Count
1. Describe 3 causes of cases of false allegations of CSA and explain why the prevalence of false reports may be underestimated.	4.3% (1)	4.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	26.1% (6)	65.2% (15)	4.43	23
2. Describe and explain research findings suggesting that, in absence of corroborative evidence, neither professionals nor laypersons are able to accurately discriminate between true and false reports of child sexual abuse.	4.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	25.0% (6)	70.8% (17)	4.58	24
3. Describe and explain methods for a) obtaining corroboration for more allegations of CSA; b) improving the accuracy of judgments about allegations of CSA; and c) controlling the ratio of false positive and false negative errors in legal decisions about CSA cases in order to bring this ratio more in line with deeply held sociolegal values.	8.3% (2)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (3)	25.0% (6)	54.2% (13)	4.17	24
4. Describe ways to improve outcomes in custody disputes that include allegations of CSA and the appropriate use of supervised visitation in these cases.	4.2% (1)	12.5% (3)	12.5% (3)	33.3% (8)	37.5% (9)	3.88	24
5. Describe differing perspectives on cases of alleged CSA, including the perspectives of judicial officers, law enforcement, forensic interviewers and visitation supervisors.	4.3% (1)	13.0% (3)	8.7% (2)	34.8% (8)	39.1% (9)	3.91	23
answered question							24
skipped question							199

28. Steve Herman, PhD (1=Poor, 5=Excellent)

	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Rating Count
Level of knowledge	3.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	3.2% (1)	12.9% (4)	80.6% (25)	4.68	31
Expertise	3.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	3.2% (1)	12.9% (4)	80.6% (25)	4.68	31
Teaching ability	3.2% (1)	3.2% (1)	0.0% (0)	22.6% (7)	71.0% (22)	4.55	31
answered question							31
skipped question							192

29. Lucy McSweeney, LLB (1=Poor, 5=Excellent)

	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Rating Count
Level of knowledge	3.4% (1)	6.9% (2)	17.2% (5)	34.5% (10)	37.9% (11)	3.97	29
Expertise	3.6% (1)	7.1% (2)	17.9% (5)	32.1% (9)	39.3% (11)	3.96	28
Teaching ability	3.6% (1)	10.7% (3)	25.0% (7)	25.0% (7)	35.7% (10)	3.79	28
answered question							29
skipped question							194

30. Session overall (1=Disagree, 5=Agree)

	1	2	3	4	5	Rating Average	Rating Count
This session expanded my level of knowledge on the topic	0.0% (0)	3.2% (1)	3.2% (1)	29.0% (9)	64.5% (20)	4.55	31
						answered question	31
						skipped question	192

31. Comments:

	Response Count
	12
answered question	12
skipped question	211

Page 6, Q5. Comments:

1	Very relevant. I will use this information.	Jun 11, 2014 10:00 PM
2	Really enjoyed this workshop. Worthwhile!	Jun 4, 2014 9:33 PM
3	Thought provoking in terms of looking for best evidence and how to consider this in terms of the overall evaluation.	Jun 4, 2014 11:02 AM
4	More information about custody and access disputes and less information about investigations would have been helpful.	Jun 4, 2014 10:06 AM
5	Excellent institute! Just by itself, it made the entire 4-day long conference worthwhile.	Jun 2, 2014 10:53 AM
6	Steve Herman was very much an expert. I learned a lot from him. I wish, though, that he had spoken the entire day or more of it than he was allowed.	Jun 1, 2014 8:47 AM
7	Dr. Herman's presentation was excellent. However, there was a significant disconnect between the information he was presenting and the information provided by the panel. The panel appeared to not understand that their standards of practice were contradicted by the research presented by Dr. Herman. It would have been MUCH better if the panel had been comprised of judicial officers from other countries. Frankly, there were better comments made by the audience that by the panel. The panel was an embarrassment to those of us who are from Ontario.	May 29, 2014 8:51 AM
8	Handouts were disappointing because illegibly small print. Slides had too much print on them. Will welcome the electronic version as promised by presenter. Enjoyed discussion prompted by panel. Helpful contributions from other attendees.	May 28, 2014 9:37 PM
9	I gave Lucy McSweeney 3s because she did not present much. I would rather have given her non-applicable	May 28, 2014 5:07 PM
10	The members of the panel were irrelevant to the workshop topic. The moderator did not do a good job of getting the panel to stay on topic, Last two hours were a waste - Herman was excellent, however	May 28, 2014 4:30 PM
11	Very good especially the afternoon sessions with panel and greater interactivity	May 28, 2014 4:08 PM
12	Great session!	May 28, 2014 3:57 PM