

53rd Annual ABCT Convention

Continuing Education Credit — General Sessions

To receive CE credit from general sessions, please:

BE SURE YOU SCAN IN AND SCAN OUT OF ALL SESSIONS.

1. Find the sessions you attend on the following pages and answer all the questions.
TO RECEIVE CREDIT THESE QUESTIONS MUST BE ANSWERED
2. List the total number of sessions attended at the bottom of each page.
3. Sign the form below.
4. Return the signature page and the completed pages only via e-mail to CECredit@abct.org, or fax to (212) 647-1865 or mail to: 305 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10001 no later than January 15, 2020.
5. Be sure you have paid the CE fee.

***Continuing Education for the 2019 Atlanta, GA Convention
will be processed at the ABCT office until January 15, 2020.***

Please remember, the booklets will be compared to the scan-in/ scan-out reports from each session. **ONLY** those sessions in which you have been scanned in and signed out will be counted. ***Please make sure you are scanned in and out of each session.***

You will receive a personalized certificate, noting the number of credit hours you have earned, approximately 8 weeks after the Convention, or 8 weeks after this booklet is received.



ABCT is approved by the American Psychological Association to sponsor continuing education for psychologists. ABCT maintains responsibility for this program and its content.

This program is approved by the National Association of Social Workers (Approval # 886427222) for **27** continuing education contact hours.

The Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies has been approved by NBCC as an Approved Continuing Education Provider, ACEP No. 5797. Programs that do not qualify for NBCC credit are clearly identified. The Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies is solely responsible for all aspects of the programs.

ABCT is recognized as a California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (CAMFT)-approved Continuing Education Provider (#133136). The ABCT Annual Convention meets the qualifications for **28** hours of continuing education credit for LMFTs, LCSWs, LPCCs, and/or LEPs as required by the California Board of Behavioral Sciences.

ATTENDEE

PRINTED NAME

Signature

Which Way Do You Go? A Live, Annotated Demonstration of Acceptance and Change in Adolescent DBT

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: M303, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Explain the core dialectic in DBT

Describe six levels of validation

Describe three types of change strategies

Identify two differences between acceptance and change strategies when targeting suicidal and self-injurious behaviors

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate

Adequate

Good

Excellent

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Virtual Reality Exposure Therapy For PTSD: Demonstrations of Imaginal Exposure With and Without Virtual Reality

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: A708, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe how virtual reality exposure therapy is used for PTSD.

Discuss potential advantages of using virtual reality for imaginal exposure to trauma memories.

List prerequisites to implementing virtual reality exposure therapy for PTSD.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Adaptations for Assessments & Increased Impact of Evidence Based Treatments for Individuals With Autism Spectrum & Co-occurring Disorders

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 12:30 PM - 2:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon D, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the problems of assessment and diagnostic overshadowing for the ASD population

Analyze the barriers to effective treatment for people with ASD

List 3 adaptations for evidence based psychotherapy to increase utility with ASD

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Beyond Standard CBT: Innovative Developments in Behavioral Interventions for Eating Disorders

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: M104, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Summarize the research on CBT effectiveness and limitations with eating disorders.

Describe four novel, evidence-based approaches to eating disorder treatment: CBT with exposure therapy techniques, DBT, RO DBT, and TBTS.

Discuss how each treatment addresses the previous limitations of CBT with eating disorders.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Intensive CBT for Youth With Anxiety and Obsessive-Compulsive Disorders: Special Considerations for the Design and Delivery of Treatment

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 3:00 PM - 4:30 PM

Location: M103, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe current research and clinical findings relevant to the implementation of intensive, exposure-based CBT for youth with anxiety and OCD.

Discuss clinical considerations and programmatic decisions for treating youth with anxiety and OCD in an intensive format.

Clarify the challenges unique to delivering brief, intensive CBT for youth and explain potential strategies for overcoming barriers.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Clinical Considerations for Culturally Tailored Couple Care With Underserved Groups

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: A706, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Provide a framework for the culturally competent treatment of diverse couples

Understand key clinical, empirical, and practical considerations for culturally tailoring couple therapies

Consider how to address health disparities that various demographic groups face in accessing quality relationship services

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

“The Way You Make Me Feel”: Trans-theoretical Approaches to Addressing Emotions in Couple Therapy

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: L504-L505, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify the role of emotion in understanding relationship distress among different theoretical approaches of couple therapy

Discuss interventions targeting emotion across different orientations of couple therapy

Discuss the adaptation of trans-theoretical approaches to emotion among couples from different cultures and with varied presenting problems

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Beyond the Office: Benefits, Challenges, and Considerations for the Use of Telehealth in Diverse Clinical Settings

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: L508, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Develop an understanding of the current research on teletherapy, the APA guidelines for teletherapy, and the benefits of teletherapy.

Learn about the challenges that arise from the use of teletherapy and how to address these challenges in different clinical settings.

Learn about different adaptations to cognitive and behavioral techniques for use in teletherapy.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Optimizing Success in Delivery of Trauma Focused Treatments with Patients With Borderline Personality Disorder

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: M104, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Discuss current research base and clinical practice in treatment of comorbid BPD and PTSD

Discuss concerns about implementing TFTs with BPD individuals and dispel myths about this work

Delineate strategies for implementing PE and CPT protocols to fidelity while also monitoring patient safety and therapy interfering behaviors

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Challenges of Treating Traumatized Adolescents: Successes, Failures, and the Value of Good Old-Fashioned Case Conceptualization

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: M303, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify barriers to implementation of evidence-based treatments for adolescents with interpersonal trauma histories

Present rationale for and use of an evidence-based protocol that integrates treatment components to address each of these barriers

Emphasize treatment success and failure as a function of how well case conceptualization synthesizes the treatment principles

Discuss implications for training/delivery of treatment whose effectiveness may depend upon careful, nuanced synthesis of different theories

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Embracing the Dialectics in the Implementation of Dialectical Behavior Therapy (DBT) in the Veterans Health Administration (VHA)

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom A, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Present current information available on the benefits of DBT in the VHA, including current research completed on the cost savings.

Discuss the unique challenges encountered with use and implementation of DBT in VHA including recent research completed on these challenges.

Describe the facilitators that have been found to assist in implementation of DBT in the VHA, as well as sustain DBT Programs.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Foundations and Flexible Applications of Behavioral Activation in Clinical Context

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: A701, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand the Behavioral Activation treatment model, rationale, evidence base, and foundation in affective neuroscience.

Understand how to flexibly implement a principle-driven BA model in practice settings with complex and heterogeneous case examples.

Address barriers to treatment and describe augmentation strategies via structured parental involvement and in-vivo BA strategies.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Exposures Gone Awry: Rallying and Recuperating from Unforeseen, Unanticipated, and Uncommon Blunders!

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: A708, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Discuss how to design and implement the various types of exposure therapy

Identify common challenges in conducting exposure therapy

Describe what the therapist can do when unanticipated issues emerge during exposure therapy

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Psychologists in Pediatric Medical Settings: Extending the Reach of Evidence-Based Treatment

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM **Location:** Imperial Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Discuss the ways in which behavioral health frameworks extend evidence-based treatment to a broad audience.

Describe several models of integrating psychologists into pediatric medical settings.

Identify and problem-solve common challenges related to implementation of behavioral health models.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Athlete Mental Health: Strategies for Engaging Stakeholders in Identification and Treatment

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM **Location:** L504-L505, Lobby Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Present current research base of athlete mental health and describe practice-related gaps in this literature.

Discuss linkages between mental health and athletic performance.

Identify strategies for overcoming barriers to adequate assessment and treatment of mental health concerns in athletes.

Describe the role of policy in the assessment and treatment of athlete mental health.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Practicing Cognitive Behavioral Therapy With Religious Patients From Christian, Muslim and Jewish Communities

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM **Location:** L506-L507, Lobby Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe religious-cultural issues in the dissemination of cognitive behavior therapy.

Understand some of the unique needs of religious Christian, Muslim and Jewish individuals presenting for treatment.

Explain how religious worldviews and practices can be addressed in case conceptualization.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Clinical Challenges and Opportunities for Family Involvement in the Treatment of Adult Psychopathology

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: L508, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the potential and unique advantages of addressing adult psychopathology in an interpersonal context.

Understand the rationale for involving family members in treatment for several psychological disorders.

Describe the challenges of working with couples/families in the treatment of psychopathology along with strategies to address these challenges.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Improving Access to CBT in Rural Canada: Challenges and Opportunities

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: M101, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the current challenges of limited access to CBT within rural geographic settings of Canada.

Describe opportunities for increasing access to CBT within rural areas based on examples from rural Canada.

Describe differences and similarities between private and public practice settings and how this impacts CBT delivery in rural areas of Canada.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Increasing Diversity in Clinical Training

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** L504-L505, Lobby Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the importance of increasing diversity in clinical training

Identify barriers to inclusion of minority individuals in clinical training

Identify strategies for increasing diversity in clinical training

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Building the Workforce to Deliver Psychological Therapies Globally

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 12:30 PM - 1:30 PM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom B&C, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe how brief psychological therapies are delivered in global contexts, including the settings, providers, format, and effects;

Describe how training and competency assessments are conducted for providers and the evidence on digital approaches for delivering these interventions;

Discuss a new initiative that aims to transform the opportunities to learn and master the delivery of brief psychological therapies globally.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Transforming the Lives of Children, Parents, and Communities: Accomplishments and Future Opportunities

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 1:30 PM - 2:30 PM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom B&C, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe how innovations in the delivery of positive parenting principles has occurred to tackle a diverse range of child problems.

Demonstrate an understanding of integrated, multilevel systems of evidence-based interventions to promote population-level change.

Explain how parenting interventions continue to evolve to address the needs of contemporary parents and families in a culturally sensitive manner.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Increasing Impact of Cognitive Behavioral Therapies: Why Public Health?

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 9:00 AM - 10:30 AM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom B&C, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Described the CDC conceptual framework for population health and prevention and implications for increasing the impact of cognitive behavioral science.

Discussed strategies to scale up and scale out effective prevention and intervention approaches to maximize their public health impact.

Illustrated successes and challenges of implementations and implications for increasing the reach and sustainability of effective practices.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Imagine Being Accused of Scientific Fraud!

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 11:00 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom B&C, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the upside, downside, and aftermath of a scientific controversy that derived from research successfully challenging conventional wisdom.

Describe evolution of a program of motivational behavioral-cognitive treatment research on alcohol problems to pioneer research on self-change and innovative treatments.

Describe how studying persons with alcohol use disorders when they were intoxicated provided valuable insights into the nature of alcohol problems.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little		A Great Deal
1	2	3
		4
		5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2	3
		4
		5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Starting your Private Practice: Advice from Expert Guides

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Ballroom A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Explain three specific pieces of information from mid-level and senior cognitive-behavioral professionals about developing a private practice.

Identify and describe two specific decision points in building your practice, including choices regarding insurance, individual vs. group practice, and identity development.

Describe panelists' answers to the questions you have about your emerging career in private practice.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Graduate School in Psychology: Getting In and Making It Work

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:30 PM

Location: A707, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 2

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Provide information about activities one could engage in as an undergraduate student that will best prepare him/her for graduate school in psychology.

Provide information about selecting graduate programs, filing applications, completing a personal statement, and interviewing.

Provide information about strategies for surviving the first year in a graduate program.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

CBT Express for Young Patients : Bite-sized Versions of Conventional Procedures

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM Location: M102, Marquis Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Develop a personalized and portable case conceptualization suitable for multiple emerging service contexts caring for young patients

Apply 5-7 brief CBT techniques that can be applied in approximately 15 minutes when treating young patients in pediatric, school-based, inpatient, and traditional outpatient behavioral health settings.

Extend the reach of CBT with youth to novel contexts that demand brief scalable assessment and treatment

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Sports, Superheroes, Star Wars and Beyond: Strategies for Teaching Cognitive and Behavioral Principles to Anxious Youth and Making Therapy Fun

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM Location: M103, Marquis Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

demonstrate at least three strategies for incorporating sports and pop culture into teaching youth about the CBT model.

Demonstrate at least three strategies for incorporating sports and pop culture examples into multiple CBT components such as cognitive restructuring and exposures.

Create and utilize at least three elements of a superhero narrative for youth with anxiety disorders.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Overcoming Challenges in the Therapeutic Relationship

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Location: M102, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify dysfunctional beliefs associated with therapeutic relationship problems.

List techniques to repair ruptures.

Use strategies to prevent problems in the therapeutic relationship.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Strategic Pressure for OCD: When All Else Fails

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Location: M103, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Attendees will understand the rationale for using Strategic Pressure and how to determine when it is appropriate to institute Strategic Pressure.

Attendees will learn how to motivate and educate families about their role in strategic pressure.

Attendees will learn the how to create therapeutic forced choices and how to transform the treatment refusing patient into a collaborator in his/her own program.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Building the Effective Workforce of the Future: A Comprehensive Model for Training Students in Evidence-Based Practice for Youth Mental Health

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 12:30 PM - 2:00 PM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom A, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the MAP system and how it meets educational objectives related to practice delivery, real-time measurement, and clinical decision-making.

Identify how the MAP curriculum can be tailored for a diversity of learners and to support their learning over time.

Recognize empirically supported practices in instruction and training of youth mental health treatments.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

How to Integrate Mindfulness into a Cognitive Behavior Therapy Framework

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 1:00 PM - 2:30 PM Location: M102, Marquis Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe how mindfulness strategies fit into a Cognitive Behavior Therapy framework.

Identify beliefs about thoughts, thought processes, and emotions that can be targeted during mindfulness meditations.

Conduct mindfulness meditations designed to evaluate beliefs about thoughts, thought processes, and emotions.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Stronger Than OCD: Engaging Youth in Exposure and Ritual Prevention Treatment

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 1:00 PM - 2:30 PM **Location:** M103, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Better understand the challenges of providing effective treatment for pediatric OCD

Apply concrete strategies to improve engagement of youth in EX/RP treatment

Generate and execute creative exposures that are geared for youth

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

The Unified Protocol For Transdiagnostic Treatment of Emotional Disorders in Children: Applications For Anger and Irritability

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM Location: Imperial Salon B, Marquis Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Apply a unified, transdiagnostic case conceptualization model to the treatment of anger and irritability in youth

Enhance participants' ability to flexibly deliver the Unified Protocol for Transdiagnostic Treatment of Emotional Disorders to irritable youth and youth with disruptive behaviors

Understand how to conduct exposure and opposite action experiments targeting anger, frustration intolerance, and irritability in youth

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Evidence-Based Treatment With a Higher Purpose: Spiritually-Integrated CBT

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 3:00 PM - 4:30 PM Location: M102, Marquis Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all Somewhat Completely
1 2 3 4 5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe at least three ways that spirituality/religion is functionally related to mental health

Formulate spiritual resources and struggles in clinically meaningful terms

Implement a brief CBT-based assessment of spirituality in clinical practice

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little A Great Deal
1 2 3 4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful Extremely Useful
1 2 3 4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate Adequate Good Excellent

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Behavioral Activation for Adolescents

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM **Location:** A705, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Implement key BA principles, techniques, and strategies with their adolescent patients

Flexibly adapt BA components based on the characteristics of their adolescent patients (e.g., SES, developmental level, family dynamics)

Generate creative solutions to common treatment barriers that arise with adolescent patients and their families

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Integration of Multiculturalism and Cognitive Behavioral Treatments for People of Color With Anxiety

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM Location: M301-M302, Marquis Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the theory and research that support the integration of multiculturalism and CBT in the treatment of people of color experiencing anxiety.

Learn and understand how specific stressors often impact the development, course, and treatment of people of color experiencing anxiety.

Learn specific skills through case presentations from our work to highlight the ways that cognitive behavioral therapies can be adapted to better serve clients from marginalized backgrounds.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Bringing ERP From the Classroom to the Treatment Room: A Guide for Students and New Therapists to Motivate Patients to do ERP.

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM Location: L504-L505, Lobby Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Participants will learn to apply basic theory behind ERP to actual, real world cases.

Learn how ERP works and reasons why it may not in order to not make the same mistakes that seasoned professionals made when they were first starting out using ERP.

Participants will learn specific ways to introduce ERP to their patients so that their patients will actually look forward to doing ERP.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

CBT for Addictions: Customizing Your Strategies to Meet the Needs of People From Diverse Backgrounds

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Imperial Salon A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Articulate their own personal definition of sociocultural diversity, specifically in the context of CBT for addictive behaviors

Explain how they integrate sociocultural diversity into their CBT case conceptualization when treating people with addictive behaviors

Identify how their sociocultural background may impact how they think about people from different backgrounds

Describe at least one actual clinical experience that has impacted their view of sociocultural diversity

Explain how their CBT case conceptualization impacts their choice of specific techniques for people from diverse backgrounds

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

CBT for Looming Vulnerability Distortions in Anxiety

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon D, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the theory and research that support a looming vulnerability model as a cognitive perspective to anxiety and fear.

Describe novel techniques for targeting and correcting these cognitive and perceptual distortions that can provide adjunctive tools for CBT protocols.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Treating Impulsive, Addictive, and Self-Destructive Behaviors

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Imperial Salon A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Conceptualize dysregulated behaviors with empirically supported methods.

Integrate evidenced-back strategies to improve treatment engagement in clients with dysregulated behavior(s).

Describe strategies to address common treatment obstacles (homework noncompliance, missed sessions, ambivalence about treatment, etc.).

Customize strategies and techniques to fit diverse client needs and treatment plans.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Using Digital Tools to Facilitate Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy for Insomnia Treatment With Veterans

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon C, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe how free digital CBT-I resources such as Path to Better Sleep or CBT-i Coach meet an important public health need.

Describe how these resources can be used with Veterans, either as adjuncts to treatment or as recommendations for self-care.

Identify three client-centered considerations to take into account when integrating technology into clinical care.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Cognitive and Behavioral Practice With Sexual and Gender Minorities

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM **Location:** M103, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify and address psychological processes unique to sexual and gender minorities in order to maximize treatment gains.

Increase your ability to apply and adapt CBT techniques such as cognitive restructuring, exposure, and behavioral activation to sexual and gender minority specific treatment targets.

Utilize acceptance and mindfulness-based techniques such as cognitive defusion, values clarification, and committed action for work with sexual and gender minorities.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Recovery Oriented Cognitive Therapy for Schizophrenia

Date: 11/23/2019 Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM Location: A704, Atrium Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Name the three parts of the Recovery Oriented Cognitive Therapy Protocol

Explain how the therapeutic relationship and in session experiences are used for behavioral experiments.

Describe the cognitive formulation for negative symptoms.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Having Faith in Acceptance-based Science: Are the Spiritual Foundations of Mindfulness Compatible With Behavior Therapy?

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM Location: M202, Marquis Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the convergence & divergence of concepts underlying behavior therapy with the spiritual tenets underpinning contemplative practice.

Discuss the position of different behavior therapies on contemplative practice requirements for practitioners.

Discuss principles to navigate the tension in providing a science-based intervention that includes contemplative practices.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Translating Research Findings to Clinical Practice: Out of the Echo Chamber; Into the Marketplace!

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM Location: A702, Atrium Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify several ways direct-to-consumer marketing can increase mental health literacy and extends the impact of cognitive behavioral science

Describe innovative presentation skills that will help professionals communicate state of the science findings to multiple stakeholders

list guidelines and tips for self-help materials to improve individuals' health and well-being

Discuss training needs and demands of multiple professionals who are learning evidence based procedures

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

The MAP Toolkit For Enhancing the Connections Between Science and Practice: Common Elements and Much More

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM **Location:** A705, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Delineate challenges to using evidence to inform actions, clinical practice, workforce development, and/or improve systems.

Define the MAP system, including how it leverages evidence from a variety of sources, and distinguish MAP from evidence-based treatment programs.

Identify ways that a system like MAP can influence services at a variety of levels (e.g., direct services, workforce development, policy).

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

So You Want to Train People From Different Professions in CBT... Now What?

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: L504-L505, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Attendees will be able to discuss factors to consider in developing and executing CBT curricula for trainees across different professions.

Attendees will be able to describe strengths and challenges for trainees and supervisors related to CBT in an interprofessional training context.

Attendees will be able to identify important considerations for CBT competency in non-psychologist trainees.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Treatment Engagement of Youth With suicide Risk From Underserved Communities

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe barriers to treatment engagement in youth with suicide risk from different minority groups

Discuss how barriers are similar and different across groups

Describe culturally responsive strategies for effectively engaging underserved youth

Present ideas on how to effectively adapt evidence-based interventions to be culturally responsive to high-risk youth

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Cognitive-behavioral Interventions for Substance Use Disorders: Challenges and Future Directions

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM **Location:** Imperial Salon A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Discuss the limitations of cognitive behavioral treatments for substance use disorders across clinical populations

Identify the contexts that present challenges to the implementation of substance use treatments

Explore possible strategies for addressing limitations of current treatments and their implementation

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Social Justice Advocacy: What it is, Why it Matters, & How to Help Psychology Fellows Integrate it into Their Professional Identity and Practice

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM Location: M301-M302, Marquis Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe social justice advocacy, focusing on institutional-level advocacy that promotes equity and inclusion in mental health

Discuss research that can inform social justice advocacy training and facilitate associated professional development for psychology fellows

Present expert recommendations for social justice advocacy training for psychology fellows

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Advocacy in Action: Psychologists' Role in Advocacy to Improve the Health of Marginalized Populations

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM Location: M304, Marquis Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Discuss the importance of engaging in advocacy as psychologists

Provide examples of how psychologists can use advocacy to collaborate with marginalized communities, reduce disparities, and advance science

Describe the challenges of engaging in advocacy as psychologists and offer potential strategies for overcoming barriers

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

CBT in the Media: Strategies for Communicating Cognitive Behavioral Science Effectively

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: A702, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Provide attendees with concrete strategies for communicating with a variety of media outlets (e.g., newspaper, radio, TV, Twitter)

Describe opportunities for increasing media dissemination of cognitive behavioral science and practice

Define specific terminology related to interacting with the media as a scientist practitioner.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Community Violence: Promoting Change by Bridging Science, Training, Policy, and Practice

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM **Location:** Imperial Ballroom B, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Attendees will gain a working understanding of the present literature and current conceptualization of community violence exposure

Attendees will learn about ongoing efforts towards violence prevention and intervention at the national, state, and local levels

Attendees will consider future directions in community violence prevention and intervention, and explore implications on training and policy

Attendees will receive practical recommendations towards understanding and addressing community violence in their own science and practice

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Research Recruitment Strategies For 'Hard to Reach' Populations: A Panel to Share Lessons Learned and Tangible Takeaways

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM **Location:** M304, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe challenges in recruiting hard-to-reach populations for participation in research.

Provide concrete examples of ways in which to partner with and recruit these populations to be part of research

Discuss methods for monitoring and evaluating recruitment strategies.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Parenting Gender Diverse Youth: Setting a Research and Clinical Agenda

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** L506-L507, Lobby Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Introduction to the particular needs of families with gender diverse youth.

Discuss the current state of clinical practice with families of gender diverse youth.

Highlight gaps in the literature pertaining to parenting gender diverse youth.

Explore how encouraging affirming caregiver approaches with gender diverse youth could inform future research and clinical directions.

Examine salient barriers to affirming parental practices, as well as the role of clinicians and researchers in this domain

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Bridging Anxiety, OCD, and Psychosis to Address Overlapping symptoms and Provide Evidence-based Care for Comorbid Presenting Problems

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** M106-M107, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe and assess the intersections of OCD and psychosis and anxiety and psychosis

Gain confidence in assessing and treating anxiety/OCD for those with psychosis and psychosis-like experiences for those with anxiety/OCD

Understand the role of transdiagnostic constructs like anxiety sensitivity and intolerance of uncertainty across many disorders

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

The Role of Cognitive Behavioral Science in Addressing Individual and Systemic Constraints to Evidence-based Practice in the Changing Health Care Marketplace

Date: 11/23/2019 Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM Location: M301, Marquis Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify external factors influencing the mental health, educational, and training systems that impact clinical decision-making processes.

Discuss how providers can translate results from research and training to “soft skills” necessary for successful treatment of clients.

Identify research directions in cognitive behavior science that inform effective delivery of evidence-based protocols in clinical practice.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Making CBT an Alternative to Medication at Scale: Emerging Pathways for Increasing the Accessibility of Evidence-based Psychological Treatments

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: M302, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe key developments occurring within the mental health care landscape

Understand how these developments may enable CBT to become more accessible

Identify potential obstacles to making CBT more accessible

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Making Our Science Palatable to the Hungry Public: Embracing the Power of Social Media

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom A, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

To clarify boundaries of pseudoscience vs. science in mental health assessments & treatments

To articulate effective communication strategies for conveying evidence based mental health information across workplace and media settings

To critically examine evidence based practices for pseudoscience components and claims

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Telehealth and mHealth: Innovations and Challenges in Clinical and Research Applications Across Private Sector, VA, and DoD Settings

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify three or more ways in which telehealth and/or mHealth are utilized in clinical and research capacities, as well as future advancements.

Recognize three or more ethical/legal implications that arise in use of technology in clinical and research settings, and possible solutions.

Consider at least three risk implications for mHealth and telemental health, particularly among those with dual diagnosis and higher risk.

Explore potential collaboration opportunities and barriers between agencies for application and dissemination of telehealth and/or mHealth.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Successful Career Paths For the Scientist-Practitioner: A “Branching Pipeline” Approach to Retaining Women in Clinical Psychology

Date: 11/23/2019 Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM Location: Atrium Ballroom A, Atrium Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all Somewhat Completely
1 2 3 4 5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

(1) Review research on the role of a dichotomized view of career paths in the underrepresentation of women in clinical psychology careers

Enhance knowledge about the wide range of career paths for scientist-practitioners and strategies for successful pursuit of opportunities

(3) Discuss the importance of legitimizing multiple and varied careers paths to more successfully retain women in the field of clinical psychology

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little A Great Deal
1 2 3 4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful Extremely Useful
1 2 3 4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate Adequate Good Excellent

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Levering Technology to Support Personalized Care: Applying User-centered Design, Citizen Science, and Machine Learning Algorithms to Digital Interventions

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Learn key facets of the clinical product development process that improve therapist delivery of personalized treatment.

Learn about patient engagement in digital tests of neurocognition and quality control of mobile mental health assessments.

Learn how machine learning algorithms can be applied to the personalization of behavioral activation.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

How will Progress Continue After the Grant Ends? The Role of Purveyor Organizations in Sustainable Dissemination of Evidence-based Programs

Date: 11/23/2019 Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM Location: A701, Atrium Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe how purveyor organizations can enable sustainable dissemination of evidence-based programs.

Evaluate the merits, limitations, cautions, and ethical considerations of commercializing evidence-based programs.

Consider how purveyor organizations can be involved with research on implementation of evidence-based treatments.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Improving the Impact of Evidence-Based Treatments for Youth: What the Manuals Don't Tell You About Navigating Caregiver Challenges

Date: 11/23/2019 Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM Location: A702, Atrium Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify common and distinct challenges when working with caregivers across diagnostic presentations.

Examine the differential impact of caregiver challenges across treatment modalities.

Describe evidence-based strategies to navigate these barriers.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Training Masters-Level Clinicians in Evidence-Based Cognitive-Behavioral Practice

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM **Location:** L401-L403, Lobby Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe approaches to effectively structuring course curricula in Masters-level EBCBP programs.

Describe approaches to optimizing community practicum experiences for students in Masters-level EBCBP programs

Consider professional development steps helpful in obtaining a faculty position in a Masters-level EBCBP program.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Jumping Off the Academic Track: Extending the Social Impact of CBT in Unique Careers

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon C, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify unique non-academic career opportunities available to research scientists and evidence-based practitioners

Employ strategies for pursuing these unique non-academic career opportunities

Evaluate the pros and cons of choosing a less traditional career path

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Ladies First! Perspectives and Pointers From Four Past Presidents for Women Pursuing a Path in the Profession

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: M302, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify structural and attitudinal constraints impeding women's progress in the field.

Describe how early career psychologists with family care responsibilities can successfully combine their professional and family roles.

Discuss how senior psychologists on how to successfully nurture the careers of their younger colleagues.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Implementing and Sustaining Evidence-Based Practice for Serious Mental Health Conditions: Georgia's Recovery-Oriented Cognitive Therapy Initiative

Date: 11/24/2019 Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM Location: A602, Atrium Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand how an evidence-based approach (CT-R) operationalizes recovery and resiliency.

Identify elements of a successful statewide implementation of CT-R.

Name three outcomes from the CT-R implementation in Georgia.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Anxiety-Focused PCIT: Innovations in the Treatment of Early Childhood Anxiety Disorders

Date: 11/24/2019 Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM Location: A705, Atrium Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Present the current research base and state of clinical practice regarding PCIT adaptations for treating early childhood anxiety disorders.

Describe the similarities and differences between therapeutic approaches and elucidate the common mechanisms leading to behavior change.

Discuss the future of early childhood anxiety treatments with respect to the format, feasibility, and efficacy across settings and populations.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Expanding the Reach of CBT Through Community, Industry, and Neuroscience Partnerships

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** M101, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Present research on current efforts to integrate CBT across diverse contexts (VA, industry, smartphone app companies).

Discuss the rationale for partnering with diverse stakeholders.

Describe pragmatic elements, successes, and challenges of each kind of collaboration.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Integrating Community-Based Projects in the Training of Clinical Scientists For Social Impact

Date: 11/24/2019 Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM Location: L504-L505, Lobby Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Explain ways to effectively form partnerships with community-based organizations

Demonstrate how to have students apply course material through community work

Identify ways to assess community-based work through assignments, surveys, and products

Describe challenges of community-based work

Explain strategies for maintaining partnerships and disseminating products to the community

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Responding to #FakeNews With #RealScience: How to Disseminate Clinical Science to the Media

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM Location: M105, Marquis Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify various methods (blogs, popular press books, social media, television, podcasts) for communicating clinical science to the public

Take necessary steps to create a presence on social and/or mainstream media

Recognize the pros and cons to media involvement, and utilize strategies to successfully avoid common pitfalls

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Facing Fear the Right Way: What We Know and Need to Learn About Maximizing Exposure Outcomes

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Marquis Salon D, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the elements of therapeutic learning during exposure that are most important to optimal outcomes.

Discuss the clinical strategies that maximize such elements of therapeutic learning during and between exposures.

Identify gaps in our understanding of the mechanisms of exposure in order to inform directions for a research agenda.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Ensuring Cultural Humility Across Clinical Research Designs

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** M303, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe and discuss cultural humility and its importance towards ensuring quality research and clinical services for diverse populations

Discuss core skills for applying cultural humility to clinical research

Discuss how the application of these skills operate differently across research designs

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Designing Interventions People Will Use: An Introduction to User Centered Design

Date: 11/24/2019 Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM Location: A705, Atrium Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

To define user-centered design and the relevancy of it to the development and implementation of digital mental health interventions

To list examples of user-centered design concepts that could inform mental health intervention research

To identify opportunities to feasibly use methods from user centered design to design more usable mental health interventions

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Extending the Reach of Exposure Therapy: How Can We Maximize Dissemination and Delivery?

Date: 11/24/2019 Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM Location: A707, Atrium Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify a variety of barriers to the dissemination of exposure therapy and their adverse effects on treatment utilization and delivery.

Describe a number of evidence-based solutions for overcoming these barriers to disseminating exposure therapy effectively.

Outline future research and clinical directions for further identification of methods to improve the reach of exposure therapy.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Cultural Insiders: Ethics, Research, Training, and Practice for Investigators of Color Working in Diverse Communities

Date: 11/24/2019 Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM Location: M303, Marquis Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Examine barriers and ethical dilemmas that arise for investigators of color when working in communities that are culturally similar to their own.

Discuss the unique strengths and benefits of conducting community-engaged science as a “cultural insider”.

Provide recommendations and strategies to support investigators of color who aim to conduct community-engaged work with diverse populations.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Supporting Graduate Students of Color: How to Identify and Overcome Barriers to Success in Predominantly White Institutions

Date: 11/24/2019 Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM Location: M304, Marquis Level Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify the barriers and challenges students of color face in graduate programs in psychology

Learn various options for supporting students of color through graduate training

Discuss the challenges that can arise in designing or implementing support programs in established psychology programs and potential solutions

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Increasing the World's Therapeutic Intelligence Through Strategic Alignment of Individuals, Institutions, And Industries

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 6:15 PM - 7:30 PM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom B&C, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the "Three D's" of robust knowledge frameworks deigned for challenging contexts: Diversity, Dynamics, and Development.

Provide one or more concrete illustrations of Coordinated Strategic Action as a way of organizing people, knowledge, and technology to reduce human suffering and increase wellness.

Articulate the contingencies operating on yourself as an individual, on your institution, and on your industry, to consider how to better align our collective activities with our larger mission.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Improving Support for Parents During Psychology Training

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM Location: A702, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify challenges faced by psychology trainees who are also parents at each step of the training process (graduate school, practica placements, internship, and postdoctoral fellowship).

Propose and discuss solutions to providing better support for parents during the psychology training process.

Discuss benefits and drawbacks of implementing these solutions in psychology training programs.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Living as a Scientist-Practitioner: How to Conduct Research in Your Clinical Practice

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** A702, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify one step s/he can take to conduct research in his/her clinical setting.

Identify one research question that s/he could investigate in his/her clinical setting.

Name two strategies that s/he can carry out to obtain an ethics review of a study s/he wants to conduct in his/her clinical practice setting.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Careers in Clinical Psychology: Which Path Makes Sense For Me?

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 12:30 PM - 2:00 PM

Location: A702, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

...describe different career paths that are consistent with the mission of ABCT and the professional values of its members.

Provide advice for students on how to choose and navigate career paths.

...address questions and concerns about career decisions and related quality of life.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Applying for F31 Predoctoral or F32 Postdoctoral Fellowship Awards

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** A702, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand the key elements in an F32 proposal

Be able to identify potential weaknesses in the application and options to address those weaknesses

Know how to get started

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

The Power and Promise Individual Participant Data: Developing A Clinical Trial Repository for Pediatric OCD

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** A702, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Participants will be able to Identify evidence gaps in pediatric OCD that can be addressed using IPD from clinical trials

Participants will be able to articulate the assumptions undergirding analysis of IPD.

Participants will be able to identify current approaches to IPD analysis.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Developing Your Research Career: NIH Training and Career Development Funding Opportunities

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 1:00 PM - 2:30 PM

Location: A702, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand NIH career development funding opportunities and the application review process.

Become familiar with NCCIH funding priorities for mindfulness and acceptance-based approaches.

Be able to develop a successful research career plan that links different NIH funding opportunities to different stages of career development.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

It Never Hurts to Ask! Strategies to Negotiate Academic Job Offers

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** A702, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Recognize the importance of negotiation as a specific skill with implications for professional development.

Identify components of particular elements of the position that could be negotiable.

Learn specific skills to negotiate successfully.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Values-Based Self-Care: Creating a Professional Self-Care Plan that Will Stick

Date: 11/24/2019 Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM Location: A702, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Develop personally relevant self-care strategies grounded in their values

Problem-solve how to continue with self-care practices as a busy professional, particularly when challenges to self-care plans arise

Better promote self-care in others, including their students, clients, trainees, and workplaces

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

ABCT 2019 Student Workshop - CBT for Depression

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 11:30 AM **Location:** A703, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 3

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Use a cognitive conceptualization to plan treatment;

List key techniques to develop the therapeutic relationship; and

Describe how to flexibly structure sessions.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Beyond the Ivory Tower: Clinical Science and Practice Careers Outside a University Setting

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: M202, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

The typical balance of professional activities/responsibilities across settings and how performance is evaluated across those settings.

Advantages of (and challenges to) conducting mental health research across career settings.

Recommendations for embarking on successful careers that fall outside the department of psychology faculty model.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Toward a Dimensional Taxonomy of Perseverative Thought

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** L506-L507, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify important underlying features for defining and distinguish between traditionally-defined subtypes of PT.

Describe some ways that advanced quantitative methods have furthered our understanding of PT.

Discuss the potential implications, benefits, and drawbacks for diverse stakeholders of implementing a dimensional model of PT.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Training Family and Caregivers in CBT for Psychosis-Informed Skills Within the Context of a CBTp Provider Network

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: A704, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Recognize the challenges in current approaches to caregiver engagement for families of individuals with psychosis.

Describe the impact of evidence-based family-focused interventions on caregiver mental health and engagement.

Delineate the feasibility and acceptability of implementing short-term CBT interventions in caregiver populations.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Implicit Anti-Black Bias Predicts Black Mortality Rates

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: M303, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Articulate an overview of implicit bias, its role in the US historical and sociopolitical context, and its relevance to the field of mental health.

Summarize data which indicate the significant impact of anti-Black bias (state-by-state) predicting Black mortality rates.

Engage with a provided framework to deepen one's awareness and understanding of implicit bias to minimize disparaging health outcomes for Blacks.

Assess for trauma symptoms due to racism and discrimination utilizing the UConn Racial/Ethnic Stress & Trauma Survey (UnRESTS).

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Markers of Internalizing Disorders in Youth: The Interplay Between Cognitive, Psychophysiological, and Affective Processes

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom A, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe at least two key underlying processes implicated in youth internalizing disorders.

Identify at least two methods of assessing cognitive, psychophysiological, or behavioral markers of anxiety and/or depression in youth.

Describe implications of at least one biobehavioral process in psychosocial assessment and/or treatment of internalizing youth.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Barriers and Facilitators to Implementing Evidence-Based Interventions for Sleep Problems

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: A701, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe barriers and facilitators to implementing a sleep intervention in primary care for early childhood

Identify stakeholder preferences for the development of a sleep program for adolescents

Describe the outcomes of a sleep treatment adapted to increased access in the Veterans Administration Setting

Describe barriers and facilitators to implementing a sleep treatment in the VA setting

Describe the outcomes of a sleep intervention adapted to the needs of adults living in low-income housing

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Extending the Wisdom and Purpose of Mindfulness Across Couple and Families

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** A705, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Discuss the purpose and systemic aspects of mindfulness on individual, couple, and family contexts.

Identify mechanisms of mindfulness that are particularly relevant to within and cross-partner outcomes as well as parent-child dyadic outcomes

Discuss the adaptation and utilization of mindfulness among underserved populations.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Cognitive and Electrophysiological Advances in Anxiety and Related Disorders

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** L504-L505, Lobby Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

In this symposium, audiences learn complex 'cold' cognitive control profiles in anxiety and related disorders.

At the end of the session, audiences learn electrophysiological, prospective, and observational approaches to anxiety-cognition relations.

Learners acquire knowledge on transdiagnostic factors (e.g., perfectionism, intolerance of uncertainty) implicated in anxiety and cognition.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Maternal Depression, Parenting Behavior, and Interventions: Relation to Children's Outcomes

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: L508, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Overview of relevant risk processes, interventions for depression in mothers, and evidence-based interventions to target key risk processes

Present evidence from intervention studies that target these risk processes in depressed mothers

Learn design & results of intervention studies, summarize key findings, and identify important next steps in theory development and practice

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Treatment Fidelity Assessment: Developing Efficient Measurement Tools

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Marquis Salon A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Evaluate evidence in support of the need for efficient methods of fidelity assessment

Understand validity and reliability data on observer-rated and provider-rated measures of fidelity

Learn about novel and innovative methods for accurately assessing fidelity

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Cognition and Emotion in Self-injury and Suicide: Evidence for Novel State and Trait Risk Markers Using Objective Assessment Methods and Intensive Longitudinal Designs

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Marquis Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand how intensive longitudinal designs can be used to model temporal dynamics in cognitive and emotional states related to self-harm.

Describe at least one novel "objective" (i.e., behavioral or physiological) marker relevant to risk for nonsuicidal self-injury and/or suicide.

Explain how transdiagnostic processes involved in regulating thoughts and feelings proximally influence self-harm thoughts/urges.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Individualized Assessment and Treatment: What Wisdom Does Ecological Momentary Assessment Offer to Clinician and Client Stakeholders?

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Marquis Salon C, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe a method of applying ecological momentary assessment in the context of psychological treatment.

Describe a method of using ecological momentary assessment in applications that provide feedback directly to clients.

Name multiple ways of analyzing ecological momentary assessment data in a clinical context.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Participatory Action in Research (PAR): Building Interventions From the Ground Up

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Marquis Salon D, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Discuss the importance of integrating stakeholder feedback into the development of clinical intervention programs

Identify four major barriers to subject participation when designing clinical treatment programs

Compare three possible data collection methods used to integrate stakeholder feedback into treatment development

Implement discussed engagement strategies in the development of innovative treatment programs for relatively difficult-to-reach populations

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Untangling the Intricate Relationship Between Alcohol Use and Social Anxiety: A Focus on Cognitive, Behavioural, and Emotional Processes in a Mixed-Method Framework

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: L401-L403, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Attendees will be able to understand and explain to colleagues/students the complex relationship between social anxiety and alcohol use.

Attendees will enhance their case formulation of social anxiety and alcohol use disorders by integrating novel mechanisms and moderators.

Attendees will enhance their clinical skills by integrating novel cognitive-behavioural techniques to their practice, that stem from the lab.

Attendees will be able to use novel methodological techniques in their own research protocols, given the mixed-method approach of this symposium.

Attendees will have a clear idea of future directions regarding research on social anxiety and alcohol use, given the expertise of our discussant.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

How Can I Help this Angry Patient? Developments in the Understanding and Treatment of Dysregulated Anger

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Imperial Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Emphasize the importance of assessing and targeting anger in psychological treatment

Review current research aimed at understanding and treating dysregulated anger

Discuss the implications of this research with regard to guiding treatment for patients with dysregulated anger

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

The Feasibility of Exposure Therapy For Eating Disorders

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** M104, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Summarize data from four research projects exploring the feasibility of implementing exposure therapy for eating disorders

Review patient and therapist attitudes toward exposure therapy for eating disorders

Discuss novel applications of exposure therapy for eating disorders

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Evidence Based Treatments to Everybody: Feasibility and Efficacy of the Unified Protocol For Transdiagnostic Treatment of Emotional Disorders Around the World

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: M106-M107, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Explain different UP adaptations in diverse contexts, formats and cultures.

Show the results obtained in different RCT using the UP for the transdiagnostic treatment of emotional disorders around the world

Understand the relevance of the use of cost-effective intervention formats in public mental health settings

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Strategies to Increase Caregiver Involvement in Treatment: Novel Workforces, Delivery Models, and System Reforms to Reach Underserved Populations

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: M303, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

The learner will understand disparities that exist for caregiver attendance in children's mental health treatment.

The learner will recognize strengths and challenges of training paraprofessionals (i.e., parent partners/ CHWs) to engage caregivers.

The learner will be able to identify strategies at the individual, workforce, delivery model, and policy level to increase caregiver engagement.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

What Protects or Harms the Mental Health of Sexual and Gender Minorities?: Examinations of Psychological Inflexibility, Experiencing Sexual Racism, and Religiosity

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 9:30 AM

Location: M304, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe how psychological flexibility may be a protective factor against discrimination and rejection for transgender individuals

Describe the construction and validation of a measure of experienced sexual racism

Describe how church attendance and church type moderate the relationship between religiosity and well-being

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Beyond Symptom Remission: Using CBT to Empower Youth to Achieve Normative Developmental Milestones

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom A, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

1. Understand the principles of CBT interventions designed to address developmental tasks of childhood, adolescence and young adulthood.

Have knowledge and access to new assessment tools to examine the attainment of developmental tasks in childhood, adolescence and young adulthood.

Have a basic knowledge of the evidence-base supporting different CBT interventions that target age-appropriate developmental tasks.

Understand the practical considerations and implications of addressing developmental tasks using CBT approaches.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

The Wisdom of a Good Night's Sleep: Sleep Disturbance as a Mechanism and Target of Treatment in Depression and Anxiety

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Location: A701, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Learn about affective and cognitive processes implicated in the relationship between sleep disturbance and psychopathology.

Understand the role of sleep disturbance in the etiology and maintenance of mood and anxiety disorders.

Learn about the positive clinical outcomes of CBT for insomnia across insomnia, depressive, and anxiety disorders.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Oppressed Identities and Healing: Streamlining Intervention Targets and Coping

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** A705, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify complex interactions between DSM-based symptomatology and minority stressors.

Identify maladaptive cognitive/emotion regulation strategies, and self-beliefs, which exacerbate minority stress

Understand implications of identity-driven, contextual minority stressors in the context of treatment adaptation.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Novel Preventive Intervention Strategies For Couples and Families: Extending the Reach and Social Impact of CBT to Promote Relationship Quality and Adult and Child Well-being

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Location: L504-L505, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe newly developed interventions to promote relationship quality among diverse populations.

Summarize the relevant empirical support for these programs and their effects on relationship quality and individual well-being.

Identify novel study design and novel approaches that may be utilized to expand future research and practice.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Moderators and Mediators in Adult Anxiety and Obsessive-Compulsive Disorders

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM Location: L506-L507, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

This session will cover moderators and mediators of treatment outcome for anxiety and obsessive-compulsive disorders in adults.

This session is designed to help you understand the role of biomedical and self-report moderators and mediators of treatment outcome in adults.

This session will help you learn about motivational factors in intensive residential treatment for OCD.

This session is designed to help you understand sudden gains in treatment for OCD using either exposure with response prevention or ACT for OCD.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Families as a Source of Resilience for Youth Facing Stressors: Extending the Reach and Relevance of Family-Based Interventions

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Location: L508, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the protective role of families for youth internalizing symptoms, externalizing and risk-taking behaviors, and trauma exposure.

Recognize the impact of stressors, such as child abuse, violent victimization, and maternal HIV, on children and adolescents' mental health.

Explore evidence-based interventions targeting parenting quality among underserved youth.

Discuss avenues for incorporating parents and families into evidence-based clinical interventions with youth facing unique stressors.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Maximizing the Public Health Impact of Cognitive Behavioral Science Through Improving Consumer Engagement

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon A, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand the public health impact of low engagement in mental health services for children and families.

Describe opportunities to extend the reach of effective mental health services to serve more children and families.

Describe opportunities to improve treatment engagement for children and families who are already enrolled in mental health services.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Extending Suicide Research to the Most Marginalized Subgroups of Sexual and Gender Minority Individuals

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Present an overview of suicide disparities and unique challenges among the most marginalized subgroups of sexual and gender minority individuals

Present novel empirical evidence on the unique risk factors for suicidality among bisexual and transgender individuals

Discuss how findings may inform current theories of suicidality

Discuss how to tailor interventions and prevention efforts to meet the unique needs of bisexual and transgender individuals

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Social Media For Social Good: Using Social Media to Deliver Cognitive and Behavioral Interventions to Adolescents and Young Adults

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 10:30 AM - 11:30 AM

Location: Marquis Salon C, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand the nuanced relationship between social media use, depression, loneliness, and LGBTQ+ status among adolescents and young adults.

Understand the landscape of interventions delivered through social media, including a chatbot and the combination of posts and live counseling.

Use the social media intervention models shared to apply to different populations and mental health problems.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

The Treatment of Anxiety in Autism Spectrum Disorder (TAASD) Trial: Clinical Characteristics and Outcomes

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon D, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

To understand how social functioning and personality traits are related to anxiety in children with ASD

Identify mediators of anxiety symptom reduction in adapted v. standard CBT for children with ASD

Learn to tailor CBT to meet stakeholder priorities, such as consumer-selected treatment targets and therapeutic alliance, for children with ASD.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Anxiety Sensitivity and Substance Use: Associations and Novel Treatment Approaches

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM Location: L401-L403, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the relationship between anxiety sensitivity and substance use.

Describe sex differences in the relationship between anxiety sensitivity and substances use.

Discuss a novel treatment approach for reducing anxiety sensitivity and substance use.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Irritability in Childhood: Measurement, Predictive Utility and Treatment

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 11:30 AM **Location:** Imperial Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify the elements of chronic irritability.

Describe the role of childhood chronic irritability in the prediction of later psychopathology.

Describe evidence for the treatment of chronic irritability in children.

Identify differential informant effects in the measurement and predictive utility of chronic irritability.

Characterize evidence for the limitations of the predictive utility of chronic irritability.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Am I Good Enough? The Role of Self-Evaluation in the Context of Body Image and Disordered Eating

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Location: M104, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify different forms of self-evaluation implicated in transdiagnostic conceptualizations of body image and disordered eating.

Describe predictors, mechanisms, and outcomes of self-evaluation, body image, and disordered eating.

Identify similarities and differences in self-evaluation, body image, and disordered eating across women and men.

Discuss potential intervention targets and important directions for future research, based on current empirical findings.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

New Directions in Learning Research: Clarifying Psychopathological Risk and Identifying Treatment Targets

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Location: M106-M107, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand the role of learning in the development and maintenance of emotional disorders and problematic behaviors.

Identify vulnerabilities for problematic emotional learning and decision making (e.g., cognitive and biological factors).

Learn about new approaches for enhancing treatment outcomes that are grounded in learning theories.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Response to Treatment For Adolescent Depression: Pathways to Efficient and Personalized Psychotherapy

Date: 11/22/2019 Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM Location: M303, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe approaches evaluated to identify and augment youth response to depression treatment across settings

Identify key therapeutic principles and outcome data on innovative treatment approaches for youth depression

Understand predictors of response to treatment for depression and how to sequence treatments for optimal response

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Understanding Relationship Functioning and Dynamics to Serve Diverse and Underserved Sexual Minority Individuals

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** M304, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the impact of individual, relationship, and systems-level factors on sexual risk behavior among sexual minority men.

List common risks for IPV that can predict health disparities impacting sexual and gender minority individuals of color.

Describe common relationship concerns and satisfaction among clients with marginalized sexual identities and practices (e.g. CNM and kink).

Identify how CBT interventions can address novel issues in the lives of LGB clients and clients with other emerging sexual identities/practices.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Technology-Based Targeted Prevention of Post-Sexual Assault Substance Use and Mental Health Symptoms

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 12:30 PM - 2:00 PM

Location: A701, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Presented data on the prevalence of problem substance use and mental health problems after sexual assault

Discussed prevention program development targeting post-sexual assault mental health symptoms and substance use

Highlighted the efficacy of a video-based intervention in addressing substance use outcomes

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Mindfulness, Compassion and CBT Interventions for Mood and Anxiety Disorders: Brain and Behavioral Investigations of Therapeutic Change

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 12:30 PM - 2:00 PM

Location: A708, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Explain how compassion meditation training produces brain changes implicated in affective and motivational pathways that differ from placebo.

Describe how mindfulness practice does not enhance therapeutic alliance in individual psychotherapy but does influence therapeutic outcome.

Understand how CBT related increases in brain correlates of attention and cognitive regulation of emotion predict long-term clinical outcome.

Identify how the combination of loving-kindness meditation and CBT might help people with chronic major depression.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Partnering With Families in Therapy: Leveraging Family Processes in the Treatment of Anxiety Disorders

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 12:30 PM - 2:00 PM

Location: L506-L507, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe how family processes such as accommodation can be targeted in CBT for anxiety disorders.

Recognize ways that technology can enhance the efficacy of family-based CBT for anxiety.

Explain ways that family members can be integrated into CBT for patients with anxiety or be the primary recipients of the intervention.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Trigger Warnings! Are They Helpful, Harmful, or Neither?

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 12:30 PM - 2:00 PM **Location:** Imperial Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to define what is a trigger warning.

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to describe the rationale for trigger warnings, and two arguments against their use.

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to state whether trigger warnings are helpful, harmful, or neither to well-being.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Responding to Stress Early in Life: Bench-to-bedside Implications for Regulating Emotions

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 12:30 PM - 2:00 PM

Location: M106-M107, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

The learner will understand explicit links between responding to stress, immunity, and cognitive control.

The learner will appreciate that sexual and gender minorities commonly experience acute stressors including intimate partner violence.

The learner will be exposed to hands-on DBT- and CBT-based clinical skills that target regulation of stress during emotion dysregulation.

The learner will learn ways that basic and clinical research findings can be directly translated into community and private practice settings.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Using Technology to Enhance Cognitive-behavioral Interventions and Reduce Barriers to Access

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 12:30 PM - 2:00 PM

Location: M304, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Attendees will learn about innovative CBT treatment delivery platforms.

Attendees will learn about the dissemination, effectiveness, and acceptability of technology-based interventions.

Attendees will consider new ways to use technology to improve the dissemination and effectiveness of evidence-based interventions.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Advances in Perinatal Mental Health: Extending the Reach of Cognitive-Behavioral Science to an Understudied, Vulnerable Population

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: A701, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify cognitive, behavioral, interpersonal, and biological factors that confer risk for perinatal mental health concerns

Understand social implications and interactions of perinatal mental health with interpersonal outcomes, such as for partners and children

Consider implications and relevance of findings to prevention and alleviation of perinatal mental health concerns, such as depression and OCS

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

The Oxford Cognitive Approach to Understanding and Treating Persecutory Delusions

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: A704, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

To understand the theoretical model that underlies the new treatment, the Feeling Safe Programme.

Receive an up-date on the empirical work testing the model and treatment.

Learn about the key treatment techniques used in the Feeling Safe Programme.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Improving Treatment Outcome with Clinical Decision-making Tools

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: A708, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to list elements of measurement feedback systems that have been shown to improve CBT outcome.

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to describe some methods used to create benchmarking tools that predict client deterioration.

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to list treatment decisions that a measurement feedback system can help the clinician make.

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to describe the Peabody Treatment Progress Battery.

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to list one decision-making tool that has been shown to reduce dropout from CBT.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Emotion Socialization Matters: Delving into the Complexities of the Relations Between Emotion Socialization and Youth Internalizing and Externalizing Symptoms

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 3:30 PM

Location: L508, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the relationships among different emotion socialization parent behaviors and indices of youth psychopathology.

Discuss a child-effects model or the ways youth psychopathology impacts parent emotion socialization behaviors.

Consider how basic science on emotion socialization may enhance traditional behavior parent training interventions.

Explain how novel methodological approaches are enhancing the emotion socialization literature.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Religion and Spirituality in Couple Relationships: Building a Foundation For Expansion of Couple Therapy Research and Practice to Religious Couples

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: Marquis Salon A, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Present an overview and evaluation of aspects of religiosity and spirituality (R/S) and the influence these may have on couples' relationships.

Present key constructs of religiosity and spirituality in couples' relationships for developing behavioral marital therapy interventions.

Assist in the development of key models for applying concepts of R/S in couples' relationships to research and clinical practice.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Utilizing Technology to Extend the Social Impact of Cognitive Behavioral Science in National and International Samples

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon C, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Recognize the role of technology in addressing addressing barriers to assessments.

Understand the use of technology in providing cognitive-behavioral therapy to persons across diverse contexts.

Appreciate the technology's ability to close the access barriers nationally and internationally

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Understanding Exercise Approach-Avoidance Behavior in Women to Inform Feasible Transdiagnostic Intervention Development

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: Marquis Salon D, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand the utility of physical activity as a feasible intervention tool for a range of mental health problems

Describe the mechanisms that increase adherence to exercise-based interventions

Explain how these approach mechanisms can be used to inform physical activity-based interventions

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Lab-based Acquisition and Extinction of Conditioned Disgust: Novel Methods and Clinical Implications

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: M106-M107, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe novel methods and recent findings from experimental research on disgust conditioning

Understand disgust conditioning as a potential mechanism for eating disorders and sexual dysfunction

Explain how novel findings regarding disgust conditioning and extinction might inform treatment strategies for disorders of disgust

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Lessons Learned From Peer- and Lay Health Worker-delivered Evidence-based Interventions in Underserved Settings Locally and Globally

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM **Location:** Imperial Ballroom A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Define task sharing in the context of mental health and the different implementation strategies.

Describe quantitative and qualitative data from programs in which task sharing was implemented.

Identify key themes and differences across settings in which task sharing has been employed and evaluated.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Harnessing Clinical and Cognitive-Behavioral Science to Improve the Rigor of Paraprofessional Mentoring Interventions

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: A701, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Contrast nonspecific, relational approaches to mentoring with targeted approaches that use working alliances to deliver evidence-based skills

Examine program evaluations, meta-analyses, and return-on-investment studies to compare the effectiveness of different mentoring approaches

Identify relevant interventions from clinical and cognitive-behavioral science and their application within paraprofessional mentoring

Present illustrative models and outcomes of skills-based mentoring programs and discuss challenges, considerations, and lessons learned

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
	0	1	2	3	4	5
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Cultural and Contextual Factors Affecting Individuals with Schizophrenia-Spectrum Disorders

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM

Location: A704, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Learn how cultural and contextual factors impact health and health disparities in individuals with psychosis

Understand how language of interview may impact assessment of individuals with schizophrenia

Learn about risk and protective factors of suicidal ideation among individuals with schizophrenia

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Utilizing Text Mining in Clinical Research: Novel Applications For Improving the Prediction of Psychological Distress

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: A708, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Have an increase awareness and understanding of machine learning for text-based responses.

Identify specific applications of text-based responses to improve the prediction of psychological distress.

Discuss advantages of implementing open-ended questions in clinical research from a research and clinical perspective.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Using Network Models to Explore Differential Relations Between Individual Depression Symptoms and Various Biological Markers

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: L506-L507, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

The goal is to help learners understand the importance of analyzing individual depression symptoms instead of depression as one syndrome.

A secondary goal is to highlight the heterogeneity of major depression that is usually thought of and modeled as one consistent phenotype.

A third goal is to provide learners an introduction to network models and their utility for highly multivariate psychopathology data.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

From the Ground Up to the Sky: Spanning the Arc of Implementation Supports

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

This session aims to help you provide a rationale for supporting multiple levels in evidence-based practice implementation.

This symposium will inform you of specific strategies for providing dissemination and implementation supports.

This session will inform you of the implications of multi-level supports on EBP success in real world settings.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

New Directions in the Treatment of Suicidal People

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 1:30 PM - 3:00 PM

Location: M105, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Summarize and critically evaluate current state-of-the-art treatments for people at risk of suicide.

Describe disadvantages to a “one-size” approach to treating suicide risk and advantages of treatment-matching to optimize outcomes.

Describe opportunities and challenges of using technology-delivered interventions to treat suicide risk.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Fear and Anxiety About Chronic and Acute Pain: Mechanisms, Emotion Regulation, and Psychosocial Factors

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM

Location: Marquis Salon C, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe possible mechanisms involved in high levels of fear and anxiety associated with chronic pain

Explain emotion regulation issues that may be associated with the affective components of chronic pain

Identify the effects of age as one factor affecting fear and anxiety associated with pain across the lifespan

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Collaborating With Community Partners to Deliver Evidence-Based Practice and Increase Access to Care for Individuals With ASD Across the Life Span

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM

Location: Marquis D, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Learn how university-community partnerships that allow for broader access to evidence-based services.

Learn how to use stakeholder feedback to understand barriers to care, as well as to develop and adapt meaningful interventions for youth with ASD

Learn strategies for partnering with professionals in the community to maximize successful implementation of interventions for people with ASD.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Misophonia (Selective Sound Sensitivity): Clinical Characteristics and Cognitive-Behavioral Conceptualization

Date: 11/22/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: M106-M107, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Following this session, the learner will recognize misophonia as a distinct clinical condition

At the end of this session, the learner will understand the clinical characteristics associated with misophonia

Following this session, the learner will recognize the dimensions of anger associated with misophonia

At the end of this session, the learner will understand the range of potential interventions available for misophonia

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Utilizing Social Connectedness to Alleviate Trauma-Related Distress in Veterans

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom A, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand how social connectedness could impact a range of trauma-related distress in veterans (i.e., PTSD, moral injury, depression).

Identify different forms of social connectedness that could be utilized in trauma treatment.

Understand how social resources could complement current treatments to further alleviate trauma distress and increase functioning in veterans.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Risk and Resilience Factors in Racial and Ethnic Minority Populations

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** A701, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify various risk/resilience factors in racial/ethnic minorities

Understand how risk/resilience factors may impact the manifestation of psychopathology in racial/ethnic minorities

Identify novel directions for the adaptation and creation of culturally informed treatments

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Current Practices and Future Directions in Addressing School Refusal

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** A705, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the current best practices in the treatment of school refusal, based upon the 4 functional profiles of school refusal.

Describe two novel tools used to assist in the identification of students at risk for attendance problems.

Describe the relationship of heart rate variability to school impairment.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Using Neurobiological Methods to Understand Childhood Adversity: Identifying Underlying Contributors to Psychopathology

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: A708, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

State an overview of the psychological and biological outcomes of childhood adversity.

Explain multiple pathways by which outcomes from childhood adversity occur.

Apply knowledge of pathways to inform treatment design.

Using this symposia as an example, apply a model for how neurobiological methods can be leveraged to study complex phenomena.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Relationship Health Across Diverse and Underserved Communities: Connecting Theory and Practice to Inform Therapeutic Processes for Couple Distress

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: L401-L403, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Learn about assessment methods of relationship distress and stability, especially among underserved couples.

Learn about risk factors for relationship stability.

Learn about interventions to treat relationship distress for couples from underserved communities.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Creating a National Resource Center for Victims of Mass Violence: Addressing Mental Health Response and Consequences

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 9:30 AM

Location: L508, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

describe the prevalence of mass violence incidents in the United States

Define the various definitions of mass violence in the US and barriers to these definitions

Outline the literature around mental health consequences of mass violence incidents

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

The Process of Improving Care in Community Settings

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Marquis Salon A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the various components of the implementation process

Explain the importance of attending to the implementation process

Incorporate evaluation of the implementation process into research

Describe the importance of engaging stakeholders in implementation research

Understand challenges to implementation in a variety of community settings

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Suicidality in Underrepresented Populations

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Marquis Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe recent scientific advancements in suicide research with underrepresented populations

Identify the interpersonal factors that impact suicide risk among underrepresented populations

Provide recommendations on the most efficacious treatments for suicidality among underrepresented populations

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Novel Ways to Recruit For and Increase Uptake into Digital Mental Health Interventions

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Marquis Salon C, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe at least two cost-efficient strategies for recruiting participants into digital mental health interventions

Explain ways to design referral pathways for engaging patients into a digital mental health intervention

Describe methods for using social media and other online platforms to reach people who could benefit from digital mental health interventions

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Chronic Medical Illness and Anxiety/Depression

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Imperial Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Elucidate the bidirectional relationship between chronic medical illness and anxiety and depression.

Discuss novel intervention targets for comorbid chronic medical illness, anxiety, and depression.

Stimulate future research aimed at integrating the treatment of mental and physical health.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Interpersonal Relationships Among Marginalized Populations: Implications For Mental Health and Treatment

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: M101, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Examine how interactions with one's family may influence mental health among marginalized populations

Elucidate how the unique experiences associated with one's gender identity and sexual orientation may influence romantic relationships

Discuss how evidence-based treatment can be enhanced among members of marginalized groups

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Does How We Implement an EBT Matter? Measuring the Process of Therapy

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 12:30 PM - 2:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon C, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Name processes important for the implementation of cognitive behavioral interventions for children

Identify processes important for the implementation of behavioral interventions for children

Identify processes important for the implementation of parent-focused interventions for children

Discuss therapist factors associated with variability in the processes with which interventions are implementation

Explain the link between therapy process and treatment outcomes

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Eating Disorders, Self-injury, and Suicide: Common Pathways, Mechanisms, and Functions

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: M104, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Introduce insights into comorbidity between ED behaviors and SITBs by discussing factors that may underlie both sets of behaviors

Elucidate the temporal relationship between ED behaviors and suicide ideation

Discuss shared and unique functions of NSSI and ED behaviors on a person-rather than group-level

Discuss future directions for the study of ED behaviors and SITBs to better clarify their comorbidity and to decrease risk of harmful outcomes

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

The Influence of Time of Day on Psychopathology and Implications For In-the-Moment and Personalized Interventions

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** M106-M107, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Investigate time of day as a predictor of daily changes in psychopathology

Explore how understanding the influence of time of day on behavior may inform in-the-moment interventions for various conditions

Consider how individualized models incorporating time may contribute to more effective personalized treatment for various conditions

Learn about new applications of advanced statistical techniques and methods in psychopathology

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Expanding Impact: Addressing Co-occurring and Complicating Factors During Evidence-based Treatments For PTSD

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: M202, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Provide an evidence-based rationale for broadening the customary set of PTSD-related assessment and treatment targets

Discuss promising PTSD-related treatment targets and strategies that could improve functional and therapeutic outcomes

Make an evidence-based determination of whether (and how) to modify a PTSD treatment plan to accommodate certain co-occurring factors

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Understanding Barriers to Engaging Traditionally Underserved Populations in Mental Health Services

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: M303, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to list barriers that prevent underserved populations from engaging in mental health services.

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to describe barriers to treatment for individuals living in low- and middle-income countries.

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to recount expert recommendations for reducing mental health disparities.

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to describe how client, provider, organization, and sociopolitical factors affect service use.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Transgender and Gender Diverse Health: Minority Stress, Coping, and Implications for Cognitive Behavioral Science

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: M304, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the unique minority stressors that transgender and gender diverse individuals experience.

Explain between group differences in non-suicidal self-injury, suicidal ideation/attempts for transgender veterans versus non-veterans.

Identify cognitive mechanisms that may help transgender individuals cope with minority stress.

Explain how psychosocial syndemics impact mental health for transgender women living with HIV.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Long-term Effects of Youth Depression Prevention Programs: Patterns, Moderators and Effects on Parental Depression

Date: 11/23/2019 Time: 10:30 AM - 11:30 AM Location: A701, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand long-term outcomes of three unique depression prevention programs.

Consider how individual characteristics may impact depression trajectories over time.

Discuss the impact of depression prevention efforts on other psychological constructs.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Impacts of Relationship Transitions on Romantic Relationship Quality and Individual Wellbeing

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Location: L401-L403, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe how relationship transitions such as becoming parents and getting married affect romantic relationship quality and outcomes.

Explore how individual behaviors during relationship transitions affect their course and outcomes.

Discuss how research on relationship transitions can impact the work of service providers (relationship education, parenting classes, etc.)

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Using Acceptance and Commitment Therapy for Different Clinical Presentations: Evidence-Based Adaptations

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** L508, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe examples of ACT adaptations for specific populations.

Discuss effectiveness findings from recent ACT clinical trials.

Describe how ACT can be adapted and used to treat different presenting concerns.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Empowering Patients With Direct to Consumer Marketing for Evidence Based Psychotherapies

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Recognize the need to think seriously and collaboratively about the public messaging of EBTs

Understand lay-consumers' levels of familiarity with (and attitudes toward) EBTs

Critically consider intervention approaches designed to enhance perceptions of EBTs

Apply understanding of lay-consumer knowledge and experimental findings to development of future DTC marketing efforts

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

More than Meets the Eye: Implications of Virtual Reality for Improving and Disseminating Anxiety and Depression Treatment

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon C, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Learn current research on use of VR for behavioral assessment and treatment of anxiety and depression.

Understand the ways VR can make treatment for accessible for specific populations.

Understand the potential implications for dissemination of VR treatment to clinical practice.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Cognitive Behavioral Science Beyond the Psychotherapy Room: Identifying Mental Health Disparities and Barriers to Care to Enhance Health and Well-being Among Diverse and Vulnerable Medical Populations

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Location: Imperial Salon B, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

To identify mental health disparities among stigmatized individuals seeking medical care.

To describe how stigma and discrimination are directly and indirectly associated with mental health burden among diverse medical populations.

To learn how affective correlates of stigma, including shame, contribute to mental health burden.

To discuss how targeting avoidance coping and discrimination in interventions may improve the mental health of stigmatized populations.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Beyond Academic Impairment: Additional Risk for College Students With ADHD

Date: 11/23/2019 Time: 10:30 AM - 11:30 AM Location: M103, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Participants will learn about the risks associated with being a college-enrolled student with ADHD.

Better understanding of impairment in college-enrolled students with ADHD: lack of motivation for healthy behaviors, risky drinking, and NSSI.

Participants will gain a perspective on additional treatment considerations when working with college-enrolled students with ADHD.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

To Approach, Avoid, or Both? Towards an Improved Characterization of Positive and Negative Valence Systems in Eating Disorders

Date: 11/23/2019 Time: 10:30 AM - 11:30 AM Location: M104, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the major constructs included in the NIMH Research Domain Criteria's Negative and Positive Valence Systems

Explain the relevance of Positive and Negative Valence Systems to eating disorder symptoms

Discuss future directions in research exploring reward and threat-based constructs in eating disorders

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Workforce Support in Non-clinical Settings: Leveraging Front-line Staff to Promote Children's Mental Health in Schools, After-school, and Social Service Settings

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Location: M301, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the importance of workforce support for front-line staff in non-clinical setting to promote children's mental health

Explain the role of supervision and support to implement and sustain effective evidence-informed services

Identify empirically supported components of workforce development that support staff implementing effective strategies promoting health

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Community-Based Mental Health and Trauma-Focused Service Provision for Children and Adults with ASD

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Location: M302, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe patterns of mental health service utilization within a large-scale system driven EBP implementation.

Identify patterns and predictors of ASD providers' familiarity and use of different treatment strategies and trauma-focused care in ASD.

Describe the training needs identified by community mental health staff and leaders to provide evidence-based treatment to adults with ASD.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Recruitment, Engagement, and Retention of Underrepresented Groups in Bio-Behavioral Research: Lessons Learned and Recommendations For Investigators

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** M303, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

To outline challenges in recruitment, engagement, and retention of underrepresented groups in bio-behavioral research.

To discuss the scientific and moral rationale for recruiting and engaging underrepresented groups in bio-behavioral research.

To describe several innovative strategies for recruitment, engagement, and retention of underrepresented groups in bio-behavioral research.

To present "lessons learned" from various distinct research methodologies targeting minority populations.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Increasing Diversity in Clinical Research: Reaching New Populations and Developing Diverse Workforces

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Location: M304, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to describe how the courses of psychopathology might be different for minority populations.

The learner will be able to discuss the state of the literature in terms of sample characteristics.

The learner will be able to explain how clinician lack of understanding of diversity might pose a treatment barrier.

The learner will be able to understand the importance of increasing diversity among future researchers and clinicians.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Exercise Your Mind and Body: Boosting Physical Activity and Cognition in Severe Mental Illness

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 11:00 AM - 12:30 PM **Location:** A704, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand the appropriateness of utilizing novel strategies to track behavior and outcomes in exercise interventions.

Describe outcomes for current exercise interventions for severe mental illness and their associations with motivation.

Understand the applicability of exercise interventions to boosting wellbeing, cognition, and motivation in those with severe mental illness.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little		A Great Deal
1	2	3

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2	3

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Remote Interventions With Couples: Using Technology to Extend Our Reach

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 12:30 PM - 1:30 PM

Location: L508, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

At the end of the session the learners will be able to describe the barriers that the use of technology overcomes for couple treatment services.

At the end of the session the learners will be able to describe the special challenges in the use of technology for couples.

At the end of the session the learners will be able to name three solutions to the challenges in providing treatments to couples using technology.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Transdiagnostic Approaches in the Aetiology and Treatment of Anxiety Disorders

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 1:30 PM - 3:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon D, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

At the end of this session, the learner will know about long-term effectiveness of current treatments.

At the end of this session, the learner will be aware of novel transdiagnostic approaches.

The learner will be stimulated to critically think about current and future directions regarding the treatment of emotional disorders.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Reframing Behavioral Addictions as Reinforcer Pathologies: Implications for Theory and Practice

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 1:30 PM - 3:00 PM **Location:** Imperial Salon A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Provide an overview of behavioral economic theory as an explanatory framework for studying and understanding behavioral addictions.

Explain reinforcer pathology in behavioral addictions, such as gambling, video gaming, internet use, smartphone use, and social media use.

Describe contingency management, a prototypic treatment with potential efficacy for behavioral addiction, for smartphone and social media use.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

All the Skills, All the Time: Lessons Learned From Dialectical Behavior Therapy Intensive Outpatient, Partial Hospitalization, and Residential Programs

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 1:30 PM - 3:00 PM

Location: M106-M107, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Discuss challenges and potential solutions for implementing DBT in higher care settings.

Describe principles of measurement-based care and choice of measures for tracking reliable and clinically significant change in DBT programs

Describe outcomes associated with DBT in higher care settings

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Efficacy and Feasibility of Integrating Evidence-based Treatment and Support into Schools: Four Approaches From the United States and Japan

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: A705, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

At the end of the this session, the learner will be able to describe four evidence-based intervention programs for youth

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to identify the difference between universal and targeted prevention

At the end of this session, the learner will be able to articulate the need for evidence-based practices in schools

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Extending the Impact of Professional Training: Innovative Models to Support Clinician Competence

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: L401-L403, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify clinician barriers to delivering evidence-based psychotherapy

Explain core, effective elements of psychotherapy training and consultation

Describe innovative approaches to clinician training

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Considering Parenting in a Cultural Context: Class, Ethnicity, & Gender

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 3:30 PM

Location: L506-L507, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Define social class socialization as it relates to parent-child relationships.

Explain how parent gender may shape the assessment of traditional parenting constructs.

Describe the relevance of emotion socialization measures for Latinx families.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Technology-Based Mindfulness Interventions: Development, Patterns of Use, and Clinical Impact

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: L508, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe technology-based mindfulness interventions for various populations (adolescents, college students, ICU patients).

Understand empirical evidence for the psychological benefits of technology-based mindfulness interventions.

Consider moderators of intervention impact.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

The Integration of Religion/Spirituality into Culturally-Informed, Cognitive-Behavioral Mental Health Treatments

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 3:30 PM

Location: Marquis Salon A, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify ways in which religion/spirituality can be effectively incorporated into cognitive-behavioral based mental health treatments.

Explain how religion/spiritual coping can be used across a range of professional disciplines and clinically/spiritually diverse populations.

Describe how religion/spirituality can be infused in a variety of treatment settings (outpatient, inpatient psychiatry, community churches).

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little		A Great Deal
1	2	3
		4
		5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2	3
		4
		5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Onward, Together! Patient-Centered Research to Expand the Impact of Behavioral Treatments For Tourette Syndrome

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: M101, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

List barriers to CBIT implementation identified in patient/family surveys.

Describe different CBIT modalities that have been developed to enhance CBIT's reach.

Describe evidence associated with these different CBIT modalities that have been developed to enhance CBIT's reach.

Recognize cultural variations in family responses to tics across four different countries.

Describe the collaborative process involved in generating a collaborative agenda for researching behavioral treatments for Tourette Syndrome.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Moving From Efficacy to Effectiveness With High-Quality Implementation of Interventions For Children With Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: M103, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

To characterize factors of high-quality implementation, including fidelity, engagement of recipients, and dosage.

To explore mechanisms of action for interventions developed to address the needs of students with ADHD.

To discuss why implementation factors are important to establishing evidence-based practices in real-world settings.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Addressing Violence, Abuse, and Trauma Throughout the Socioecological Model

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: M104, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify caregiver-adolescent relationship dimensions that mitigate the effects of adversity/trauma on adolescent psychosocial adjustment.

Summarize the predictors of service utilization in adolescent survivors of child abuse and neglect.

Identify strengths/limitations of trauma-informed care implementation in organizations and the implications of these characteristics

Describe attitude and knowledge differences among stakeholders that negatively impact a coordinated community response to domestic violence

Describe benefits of and barriers to increasing the accessibility of evidence-based practices to families involved in the child welfare system

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Moving Effective Treatment For Posttraumatic Stress Disorder to Primary Care.

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 3:30 PM

Location: M202, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Explain the PE-PC protocol and the research evidence in support of effectiveness.

Describe the initial development and evolution of our model of training primary care behavioral health providers in PE-PC.

Understand experiences and lessons learned so far in disseminating PE-PC in DoD, VA, and civilian health care settings.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Expanding the Impact of Youth Evidence-based Mental Health Care Through Parents

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: M301, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe a variety of parent factors related to the use of evidence-based mental health care in different settings.

Explain parent characteristics associated with mental health care at various stages of the mental health care process.

Discuss implications of research findings for continued efforts to improve accessibility of evidence-based mental health care for youth.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Labels Matter: The Role of Sexual Assault Perceptions in Risk and Outcomes

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: M302, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Discuss the relationships between perceptions of sexual assault and mental health symptoms

Identify ways to assess perceptions of sexual assault

Discuss how perceptions of sexual assault may affect psychological treatment for survivors of sexual assault

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Cultural Competence and Evidence-based Practice in Training and Provision of Care in Diverse Societies

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 3:30 PM

Location: M303, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Demonstrate familiarity with training in cultural competence in graduate level mental health programs across two major countries

Demonstrate familiarity with training in evidence-based practice in graduate level mental health programs across two major countries

Learn how to integrate training in cultural competence and evidence-based practice throughout graduate curriculum in mental health

Learn how faculty can engage in professional development in cultural competence and evidence-based practice to enhance their teaching

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Bridging the Gap: Addressing Barriers and Improving Access to Evidence-Based Psychotherapy

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 3:30 PM - 5:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon D, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Address barriers to treatment in diverse populations, including for people with anxiety disorders and alcohol use disorder

Address effective methods to educate individuals about symptoms and evidence-based psychotherapies

Address effective methods to empower individuals to seek evidence-based psychotherapy

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Exposure Therapy: From Bench to Bedside

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: A601, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Bolster communication and coordination across the spectrum from treatment development to implementation among anxiety researchers

Present data related to maximizing the efficacy and effectiveness of exposure therapy for anxiety disorders

Present data related to factors critical for improving widespread implementation of exposure therapy to increase access to care

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Qualitative and Mixed Method Research on ADHD Treatment: The Importance of Stakeholders' Perspectives

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: A602, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Build knowledge of qualitative and mixed method techniques to analyze data on ADHD treatment.

Consider the research-to-practice gap in the field of ADHD treatment, given presenters' data on various stakeholders' perspectives.

Become well-versed in the variable nature of perspectives on ADHD treatment, including both shared and distinct viewpoints from stakeholders'.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Mental Health Interventions in Schools: Examining Multiple Ecological Levels of Intervention

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM

Location: A705, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the levels of intervention on student mental health within a school system.

Identify barriers and facilitators to implementing interventions within a school.

Explain the outcomes of a brief mindfulness-based intervention on teacher stress.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Chronic Pain and Substance Use: Toward an Understanding of Psychological Vulnerabilities

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: A706, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the associations between pain and substance use across a range of disorders of abuse

Discuss the psychological factors that contribute to the association between pain and substance use

Discuss the clinical presentation of those with comorbid pain and substance use, including potential therapeutic treatment targets

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

The Neuroscience of Hoarding and OCD: Predictors of Treatment-Response, Decision Making, and the State vs Trait Debate

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: A707, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Attendees will become familiarized with the current neurocognitive literature on decision-making in OCD and related disorders.

Attendees will become familiar with recent neurobiological findings in hoarding, including neural predictors of treatment response

Attendees will obtain a comprehensive view of the state vs trait debate in clinical trials and cross-sectional neuropsychological studies in OCD

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	4
3	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	4
3	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Cost-Effectiveness of CBT: Critical Information for Dissemination and Implementation

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

To provide didactic instruction and applied examples of cost-effectiveness research in CBT

To demonstrate how to maximize the societal impact of CBT through the use of cost-effectiveness information

To compare the relative cost-effectiveness of CBT across multiple psychological disorders

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Suicide Prevention: From Biomarkers to Intervention Implementation

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand the importance of science from bench to bedside in addressing suicide, a major public health crisis.

Describe the value of using precision medicine for suicidality.

Explain the effectiveness of suicide-focused psychosocial interventions in community settings.

Describe approaches to partner with stakeholders to implement evidence-based practices for suicidality.

Understand the types of research that span the translational research pipeline.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Improving Treatments for Hoarding Disorder: From the Laboratory to the Clinic

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM **Location:** Imperial Salon A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the diagnostic criteria for hoarding disorder, and current cognitive-behavioral models of hoarding disorder.

Describe recent advances in current understanding of emotional and psychophysiological mechanisms of hoarding disorder.

Describe recent advances in treatments for hoarding disorder.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Applying Acceptance and Commitment Therapy to the Treatment of Domestic Violence, Stalking, & Sexual Misconduct

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: M104, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Explain how Acceptance and Commitment Therapy processes can be adapted to target violence maintenance

Describe two ways in which these approaches to reducing violence differ from traditional interventions

Summarize the results of these interventions to date with regard to reducing recidivism

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Building the Capacity of Primary Care Providers and Improving Experiences for Families: Findings From Trauma-informed Training, Collaborative Care, and Specialized Medical Home Efforts

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM

Location: M202, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Explain how training in trauma-informed care affects primary care residents' attitudes and perceived competence.

Describe how primary care providers' attitudes impact their behavioral health-related effort and skill development over time.

Describe a pediatric medical home model for children in foster care and how it meets patient needs.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Behavioral Health Treatment Needs, Entry, and Outcomes Among Justice-involved Individuals

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: M301, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify treatment needs and factors associated with treatment entry among juvenile justice youth

Understand the influence of emotion dysregulation on substance use treatment needs among justice-involved adults

Understand the effectiveness of treatments for individuals who perpetrate intimate partner violence

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Brief, Technology-Mediated Interventions to Expand the Reach of Cognitive-Behavioral Therapies

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 4:30 PM - 6:00 PM

Location: M304, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Attendees will gain familiarity with five novel, technology-mediated VBIs that transport CBT-based supports to nontraditional settings.

Attendees will learn strategies for evaluating the feasibility, acceptability, and efficacy of technology-mediated VBIs for youth and adults.

Attendees will identify key challenges to providing CBT-based supports at scale using technology-mediated, brief intervention strategies.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

A Transdiagnostic, Stepped Care School Counselling System: The PRIDE Program in India

Date: 11/23/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** M202, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Outline the objectives, intervention design principles and research methods for the PRIDE adolescent mental health program in India

Review the latest findings on the acceptability, feasibility and impacts of constituent interventions within the PRIDE stepped care model

Consider the implications for future implementation efforts aimed at addressing adolescent mental health needs in low-resource settings

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Fidelity Assessment in Usual Care Settings: Implications for Implementation of Evidence-Based Treatment Models

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 9:30 AM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom B, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Summarize the methodology used by research groups conducting fidelity assessment.

Describe the development of youth, parent, and therapist tools for assessing fidelity to CBT across a range of adolescent psychopathology.

Compare self-report CBT fidelity tools to observational coding methods.

Discuss fidelity measures developed in usual care settings and their relation to adolescent clinical improvement.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Learning From Social Situations: Translating Research on Mechanisms to Reduce the Burden of Social Anxiety

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom C, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Assess factors related to the formation of biased learning from social feedback

Analyze mechanisms of change in memory biases for social situations

Compare the influence of interpersonal and symptom variables on learning in social situations

Connect learning mechanisms to distress and impairment in social anxiety, and consider how we may intervene on these mechanisms

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Social Media: Friend or Foe? Investigating the Effects of Social Media on Mood, Body Image, and Internalizing Disorders

Date: 11/24/2019 Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM Location: A601, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

To learn about recent research investigating the effects of social media use across a range of clinical phenomena both across & within individuals

To explore novel methods for studying social media use in diverse samples

To understand potential clinical implications of social media use for individuals at risk for anxiety, mood, and eating disorders

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Mindfulness- and Acceptance-Based Approaches With Marginalized Communities

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** A701, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Recognize the psychological impact of discrimination across marginalized identities

Learn how mindfulness- and acceptance-based strategies may be helpful in addressing minority stress

Learn ways mindfulness- and acceptance-based strategies can be adapted to address minority stress

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Outcome Data and Implications of a Novel, Optimization Focused Cognitive-behavioral Intervention Focused on De-stigmatizing Mental Health

Date: 11/24/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: A704, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe key therapeutic principles and outcome data of the optimization approach to mental health, and its implications for diverse populations

Outline methods of adapting existing evidence-supported treatment and screening protocols for use with special performing populations

Introduce culturally sensitive methods of engaging unique industries (e.g., sport, circus) in optimization programming

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Understanding and Modifying Cognitive Control and Processing Biases in Depression

Date: 11/24/2019 Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM Location: A706, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand the nature and complex interplay of biases in cognitive processing and control of emotional information in depression.

Learn about novel methodology and data that advances current knowledge of the nature of cognitive processing and control biases in depression.

Learn about innovative clinical applications of cognitive research and data on the effects of emotional working memory training for depression.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

The Interpersonal Regulation of Emotion Within Couples Coping With Unique Stressors

Date: 11/24/2019 Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM Location: L401-L403, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe a novel strategy for assessing and modeling emotional arousal and how it is interpersonally regulated in real time

Articulate similarities and differences in how couples coping with stress interpersonally regulate emotion across specific contexts

Recognize gender differences in the interpersonal regulation of emotion and the implications for couple therapy

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

From Laboratory to Clinic: Mechanism-Focused Treatment of Borderline Personality Disorder

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** L508, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe candidate mechanisms responsible for the development and maintenance of borderline personality disorder.

Describe treatment elements that may engage borderline personality disorder-relevant mechanisms.

Describe how BPD-relevant mechanisms can be explored across the treatment development timeline (from lab to clinic).

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Innovations in Translating CBT for Depression From the Lab to the Clinic

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Marquis Salon A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Appreciate the value of advertising CBT for depression on consumer attitudes about and willingness to pursue CBT.

Examine clinically meaningful critical decision-making points in a CBT trial, informing practice guidelines and future SMART study designs.

Articulate potential underlying cognitive mechanisms of CBT's acute and maintained antidepressant effects.

Consider integrating RDoC-relevant biomarkers into mechanism-focused CBT comparative efficacy trials, consistent with NIMH's priorities.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Interventions for Suicidality: How Good Are They, and How Can We Improve Them?

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Marquis Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand the current state of treatments for self-injurious thoughts and behaviors

Describe a new translational method for identifying the causes of, and treatment targets for, suicidality

Note evidence that “suicidality capability” does not seem to increase suicide risk

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	2
3	4
5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	2
3	4
5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Innovative Strategies to Overcome Barriers to Care for Children With Selective Mutism

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Marquis Salon C, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Discuss novel approaches to the assessment and treatment of Selective Mutism

Identify advantages and limitations of these approaches

Describe the practical implementation of these approaches in non-research-based clinical practice

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Extending the Reach of Therapeutic Interventions: Technology-based Interventions for Risky Substance Use

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** Imperial Salon A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Attendees will be presented with a review of the extant literature on some technology-based interventions.

Attendees will be presented with data on the feasibility of using a mobile app to decrease cannabis use among those with cannabis use disorder.

Attendees will be presented with data on individual differences related to intervention success, which can inform personalized interventions.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Therapeutic Potential of Oxytocin for Improving Social-Cognitive Processes and Behavior in PTSD and Substance Use Disorders

Date: 11/22/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** M105, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify how oxytocin could be used to mitigate poor outcomes in PTSD and SUD

Describe innovative, multimethod investigations of oxytocin in a variety of samples

Understand data pertaining to effects of oxytocin on social mechanisms of PTSD and SUD

Emphasize individual differences that influence oxytocin responses

Consider ways that oxytocin can be used to improve the social impact of behavioral interventions

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Pre-Loss Grief in Family Members of Cancer and Dementia Patients: A Theoretical and Empirical Examination of PLG Leading to an Evidence Based Intervention

Date: 11/24/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 9:30 AM

Location: M103-M105, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Have a clear understanding of the theoretical models of Pre-Loss Grief in relation to Cancer and Dementia family members

Understand differences in prevalence between Dementia and Cancer family members regarding Pre-Loss Grief and mental health outcomes

Learn about an intervention to reduce Pre-Loss Grief for Cancer and Dementia family members

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Change that Matters: What, Why, and How Meaningful Change Happens in CBT for Anxiety-Related Disorders

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM **Location:** M106-M107, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Present an evaluation of a range of therapeutic mechanisms that underlie treatment gains in CBT for anxiety and related disorders.

Present data summarizing the effects of therapeutic change on a variety of meaningful outcomes that transcend symptom improvement.

Describe how understanding meaningful change at a mechanistic level relates to dissemination of CBT for anxiety-related disorders.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little		A Great Deal
1	2	3
4	5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2	3
4	5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

ALACRITY Centers: Innovative Collaborations and Strategies for Research With Potential to Transform Practice

Date: 11/24/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 9:30 AM

Location: M301-M302, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe strategies for deployment-focused, stakeholder-informed research to promote research uptake and translation into practice.

Identify how technology and transdisciplinary collaborations can advance research progress and clinical practice.

Describe practice-based research strategies and approaches for optimizing interventions and transforming service delivery.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Identity Concealment: Reasons, Consequences, and Associations with Mental and Physical Health

Date: 11/24/2019

Time: 8:30 AM - 10:00 AM

Location: M304, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify reasons why individuals with a stigmatized identity attempt to conceal their identity.

Identify negative mental health outcomes associated with concealment of a stigmatized identity.

Identify negative physical health outcomes associated with concealment of a stigmatized identity.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Evidence-based Treatments in Low-and Middle-Income Countries: Adapting Treatments to Meet Local Needs

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom A, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Present an overview of the use of evidence-based psychological therapies (EBPTs) in low- and middle-income countries.

Discuss data on adaptations of EBPTs to local contexts to improve implementation.

Describe methods and approaches to adapting EBPTs to low-resource settings.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Bringing Clinical Wisdom Home: Turning Effective In-Person Therapy into Digitally-Delivered Interventions for Attention and Behavior Problems

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Atrium Ballroom B, Atrium Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

At the end of the session, the learner will be able to understand the efficacy of 4 treatment programs when delivered in-person in clinical settings.

At the end of the session, the learner will be able to describe how these methods were translated into digital delivery connections.

At the end of the session, the learner will be able to explain what challenges were met in translating in-person delivery to digital delivery.

At the end of the session, the learner will be able to describe the effectiveness and satisfaction reached in digital delivery of 4 treatments.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Transdiagnostic Implications of Parent's Socialization of Children's Emotions and Child Differences in Vulnerability

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** A601, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Presented an overview and critical evaluation of parent emotion socialization and its role as a transdiagnostic risk factor

Presented data suggesting the effects of parent emotion socialization on child psychopathology is influenced by child characteristics.

Discussed application of findings in the development of novel treatments that can be tailored based on child vulnerability

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Context Matters: Sociocultural Considerations for Psychosis Risk and Early Psychosis

Date: 11/24/2019 Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM Location: A602, Atrium Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify sociocultural processes relevant for psychosis risk and early psychosis assessment, intervention, and treatment engagement.

Understand sociocultural factors that influence prognostic outcomes for psychosis risk and early psychosis in diverse groups.

Generate relevant discussion regarding treatment and research with psychosis risk and early psychosis in diverse groups.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Emerging Research Among Military Couples: Novel Investigations and Unique Considerations

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** L401-L403, Lobby Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe bidirectional effects between relationship functioning and servicemember mental health

Explain at least one novel direction being pursued by researchers working with military couples

Describe how servicemembers and their partners are impacted by suicide and PTSD

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Extending Research on the Interrelation of Interpersonal and Emotional Dysfunction Within Borderline Personality Disorder

Date: 11/23/2019

Time: 2:30 PM - 4:00 PM

Location: M304, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all	Somewhat	Completely
1	2	3
4	5	

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Describe the interrelation of emotional and interpersonal dysfunction within borderline personality disorder

Explain emotional reactions to rejection among individuals with borderline personality pathology

Identify the contexts in which individuals with borderline personality disorder and substance use disorders are at greater risk for relapse

Identify the intersection of emotional and interpersonal motives for self-injury among individuals with borderline personality disorder

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little	A Great Deal
1	5
2	3
4	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful	Extremely Useful
1	5
2	3
4	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Serving the Underserved: Victories and Challenges in Global Dissemination of EBPs for Underserved Communities

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Present strategies relevant to global dissemination efforts of EBPs for underserved and under-resourced communities.

Present data & evidence related to the impact of successful implementation efforts on the needs of typically underserved communities.

Describe how dissemination efforts and barriers to successful implementation apply in diverse settings.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

A Translational Approach to Suicide Risk Assessment: Novel Methodologies with Implications for Diverse Populations and Settings

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand the implications of non-disclosure of prior suicidal thoughts and behaviors on accurate suicide risk assessment.

Describe the utility of two behavioral tasks with promise to supplement traditional suicide risk assessments.

Appreciate challenges associated with the implementation of suicide risk assessments in high-risk populations.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Improving the Delivery and Reach of CBT: The Role of Emerging Technology

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon C, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Discuss a mobile app meant to increase motivation to change.

Learn how coaching can improve web-based interventions.

Discuss provider and patient barriers to delivering CALM to rural Veterans.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Act Well Your Part: Using Theater to Disseminate Evidence-based Practices to Treat Core Deficits in Autism Spectrum Disorder

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Marquis Salon D, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Identify best evidence-based practices for treating social deficits in youth with ASD.

Describe several ways in which theater-based techniques are used to deliver evidence-based practices for youth with ASD.

Describe differences in use of theater-based techniques to deliver evidence-based practices to youth with ASD across the presented models.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful			Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Translating Research Findings into Practical Tools For the Assessment of Mechanisms and Barriers in Real-World Treatment For OCD

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Imperial Salon A, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Translate laboratory-based mechanistic findings into real-world clinical assessment applications

Evaluate the preliminary utility of newly-developed measures relevant to the treatment of OCD

Describe the assessment of treatment targets for OCD including obsessive beliefs and inhibitory learning

Identify potential barriers to OCD treatment including repetitive negative thinking and motivational factors

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor					Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5	
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5	

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Improving PTSD Treatment Access and Retention: Insights and Outcomes From the First 3 Years of the Warrior Care Network's Intensive PTSD Treatment Programs

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** Imperial Salon B, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Compare the program structure and clinical outcomes of different intensive PTSD treatment programs.

Describe how intensive PTSD treatment programs can increase treatment access and retention.

Summarize the overall impact and feasibility of intensive treatment programs for the treatment of PTSD.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little			A Great Deal
1	2	3	4 5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2 3	4 5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Novel Treatments For Affective Disorders (TAD): Leveraging Biological and Psychological Indicators for Treatment Personalization

Date: 11/24/2019

Time: 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM

Location: M106-M107, Marquis Level

Number of CE Credit(s): 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

The attendant has learned about the efficacy of novel treatments that targets reward and threat sensitivity in patients with affective disorders.

At the end of the session, the attendant will be able to identify psychosocial and biological transdiagnostic moderators of treatment success.

The attendant will have learned about personalizing treatment administration for patients with deficits in reward and threat sensitivity.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little		A Great Deal
1	2	3
4	5	

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful		Extremely Useful
1	2	3
4	5	

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No

Network Models Advancing the Understanding of Psychopathology

Date: 11/24/2019 **Time:** 10:30 AM - 12:00 PM **Location:** M301-M302, Marquis Level **Number of CE Credit(s):** 1.5

1. To what extent did the presenter(s) meet the stated educational objectives? Rate on scale of 1- 5 with 1 equal to not all and 5 equal to completely.

Not at all		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5

2. Based on the content of this presentation I am able to....

Understand how network models correspond to formulations of disorders and clinical change over time.

Understand some of the methodological issues in conducting network analyses

Apply network findings to conceptualizing disorders and client changes over time.

3. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?

Very Little				A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. How useful was the content of this CE Program for your practice or other professional development?

Not Useful				Extremely Useful
1	2	3	4	5

5. The preparation for the presentation(s) was:

Inadequate	Adequate	Good	Excellent
------------	----------	------	-----------

6. Please rate the following components of the presentation on a scale of 0-5 with 0 equal to poor and 5 equal to very good.

	Not Used	Poor				Very Good
Lectures and/or presentation of case examples	0	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability and usefulness of instructional materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Audiovisual or multimedia materials	0	1	2	3	4	5
Experiential/role-playing exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Written exercises	0	1	2	3	4	5
Responsiveness to participants	0	1	2	3	4	5
Location/physical facilities	0	1	2	3	4	5
Program administration	0	1	2	3	4	5

Questions continued on next page

7. Please evaluate the overall quality of the session by indicating how much you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree	
Information was current	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information was empirically-supported	0	1	2	3	4	5
Topic was covered in enough detail	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed accuracy and utility of content and basis of such statements	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) was/were knowledgeable regarding the material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Presenter(s) discussed limitations and risks of material	0	1	2	3	4	5
Material was presented clearly and logically	0	1	2	3	4	5
Issues of diversity were addressed	0	1	2	3	4	5
The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information	0	1	2	3	4	5
Instruction was at a level appropriate to training level of audience	0	1	2	3	4	5
Information can be applied to my practice or other work context	0	1	2	3	4	5

8. Presenter(s) identified whether they had any conflicts of interests or commercial support for their material?

Yes No

9. What percentage of the material presented was new to you?

%

10. Did you have an adequate opportunity to participate?

Yes No

11. Was pre-presentation publicity (program description) accurate?

Yes No

12. Did this presentation meet your expectations?

Yes No

13. What comments about the presentation or general comments do you have?

14. Overall, the presenter(s) was/were?

Poor Adequate Good Excellent

15. Comment on the performance of each presenter:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Name: Comment:

Additional comments:

16. Would you recommend that this course be repeated next year?

Yes, without reservation Yes, if suggested changes were made No