

These are indicative examples. Although we do not provide how-to steps, we recommend that sponsors use the format(s) that work best for them.

CE Program Title: Best Practices for Clinicians: An Ethics Workshop

Sponsoring Organization: ZYX Institute

Instructor(s): Jane Doe, Ph.D., J.D.

Date: October 8th, 2020, 9am to 4:00pm

Participant Information									
1. What is your professional status?	☐ Licensed Psychologist ☐ MFT ☐ LCSW ☐ Student ☐ Unlicensed Masters/Doctoral level ☐ Other (specify: _____)								
2. Please note years in your profession	☐ Student ☐ 1-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-20 ☐ 20+								
3. What was your primary reason for selecting this program?	☐ Subject was of interest ☐ Reputation of leader(s) ☐ Recommended by a colleague ☐ Important to job activities ☐ Other (please explain: _____)								
Sample Size:	30								
Program Evaluation				Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Average
4. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES									
A. Objective #1(Identify at least three areas of practice for which legal/ethical changes have developed in the past 5-10 years) was met.							7%	93%	4.93
B. Objective #2 (State the most effective strategy for maintaining clinical records of patient/client care) was met.							33%	67%	4.67
C. Objective #3 (Identify two significant problems for clinicians who wish to provide telehealth services) was met.							13%	87%	4.87
D. Objective #4 (State two major cautions for clinicians who receive subpoenas for patient/client records) was met.							20%	80%	4.80
E. Objective #5 (State the differences between the three classes of witnesses in courts) was met.							7%	93%	4.93
F. Objective #6 (Identify two "slippery slopes" of concern to clinician risk management) was met.					7%		20%	73%	4.60
5. Content was appropriate for postdoctoral level training.							7%	93%	4.93
6. Instruction was at a level appropriate to postdoctoral level training.							13%	87%	4.87
The Instructor(s)...				Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Average
7. Knew the subject matter							7%	93%	4.93
8. Presented content effectively (e.g., promoted deep reasoning and learning; included a consideration of obstacles or anomalies)							13%	87%	4.87
9. Elaborated upon the stated objectives							13%	87%	4.87
10. Provided a variety of applied examples (e.g., case presentations)							7%	93%	4.93
11. Maintained my interest							20%	80%	4.80
12. Answered questions effectively						13%	7%	80%	4.

Professional & Ethical issues	YES	NO
13. The email sent to announce the workshop made clearly evident prior to registration, the following:		

a. Requirements for successful completion of the activity (i.e., attending in the program's entirety and completing an evaluation form)	100%	
b. Commercial support for the instructor, sponsor (i.e., ZYX Institute), content of workshop, or benefit of endorsement for products (e.g., any relationship that could reasonably be construed as a conflict of interest including but not limited to research grants, royalties for books or training, commercial support from companies or pharmaceutical sponsorship; provided on flyer advertising workshop)	100%	
14. Accuracy and utility of the materials presented, the basis of such statements, the limitations of the content being taught and the severe and most common risks	100%	

Venue & Setting	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not applicable	Average
15. Facility was adequate for my needs		7%	20%	73%		3.72
16. Special needs were met (e.g., disability or other accommodations as requested)			13%	20%	67%	3.60
17. Program flyer distributed via email was informative and accurate			27%	73%		3.73
Learning	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Average
18. Information could be applied to my practice or other work context			7%	13%	80%	4.73
19. Information could contribute to achieving personal or professional goals			7%	20%	73%	4.73
20. Cultural, racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, and gender differences were considered	7%	13%	40%	7%	33%	4.66
21. Learning was enhanced through a variety of media utilizing auditory, visual, and multimedia formats		7%	13%	33%	47%	3.46
22. The presentation facilitated the integration and synthesis of information			7%	33%	60%	4.53
23. How much did you learn as a result of this CE program?	Very little	Little	Some 7%	A good bit 26%	A great Deal 67%	4.60
24. How useful was the content of this CE program for your practice or other professional development?	Not useful	A little useful 7%	Somewhat useful 7%	A good deal useful 13%	Extremely useful 73%	4.52
25. Would you recommend this program to others?	Yes 100%	No				

Narrative and Overall Response

26. What was your overall impression of the activity? What went well? What could have been improved?

- Knowledge is amazing.
- Extremely useful.
- Very helpful update on laws and developments.
- I wish there were more time to complete the slides.
- Dr. Doe has to be one of the leads in the country on this.
- She could control amount of questions.
- Long stories not that illustrative.
- Excellent.
- Excellent presentation!
- Great discussions.

27. What did you learn that was new or different? How and/or will this information change the way you practice?

- Legal updates were great.
- Updates on legal standards, informed consent.
- About considerations for adolescents sexting – will include info in consent.
- Improve informed consent docs.
- Consultation to telehealth.
- Really appreciate the up to date information re: CA laws.
- Clarified some of the new regulations.
- Law is very interesting

28. What topics or presenters would you like to see in future CE presentations?

- Law and ethics always most useful.
- In depth suicide risk assessment. Ethics in working with families.
- How to be a good supervisor without doing competencies again.
- Would like to see supervision program.

29. Other comments (use back if needed)

- Could do better cutting off questions.
- Looking forward to next time.
- Excellent presentation!
- Doe is a national treasure.