



## *Program Evaluation*

# **Appellate Advocacy 2019**

Wednesday, October 30, 2019  
NH Bar Association Seminar Room, Concord

I have practiced law:

Less than 3 years – 6      3-5 years - 3      6-15 years - 7      More than 15 years - 28

The number of attorneys in firm/office:

Solo – 9      Small Firm - 4      Medium Firm - 7      Large Firm - 8  
Corporate Counsel - 0      Public Sector -13      Other - 3

- 
- 1) Did the program deliver what was promised?..... Yes - **44**      No - **0**
    - Terrific!
    - Program flowed well.
  - 2) Was the program timely and current? ..... Yes – **44**      No – **0**
  - 3) Do the written materials appear to be useful as a post-program reference? ..... Yes - **44**      No - **0**
    - Very.
    - Great materials.
    - Excellent materials. (2)
    - The written materials appear to be extremely helpful.
  - 4) Was the time allotted for this program appropriate and well managed? ..... Yes – **43**      No – **1**
    - I would have liked more time for “administrative appeals”.
    - This CLE could easily have been 3 days long, but the time we did have was well managed.
    - As to briefing, too much focus on criminal; Doreen Connor shut out on the civil end.
    - Morning felt rushed. Not sure if it was intended to be broad or specific in focus.
  - 5) Was there adequate opportunity for questions?..... Yes – **43**      No – **1**
    - The requirement to write questions was very awkward.
    - Largely, yes.
  - 6) Was the presentation format suitable to the content? ..... Yes - **44**      No – **0**
  - 7) Would you recommend this program to a colleague? ..... Yes - **44**      No - **0**
    - Highly.
  - 8) What did you like most about this program?
    - Knowing how the justices prepare for oral argument to better hone my appellate navigation.
    - The Supreme Court panel. (11)
    - NH Supreme court panel was insightful and entertaining.
    - The practical advice from attorneys and justices about preparing your argument, briefs & oral argument. (2)
    - Justice Lynn’s speech – Exhibit A for why we need to maintain the 70-year-old retirement age.
    - Practice tips.
    - Ted Lothstein did a great job of moderating and time management.
    - The interaction between panelists and audience members.
    - Knowledgeable panelists.

- The Justices! Loved observing their interaction. It humanizes the appeal process.
- Judge Lynn’s thoughts. Insight from our bench.
- Real substance.
- Dialogue with Supreme Court Justices. (5)
- Comments/interactions by all justices.
- Very informative; very valuable access to experienced practitioners as well as the court.
- Expertise of all the panelists. Excellent practical questions by Ted Lothstein, especially to Supreme Court justices.
- Everything: panel, subject matter, format.
- Strong panel. Great to hear directly from the Supreme Court.
- That the Justices were candid and provided valuable insight to the process.
- Hearing from actual judges about what irritates them.
- Q&A with the court. Everything else was also great.
- Quality and knowledge of the presenters.(2)

9) How can this program be improved?

- I think focusing on the appellate process only during the CLE. One person’s speech was off topic and made it difficult to focus in the last portion of the CLE.
- Submission of questions prior to today’s CLE for panel. Access to PowerPoints from today’s presentations.
- Could have saved Justice Lynn’s remarks for the end because it’s a long day and was hard to focus on the last presentation, which was more valuable.
- It was hard to follow in the written materials. Some speakers provided great information that wasn’t in the materials. Some presentations seemed to go out of order from materials. Giving access to watch webinar after the fact would be one way to solve this. Also, it would be great to get materials electronically. Hard to have longer sessions in the afternoon. Shorter sessions in the afternoon probably would be better.
- More interaction with audience. (2)
- Perhaps separated into two CLEs, one civil & one criminal so more detail could be used.
- Allowing more time for Q&A.
- Just fine as is.
- No suggestions. This was probably the best program I’ve ever attended.
- More insight from judges on more specific issues.
- A little more federal.
- It seems neither judges nor lawyers are comfortable speaking about specific strategies in specific cases – perhaps that’s inevitable, but it seems to diminish the ability to impart effective advocacy skills.
- I think it was outstanding. No suggestions.

10) On a scale from 1-6, how would you rate this program overall?

<i>Poor</i>			<i>Excellent</i>			
<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	
0	0	0	0	12	24	<b>5.67</b>

**SPEAKERS**

Please evaluate the content and delivery of the presenters.

	<i>Poor</i>			<i>Excellent</i>			
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	
■ <b>Doreen F. Connor, Program Co-Chair</b>	0	0	0	1	11	29	<b>5.68</b>
■ <b>Theodore M. Lothstein, Program Co-Chair/CLE Committee Member</b>	0	0	1	2	11	29	<b>5.58</b>
■ <b>Seth Aframe</b>	0	0	0	3	8	32	<b>5.67</b>
■ <b>Eileen Fox</b>	0	0	0	3	17	23	<b>5.47</b>
■ <b>Timothy A. Gudas</b>	0	0	0	4	14	23	<b>5.46</b>
■ <b>Stephanie C. Hausman</b>	0	0	0	3	10	26	<b>5.59</b>
■ <b>Christopher M. Johnson</b>	0	0	0	5	10	26	<b>5.51</b>
■ <b>Sean R. Locke</b>	0	0	0	3	14	25	<b>5.52</b>
■ <b>Daniel E. Will</b>	0	0	0	2	15	24	<b>5.54</b>
■ <b>Hon. Gary E. Hicks</b>	0	0	0	1	7	35	<b>5.79</b>
■ <b>Hon. James P. Bassett</b>	0	0	0	1	8	32	<b>5.76</b>
■ <b>Hon. Anna Barbara Hantz Marconi</b>	0	0	0	3	6	32	<b>5.71</b>
■ <b>Hon. Patrick E. Donovan</b>	0	0	1	0	9	32	<b>5.71</b>
■ <b>Hon. Robert J. Lynn</b>	0	1	1	1	8	32	<b>5.60</b>

11) How did you find out about this program?

Bar News - 16

Mailing from NHBA - 13

Website - 3

Colleague - 11