

01.13.09.01

**PROGRAM EVALUATION
Sarasota – Tuesday, 13 Jan, 2009**

Douglas Arent: Rethinking our Energy Economy: Prospects and Challenges

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re Presenter

The presentation was interesting, but perhaps a bit too technical. Handled questions well.

PowerPoint was technical with several complicated slides. A larger screen would have improved ability to see and understand the information.

Speaker took a complex subject and made it clearer for us personally and globally.

Too much information to be conveyed in time allotted. Consequently, speaker went too fast and didn't explain acronyms, technical terms, scientific and technical terms as much as needed, at least for me. PowerPoint charts too small in large space, especially for folks on left side.

Too many complicated graphs, graphs, and too little simple explanations. (6 responses)

Speaker's PowerPoint slides were unsatisfactory because:

- Way too busy
- Could not be read from the 6th row
- Too involved/complicated
- Could not and were not explained by the speaker

First portion totally too technical for general population. Some interesting facts, but his presentation is more geared to scientists, not lay people. Too many "graphic" details to absorb.

Speaker should change his name to Lamont Cranston. I spent 30 years in the energy industry and read some of the studies he referenced, and I understood much of what he discussed. I feel sorry for those who were overpowered by his apparent knowledge and probably believed his conclusions. Much of NREI's policy is based on the belief that global warming is caused by man. When the coming ice age is verified, NREI will be focused on how to put more CO₂ into the atmosphere.

Boring!! Painful!!

The speaker took a subject of current interest, relevance and importance and spoke as though to professionals in that area or scientists – very boring and disappointing!

PowerPoint slides were too busy and complex.

Very technical. Should be more emphasis on daily life.

Slides too technical and complicated. He did not translate them well into laymen's terms. Not enough time. Very confusing to me as a non-scientific person!!

Too much information! Print too small.

The future path to take to achieve energy independence, protect the environment, and control costs in a democracy is a minefield.

The subject matter is complex. It would have been better to dispense with the slides because they distracted from the narrative.

Too technical for the average knowledgeable person.

Too many fact and charts. Not enough cohesive discussion.

Speaker has excellent speaking voice, pleasant and clear. He did very well answering the questions and handling the intrusive man who felt he knew more than the speaker.

Complexity of slides decreased visibility and clarity of the presentation.

Interesting, but very technical. Could be made more interesting by now endeocdeed (sic) committees effected by energy.

The actual PowerPoint presentation and information presented seems to have been for a different audience, a notch above us and comprehensible relevance to us. Needs to be more pragmatic and relevant to the audience.

Good summary.

Since we could not read anything on his slides, we had difficulty understanding his comments on the slides. He needs 1) Readable slides 2) Slow down 3) Give fewer ideas.

Unable to see slides. They were a distraction.

Good speaker. Much too complex to follow.

I don't know more now than I did when I came in!

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re SILL Programs

How about SILL on Wheels and travel lecture to various places in the State areas?

CommS0203Dachi

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Sarasota – Tuesday, 03 February 2009

Stephen Dachi: Contemporary China: Emerging 21st Century Superpower

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re Presenter

Great sense of humor. Very understandable presentation.

Best speaker I've hear.

Great lecture!

Best program to date.

Dr. Dachi's deep knowledge and understanding of his topic is very obvious. His sense of humor is delightful and added to his speech. He has a wealth of knowledge and he makes it interesting.

Good speaker! Uses humor to illustrate his points. Lots of knowledge of how the world works with good command of key facts. A fine addition to the SILL program.

He is humorous – but did not learn anything new.

Address next year, but not by him.

Entertaining, but no substance.

Do you bring non conservative speakers to the SILL? Where are the women speakers??

Best speaker of series.

Interjects humor very well with presentation.

Presented material clearly.

Best speaker to date.

Really provoked some issues to pursue and ask more questions about. Plenty of new facts. Plenty to think about. Thanks!

Wonderful! Very entertaining also!

Excellent!

CommS0204Dachi

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Sarasota – Tuesday, 04 February 2009

Stephen Dachi: Japan: Slipping or Holding its Own as the World's Second Largest Economy

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re Presenter

I would prefer China next year.

All excellent

Absolutely invite him back.

He was a terrific speaker. Could we have the lecturers speak for an hour – questions to end at 11:45?

Knowledgeable and humorous. Loved it.

Wonderful!

Terrific speaker – one of the best this year so far.

Didn't like speaker's tone.

Very good morning!!

Very effective speaker.

And all without notes!

Invite him to return to speak about another country he knows about.

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re SILL

Always prefer Powerpoint with lecture.

Lectures used to run until 11:30 followed by Q&A.

CommS0205Dachi

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Sarasota – Thursday, 05 February 2009

Stephen Dachi: North and South Korea: Can This Long-Divorced Couple Ever Get Together Again?

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re Presenter

Very good dry humor.

He started out slowly – boring?? Perhaps all those languages were fighting for preeminence – Rest of presentation clear, on point. Loved his droll sense of humor.

Excellent, effective, and funny speaker.

Only rehashed old material.

This was silly – the real issues (current breakdown in negotiations) was not addressed.

Excellent speaker – humor was appreciated. It was mesmerizing and the fastest hour I've spent! Kept my attention throughout and I came away with much more knowledge than I expected.

Urge that speaker return for lecture on any topic – a fabulous presentation.

The speaker was very informative, interesting, and presented the topic in a most effective manner. He was “outstanding”!

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re SILL

Need heat in building.

01.27.09.01

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Sarasota- Tuesday, 27 Jan, 2009
Drs. Michael Tanner and Ted Marmor
Healthcare Reform Debate: Why, How, When Likely?

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenter

Dynamic debate. Please have Dr. Marmor again. We enjoyed and appreciated him today and last year.

Invite Marmor to return, not Tanner. (3 comments)

Should have emphasized 10 AM starting time, especially last week.

Dr. Tanner is difficult to understand (mike?)

Best SILL presentation ever!

Excellent, informative, thought provoking!!

Marmor was superior. Tanner is a fool! Stop, Dr. Tanner, beating that drum. Libertarians are a small minority who can't win and won't (???)

A highly interesting and relevant discussion, conducted spiritedly and amicably. I found Dr. Marmor to be more reasoned and persuasive in his presentation and Dr. Tanner to be limited by his free market ideology – but both made interesting points.

Should dementia be treated in psych hospitals?

Excellent.

The best program this year! Please continue to revisit this topic next year and following years. The topic is critical for this audience.

Dr. Tanner has specific definite opinions. He's not open to discussion. He does not explain his positions well, nor does he explain well how his position will benefit most Americans.

Questions from the audience not as good.

I lost interest in the debate after about one hour.

Both the topic and the speakers were effective and interesting. However, I wouldn't want to come to another lecture/dialogue next year.

Debate is most interesting format.

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re SILL Program

In the interest of time: Do we need moderator to ask questions?

The debate program is terrific. Please do more. (2 comments)

Photographer's flash camera was distracting.

Someone should control those asking questions – One question per person.

CommS0210Bechtold

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Sarasota – Tuesday, 10 February 2009
Dr. Peter Bechtold: Iran, Syria and Lebanon

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re Presenter

Complained about lack of time, then rambled too long.

Subject should have been more narrow.

Took too long to get into the topic.

The best.

Wow.

The best speaker we have had! More time needed.

Best speaker in the series – even last year. We could have listened for hours!

Effective, but needed much more time. I wish we had the option of extending the speaker's talk until noon. Today, especially. Many outline items were skipped or given scant treatment. This was frustrating. Though what we did receive was excellent and for me, led usefully to a shift in understanding the region. We need these chances to get viewpoints different from even our "best" pols (?)accounts if they draw us closer to the reality of political culture.

An exceptionally brilliant speaker! Extraordinary historical depth! I hope he can develop a relationship with President Obama.

Give him more time or limit the subject matter.

Best done in three separate lectures.

Terrific talk – from an expert!

Dr. Bechtold's speech was splendid. It was informative, well-reasoned and well presented. Thank you for having him!!

He is terrific and the time way too short.

I don't agree with his views on Israel. I'd like to hear him again on that subject.

I'm totally confused!

This speaker, although highly intelligent, was totally biased.

Too much material. Too much talking about lack of time and other extraneous matters. Slides going too fast. Talk should have had a narrower focus.

Good overview but he wasted first 20 minutes.

The speaker had so much to say but spent time talking about what he was talking about, how he didn't have enough time, etc. Just tell us instead!! He had so much to say and so little time to say it.

He needs to go to Iran 101, explain terms.

Definitely invite him back. Longer lecture please.

He spent too long telling us he didn't have enough time to tell us what he needed to.

He should have gotten to the "meat" sooner – spending less time explaining the lack of same.

A lot of material. He needed more time.

Comms0211Bechtold

**PROGRAM EVALUATION
Sarasota – Wednesday, 11 February 2009
Dr. Peter Bechtold: Understanding Iran**

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re Presenter

Too much info. I can't retain all to feel I have new concepts. (my problem)

I thought he talked extremely fast.

Less maps!

A very well-informed speaker.

He obviously had more material he could have covered, had he had more time. Why area these lectures limited to the present time-frame? We'd be glad to sit and learn more if more time was allotted.

Too much info in one hour to comprehend.

Outstanding.

Superb speaker. Deep understanding of the Middle East.

A superb speaker, but too little time for that amount of information.

Very good!!

Bring him back.

Subject too large to process, but excellent presentation. I will not take the "final."

One of the best speakers ever! Learned so much.

Lots of information that I never have heard. He is delightful to hear.

I could understand 50% of his message.

Voice loud, but not clear. Voice reverberates.

Yesterday's lecture was the same, though today's was better organized.

Slides and outline very organized – time managed poorly. He skipped over a very interesting slide of the history in Iran of WWII.

The SILL audience is educated and knowledgeable. We did not need 45 minutes of history that we can, if we have not already, receive. What we came to hear is the push/pull of ideas – that is what we must understand about Iran. Not until the last minutes and in questions did Bechtold become provocative and interesting. Last question should have been his subject for lecture!

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re SILL

He came over better (voice) to me sitting in back row when he used the dais microphone. It seemed to counter his accent “getting in the way.”

Please allow speakers to complete their lectures and do not cut them off!! Thank you.

CommS0224mikell

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Sarasota – Tuesday, 24 February, 2009
Dr. Gwendolyn Mikell: A new Generation of African Leaders:
Challenges and Possibilities

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re Presenter

She is obviously knowledgeable, but delivery was not interesting.

Dr. Mikell is knowledgeable, but assumed the audience knew more. Would like to have heard more detail about their leaders and give more history. Not enough time.

Read from notes. Poorly presented. Slides didn't add to presentation.

She assumed that we had a base of knowledge of African leaders, which we don't have. It was very hard to follow the names she continued to mention.

The speaker, unfortunately, was incapable of making the topic interesting. Her delivery was dull. Organization of material was poor.

Boring.

An important topic I don't know enough about or think about.

The Q & A was more interesting than the presentation.

I am afraid that after this talk, I have no new understanding of what these many African countries represent and how they interrelate.

I would have liked more information on the new leaders instead of having so much of the lecture focused on the history of Africa.

The questions were the best part of the session.

Q & A best part of talk.

Poor speaker "ah, ah."

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re SILL

Please try to get some heat!!

Soft voice. More amplification needed.

To insure the speaker knows he/she is due in one week, it would help if someone phoned the speaker to confirm the date.

CommS0304Hurley

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Sarasota – Wednesday, 04 March, 2009
Michael Hurley: Are We Safer Now?

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenter

The best we have had!

Well done.

Best lecturer this year.

Very outstanding!

Best lecture to date.

Topic should have been “What we are doing to make us safer”, not to scare us!!

He merely pointed out what we already know. No suggestions for the future.

Lengthy responses, but well done.

Too much time on the moderator’s question and others. Did not allow sufficient time for the many questions waiting to be answered.

Good topic. Non-analytical, disjointed presentation.

Answers were too long.

Q & A was excellent. Ad lib speaking was excellent. While his speech material was very informative, some of the writing was trite.

Presentation had no structure. Very confusing.

Excellent! Scary!

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re SILL

I think that the speaker should concentrate on questions posed by the audience, not the chair on the platform. People were waiting to ask questions whilst the speaker spent over five minutes on the chair’s question.

Next year could you tell us if the speaker was here in previous years, what their topic was?

Need much larger screen.

Several slides this season, including today, are too small to see from audience. Maybe handout copies of slides pertinent to speech (have them on line so we can bring them ahead and bring them).

I'm sure that the SILL representative will ask the speaker in the future to respond to questions more concisely.

CommS0219Glenn

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Sarasota – Thursday, 19 February, 2009
John Glenn: Foreign Policy Challenges For President Obama

VERBATIM EVALUATIONS: Re Presenter

Dr. Glenn was an excellent replacement! I hope SILL will be able to arrange for his return.

Refreshing to have a speaker who did not try to get laughs by panning Bush.

This was a little too elementary. With so much to cover, better to do less with more details.

Answered questions very well.

A good substitute – only two days warning. His ratings by me would probably have been higher if Glenn had had more time to prepare.

Very difficult to understand – poor projection – swallows words.

VERBATIM EVALUATIONS: Re SILL

Some areas could not be heard.

The sound system was at low volume making him hard to hear.

Introduction too long!

CommS0225mikell

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Venice – Wednesday, 25 February, 2009
Dr. Gwendolyn Mikell: A new Generation of African Leaders:
Challenges and Possibilities

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenter

She is personable and very knowledgeable.

Excessively socialist, leftist. Failed to substantiate conclusions. Puts too much blame on West. Puts too little blame on Africans in order to justify her conclusions.

At least point to items on screen when discussing the items. Didn't explain current situation enough.

Delivery poor. Voice dropped.

Charming lady, but meandered in her talk.

Suggestion if the speaker returns: Growing Positive Role of Women in Africa. Should give a visual overview of continent. Coordinate slides to be specific.

A poorly developed presentation. Not enough specific information.

Worst speaker in my five years with SILL.

Speaker was disorganized and unfocused with only limited specific information. Too general!!!. I would not come back to hear this speaker !!!

Speaker did not give the necessary information as to why and how the problems in Africa developed. Do not want to hear her again.

Lack of preparation and organization. Left ideas or facts hanging without explanation or development. Should have contrasted the way colonial powers left Africa without preparing locals for self-rule. For example, the U.S. handling of Japan after WW II. She never mentioned this issue at all.

Too general. Too much information for short time.

She was awful! Droned on and on w/o getting to her point. Message wasn't clear. Sorry!!

Speaker was too general and vague. Suggest a different speaker. Focus on examples of a handful of states rather than try to address problems of the entire continent. Need more specifics, clarity, and focus.

Dr. knows her material, but not concise. Hard to follow.

She was more concrete with questions. Too vague in speech portion.

Delivery poor. Voice dropped.

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re SILL

PowerPoint maps and scale too small. The charts didn't keep up with her talk.

The maps were not readable where I sat toward the back.

Re maps: She could use a laser/pointer.

Unable to see map, etc., on screen.

Projections on the available screen are largely irrelevant because detail cannot be seen by most of the audience.

Maps hard to see/understand.

CommS0226mikell

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Sarasota – Thursday, 26 February, 2009
Dr. Gwendolyn Mikell: A new Generation of African Leaders:
Challenges and Possibilities

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenter

We all needed more background info on Africa and its many countries and their problems.

Very poor. Sounded like my worst college professor.

Future addresses focusing on Africa rather than Annan would be more compelling and important.

Very boring session. Subject Africa is very important.

All speakers who read a script are boring.

Her focus was personalities and people versus issues. Need less UN and more Africa. Need a lecture on Africa similar to lectures on Iran & Iraq. First very poor lecture in four years!

The speaker, to put it bluntly, was boring. I had trouble following the reasoning and logic during the talk. I would love to learn more about what is going on in the countries of Africa, but I did not gain that knowledge today.

This is like an old SILL speaker not in the least stimulating. Lack of attendance at lecture indicates 1) lack of interest 2) knowledge of how boring speaker is.

Boring delivery. Did not adequately indicate topics to be covered in making her analysis. Almost monotone. Slow delivery.

The subject was not of general interest. Her Tuesday subject (the new generation of leaders in Africa) was more forward-looking and of more general interest. Today's subject was a good one for historians with a specialized interest in African and UN history. Her message was too disparate and detailed, a research paper rather than a message.

Topic suggestion for Africa: Islam in Africa, Economies in Africa, Political Upheavals.

Important topic, presented poorly. Intro good, but message was not clear.

Totally underwhelmed by this talk!

Speaker knowledgeable and well organized, but delivery style somewhat halting. Lecture format somewhat flat.

I found her presentation important but confusing. Perhaps she tried to cover too much territory. Anecdotes might have clarified some points. Too superficial. A “taste” not a “serving” of information. Question period very good. Her responses better than her presentation.

I felt that the topic was too broad. It would have been better to talk about one or two African countries in more depth.

Not current enough. Mostly about period before 2001.

Hard to follow. I found earlier talks more informative. Important topic. Questions good.

Other lectures on Africa: “Why American Style Democracy Is So Difficult For Africa” and “The Kind of Representative Government That is Most Likely To Take Hold”.

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re SILL

It occurs to me that there were no (or maybe one or two) black faces in the SILL audience! I noticed lack of interest in the topic on the part of many in the audience around me – reading paper – doing puzzles, etc. – and a majority of audience leaving before Q & A. Are we still showing signs of racism???

CommS0305Hurley

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Sarasota – Thursday, 05 March, 2009
Michael Hurley: National Security Reform: Is it Working?

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenter

Michael Hurly is a relatively low-key speaker compared with other speakers, but he is exceptionally well informed and is able to provide excellent insights. Definitely should be asked to return.

Speaker seemed unaware that all pilots trained in Venice, Florida to take a plane up but NOT to land.

He was much better today speaking without using his notes. Yesterday he gave a canned speech.

Excellent presentation. Good topic!

Invite this speaker back. A problem that won't go away.

CommS0326Dodd

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Sarasota – Thursday, 26 March, 2009

Ambassador Tom Dodd:
Latin America: Nationalism and Populism in 21st Century Diplomatic Relations

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenter

More specific on subject. Speak on specific country or zone.

Ambassador Dodd clearly knows his subject well, but he speaks too rapidly, making it difficult to follow him.

Speaking style better for seminar than lecture to large audience.

He has opened up my knowledge of my neighbors.

Bravo!

Fabulous presentation.

Excellent – a part of the world we need to learn more about!

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re SILL

Difficult to hear clearly.

The sound system today had an echo or reverberation so that it was often difficult to hear what he was saying. This was especially true at the beginning, but even after it was “fixed” it was still present.

Ambassador Dodd’s mike was a bit too loud after adjustment was corrected. A few key words were lost. He did speak a bit fast.

CommS0303Gallo-Michaels

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Sarasota – Tuesday, 03 March 2009

Drs. David Gallo and Patrick Michaels: Global Warming: Reality or Fantasy?

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenter

Some of the discussion of modeling was over my head, such as “straight line due to interaction of variables and if not straight something.” It would be interesting to consider other changes in environment, such as increased acidity of ocean.

Limit the time spent on question from audience, so that other people get a chance to ask a question. Dr. Michaels seemed very slanted and appeared very arrogant! Dr. Gallo was an excellent speaker.

Like the format, but not with these speakers. (4 responses)

Very important issue, but case “against” was more efficiently made by far and this imbalance was ineffective in helping understand why there is disagreement scientifically. Neither speaker has much in the way of public policy recommendations. Although Dr. Gavin had a view on why scientists are only “romanced” if they are “pro” climate change, nobody addressed reasons why, if at all, politicians like Gore are allegedly overblowing the issue.

Excellent format.

Dr. Gallo had good slides. Dr. Michaels was too scientific.

Need two speakers who have a position on key question. What’s causing global warming? What do we do about it?

Would prefer that speakers stand.

Dr. Michaels seems to have an agenda.

Around the issue of “what direction for public policy?” so many fact, theories, etc. follow parallel lines and do not intersect to provide a pivotal point for a policy position.

Dr. Gallo had excellent graphics, but too vague in his conclusions.

No real answers to the situation.

Dr. Michaels spoke too loud, even yelled. Dr. Michaels is splitting hairs in saying Bush did not walk away from the Kyoto Protocol. Dr Michaels’ take on 83 reports that global warming is as bad as we thought and only 9 not as bad as we thought is media bias.

Maybe his bias and the reports may be biased on fact. Dr. Gallo is more reasonable in his approach and over ability to lower CO2 emissions and using small changes to help. Dr. Gallo was more nuanced and balanced. Dr. Michael came across as a FOX media talk show personality. He certainly tried to take over the debate.

Not enough differences in opinion. Dr. Gallo seemed to defer to Dr. Michaels.

The panel got into problems relating to their scientific communities, but not of interest to general public.

Dr. Gavin's favorite word is "uh." Undermined the program.

They agreed 1) Earth is warm 2) CO2 does make a difference. They failed to address the real question – the need to conserve our consumption of oil.

The whole program should simply have been a presentation of facts by Dr. Gallo. That would have been most beneficial/informative.

Poorly focused. Speakers were not on same page.

I would prefer a presentation with the information of Al Gore.

The topic is a very complicate issue. Too much information with two presenters on the same program. Too important to become a debate when even the scientists do not know.

The debate failed to stimulate my thinking.

It was so over my head, the only judgment I can make is the personality of the speakers.

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re SILL

More questions from audience.

Moderator too wordy.

Michaels' microphone too loud/grating on the ear.

The format is irritating to me because the debaters are always so diametrically opposed.

Heat the theater.

Would prefer single speakers in two separate Tuesdays.

We did not know the debate would start at 10! An email should have been sent to members.

CommS0317Wilcox

**PROGRAM EVALUATION
Sarasota – Tuesday, 17 March, 2009**

**Ambassador Philip Wilcox
Are Israelis and Palestinians Doomed to Perpetual Conflict?**

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenter

Very Interesting – No solution with a will to succeed on all sides.

Mr. Wilcox presented all aspects fairly. He's obviously extremely well informed.

But – The great question remains ... How to accomplish a journey on the road to peace?
The load cannot be solely upon the Obama administration.

Excellent presentation.

Great!

Absolutely bring him back. He was an excellent speaker.

CommS0325Dodd

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Sarasota – Wednesday, 25 March, 2009

Ambassador Tom Dodd:
US./Latin America: Continuity and Change in the Making of Diplomatic Relations

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenter

Excellent!

Too broad. Next time, limit it to South America.

Too big a topic. Focus on one or two countries.

During Q & A, very difficult to follow his main points.

Was too broad. I would have preferred more details. For example, how does he suggest financing free trade education between U.S. and Latin America: What does he recommend our response to Chavez be? He just said we should listen. I want more specifics.

The speaker was pleasant, but too general. The topic is too vast to be presented in such a “folksy” manner. Not specific enough!

I would not invite him back. He did not understand or answer the questions effectively.

Missed medical tourism part of the last question completely. Did not learn (sp?) the Cuba.

Talk was a little too general. Should have emphasized Mexico, Immigration Problems, Venezuela Chavez problem, Venezuela Oil Dependence, Columbia Drug Problems, and Mexico Drug Trafficking. Hardly said anything about this. Would like to know how the U.S. is responding domestically to all these issues.

01.13.09.02

**PROGRAM EVALUATION
Venice – Tuesday, 13 Jan, 2009**

Douglas Arent: Rethinking our Energy Economy: Prospects and Challenges

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re Presenter

A little too technical. Questions seemed to bring it to a clearer understanding.

Too much detail too quickly. I am a retired engineer.

Presentation overwhelming. Much better on questions.

Very technical, but not too hard to understand.

Unfortunately, the subject is so large that it really could not be addressed in the time allowed.

Gobbledy gook! We want hope and specifics, not graphs.

The slides really enhanced the presentation. Brought it down to an understandable level as I am not an egotist, over (sic) as MBA electrical engineer or a physicist. However, I am well educated.

Excellent speaker!

Great. Very knowledgeable speaker.

Return each year probably.

Presentation used too many slides that were “too busy” to be understandable.

Excellent talk, but overly technical and complicated for this audience. This speaker is used to talking to his peers and others with much greater knowledge in the energy field. He did not prepare his talk for the SILL audience, with the exception of those few with scientific education and job experience.

Poor graphics. Text too small. Non-common graphics with unreadable text are useless.

Too technical for the public. Speaker had poor speech patterns (dropping voice at end of thought). SILL should be able to get better lecturers on this subject.

Very difficult to follow his PowerPoint. I appreciate the questions or it would have been a total loss for me.

01.20.09.02

**PROGRAM EVALUATION
Venice – Tuesday, 20 Jan, 2009**

Dr. John Silva: The Outlook For the U.S. Economy Under a New Administration

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re Presenter

This wasn't the presentation that I expected. I thought the topic was to relate economic prospect to us the next (new) administration, i.e., Under Obama.

I expected and wanted the speaker to elaborate more on the new administration and its expected policies and how this would affect our economic situation. Content was not the standard I am used to at SILL. It was such a narrow focus and needed the addition of the political aspects of the issue.

The content was thin and did not reflect the issues fully.

Negative person.

Too vague. Too generalized. Not much substance. All his generalizations were obvious. I learned nothing new.

Did not explain slides.

If I wanted an investment talk, I would have talked to my broker or investment houses I am used to talking to.

Excellent!

Outstanding!

Outstanding! Knowledge and presentation.

Great speaker! Should be back next year!

CommV0203Dachi

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Venice – Tuesday, 03 February, 2009

Stephen Dachi: Contemporary China: Emerging 21st Century Superpower

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re Presenter

Delightfully droll and informative.

Very easy to listen to. Good diction. Delightful subtle sense of humor.

Great sense of humor.

Good sense of humor!

Knowledgeable, but slow speaker.

I felt he lacked depth in his presentation. Speech is a little difficult to understand.

Speaker could have used some audio and visuals in presentation. AVs would help keep audience attention. Speaker had a good sense of humor.

Refreshing change from speaker reading Powerpoint presentation. I enjoyed his humor.

We've heard about China every year and it's not hugely different.

Terrific.

I did not find Mr. Dachi's talk additionally informative over my normal reading habits. He is an amusing speaker; it was the content that was missing in his talk. His answers to questions were much more informative.

It is regrettable that this speaker focused so heavily on the past history of China and did not adequately cover their development in the last 15 years, particularly modernization of many major cities, huge industrialization, movement of people into the major cities, concentration on scientific, engineering and mathematics in educating their young people (also environmental problems), and movement into a market driven/capitalist economy. No mention of the future – why not? I loved his humor and believe he is a compelling speaker.

Wonderful dry humor? Would like to have had more economic facts.

Outstanding as always.

Too short! Need more time. Should not have been cut off at 40 minutes!

Truly informed, excellent speaker with a sense of humor.

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re SILL

Turn up his mike a bit.

01.27.09.02

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Venice – Tuesday, 27 Jan, 2009
Drs. Michael Tanner and Ted Marmor
Healthcare Reform Debate: Why, How, When Likely?

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenter

Although Dr. Tanner is an articulate, effective spokesman for a conservative agenda, I disagree with his position and find it unbalanced and without informative content. I don't need partisan propaganda.

The Cato Institute is too biased in its outlook on government. They have the same knee jerk toward government.

Dr. Tanner and the Cato Institute is too knee jerk conservative for me. I shudder to think of our medical care being taken care of by a "market economy" – Who has choice of doctors, basically and who cares?

Disingenuous, rightist views.

Dr. Tanner is too glib. No facts to his point of view and those he quoted were slanted to his view. Not a complete and balanced presentation. I believe he is trying to scare us.

Dr. Tanner is not a good spokesman for his position. Libertarian philosophy as a hammer without regard to actual situation.

Subject should be addressed again? – Depends on what happens in health care reform over the year. (4 comments)

I can't be objective about Dr. Marmor because I agree so strongly with him. I find his analysis and recommendations cogent and worth listening to. I'd like him back next year to assess progress and offer direction.

Marmor presents the complexity of this issue with a compassionate voice.

Tanner is somewhat imperious, but he certainly states his position effectively. And what a great voice!

Arguments were not as clear or succinct. More attacking than deifying.

Yes, in two years with a different slant – not the same program.

Dr. Marmor needs to sit on his hands.

Marmor – Good speaker, gives understandable ideas with depth and a balanced approach.

Dr. Marmor was factually good, but not polite to Dr. Tanner.

Both speakers made only one or two points and repeated them throughout debate.

Marmor is an excellent speaker. Cogent, fact-based presentation.

Best from the last three years I have attended.

Tanner spread a lot of misinformation. He is a verbal bully. Marmor is a great resource. His experience and knowledge are amazing, and he expressed himself very well.

CommV0206Dachi

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Venice – Friday, 06 February, 2009

Stephen Dachi: North and South Korea: Can This Long-Divorced Couple Ever Get Together Again?

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re Presenter

Very knowledgeable, but not as eloquent as former speakers.

Very dry and somewhat boring.

He tends to mumble.

Substantive speaker. Talk well developed. New ideas!

Much better than talk on China. Presented more facts and the history of the issues.

Very entertaining speaker with some interesting and enlightening perspectives – but very little content covered in 45 minutes.

Keep him coming back. Excellent speaker!

I was impressed with his in depth historical presentation, giving a full background of all the six countries involved in the negotiations.

A map would have been helpful!

I enjoyed this lecturer, but think it would be worthwhile to hear another expert, with Dachi returning the following year.

Well informed speaker. Presentation a little dry. Good humor. Original.

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re SILL

The green, yellow, red light system is a bad distraction to speakers. It should be abandoned in favor of a polite, yet forceful, moderator.

CommV0210Bechtold

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Venice – Tuesday, 10 February, 2009
Dr. Peter Bechtold: Iran, Syria and Lebanon

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re Presenter

Most important issues!

Outstanding.

Absolutely. Certainly. Wow!! Excellent. Without question!!

An embarrassment. Speaker unable to get to his topic for ½ hour. I wouldn't spend another hour in his presence. So disappointing.

The speaker, while very knowledgeable, wasted the first 30 minutes telling us about himself and his accomplishments. It would have been more informative if his introduction lasted 5 minutes and the other 55 minutes addressed the subject matter.

He was best on questions. Spent ½ of time saying he needed more time! Then talked into minutia for us. Could be really good, I think, if he could bring it down a little.

Cut out fluff.

He spent too much time talking about how much time he needed instead of topic.

Very little substance or information provided in first 40 minutes of lecture. Syria and Lebanon were barely covered (6 minutes). Mostly history provided on Iran. I learned very little until Q&A began. Then the information was forthcoming.

He spent too much time on the warm up and did not tackle the topic. It took him ½ hour to begin the topic. It took 45 minutes to begin the history – which should have been first. He could not communicate his knowledge in an organized manner. He was disjointed and not organized.

This man may be fluent in 5 languages, but none of these is English.

Spoke first half talking about himself.

The speaker spent 15 minutes explaining why the time frame allowed him was too short. I would hope the professor would create a presentation touching the high points of this subject and not use his college notes and skip over his entire college course. Citizens of Venice come to lecture to get more insight – not go into depth on any one topic. The

professor is very well informed and knowledgeable. Surely he could create a 45-1 hour presentation and not watered down college course.

Second part of lecture very good.

The speaker spent too much time (one-half hour) introducing the subject without too much important information. More suitable to undergraduates. He is very knowledgeable and should share this information. He had not time to cover the entire topic.

Should have used time on questions.

Took too long to get started. Questions were best part.

I would like to hear the first course.

By far the best so far.

Too much "introduction." Needs to take more time on specific subjects. Outlines on screen have so many subjects that I would like more discussion on.

Too much introduction – too little content. Lots of potential with better guidance.

Excellent speaker. Wish he could fill in big time.

Too much name dropping! Seemed disorganized.

This was history lesson, not a political lecture on what was billed. Lebanon and Syria were barely mentioned. The speaker is an actor not a lecturer. As a graduate in political science, I am extremely disappointed.

Highly qualified. Useful insights to Iran. Short in substance. Not much on what I expected in terms of Iran, Lebanon and Syria.

What a pity he didn't speak to his topic. I didn't need Bible stories, American history, President's address of last night.

Too much time spent on telling us how little time he had. Too many anecdotes off topic. Topic appeared to be ancient history. Mildly interesting, but not what I came for. Elements of talk are scattered and fractured.

Address this again with a different speaker. He was off the topic.

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re SILL

Poor sound system.

Would like to have handouts from speakers summarizing their talks.

Something wrong with the sound system – speaker's voice was often muffled. Those around us were missing his delivery.

The PA system needs replacement. Had great difficulty understanding him. A pity!

CommV0224mikell

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Venice – Tuesday, 24 February, 2009
Dr. Gwendolyn Mikell: A new Generation of African Leaders:
Challenges and Possibilities

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re Presenter

Be more concise. Have more visuals. Be shorter to allow questions.

Knowledgeable, but not interesting. Slides didn't correspond well with talk. Too professional. No sense of humor.

Subject matter was too broad for the time period. More historical detail than was necessary. Answers to questions were too detailed and lengthy.

Monotonous speaker. Poor use of visual aids. Topic as presented was for too broad for the limited time of the lecture.

Difficult to understand at times. Things that would help are 1) Speak a little more slowly, 2) Better slides – she talked about many leaders, but only used two or three slides with pictures and their nations' pictures on each one so it was difficult to keep up, 3) More slides to reflect/clarify what she is talking about when she is talking. I was very drawn to her. It wouldn't take much for her to be great. Her knowledge is extensive.

The moderator should really set the tone. She was much too long.

Voice fades at end of sentence.

Too much about women's abilities. I could not follow the leader she talked about and the specific countries they represent. More slides and pictures of the area and leaders would have been helpful.

Weak voice! Needs more enthusiasm! Somewhat disjointed. Lacked a consistent perspective. Slides were pertinent but were underutilized. Presentation needs more work!!!

Very little on specific policies that help new leaders to succeed. Poor use of visuals.

What about Libya, Morocco, Egypt, etc.

Good topic.

An awful presentation. No understandable theme. About 19 different flavors – colonial, military, next group, gender issues, economic missteps.

Africa – We do not really understand it. Yes, good to have a conceptual grasp of how we got to today over 150 years – maybe 10 minutes.

Many tribes, cultures, differing economic resources. Help shape the possibilities. Come on, we do not know the players and individual histories. How could you do this in 45 minutes? Religion, economics, tribal conflicts, disease, drought, cultures. Not much help with this talk.

VERBATIM RESPONSES: Re SILL

CommV0220Glenn

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Venice – Friday, 20 February, 2009
John Glenn: Foreign Policy Challenges For President Obama

VERBATIM EVALUATIONS: Re Presenter

Right up there with Pubanz (sic) and Walker.

Wonderful speaker. Kept to subject. Knew his subject.

Dr. Glenn possesses knowledge, humor, and a beautiful understanding of the problems the U.S. and the world must address today! I'm thankful the U.S. is filled with intelligent people like him.

Excellent substitute – glad you got him here.

Ask speaker not to lower his voice at ends of sentences and other times.

Very much enjoyed this speaker.

Topic too general. Very good speaker and expertise.

Questions answered were much more interesting than lecture.

Did not discuss Middle East, China, or South America.

The nature of this subject did not lead to any depth. It seems to me that more specific topics that allow for more information we don't already know is better. I hope we get to hear the originally scheduled talk sometime!

Was looking for more information on the economic front. Talk slanted and not bipartisan. Being a first time attendee I'm not sure I will return.

Didn't hear anything new.

What about Western Hemisphere? Canada, Mexico, South America?

The speaker provided no insights of his own. The talk was a recapitulation of the news in the daily papers. This was not a stimulating speaker.

“Clever use of Tekizeo” (sic) vis a' vis Palestine & Israel?

VERBATIM EVALUATIONS: Re SILL

I love SILL – Thank you all.

I wish there had been signs in parking lots Tuesday to warn us SILL had been cancelled!!

Microphone system does not support his speech pattern. When Dr. Glenn dropped his voice I couldn't hear.

CommV0317Wilcox

**PROGRAM EVALUATION
Venice – Tuesday, March 17, 2009**

**Ambassador Philip Wilcox:
Are Israelis and Palestinians Doomed to Perpetual Conflict**

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenter

Return to this topic when there is, indeed, some new action between these two peoples.

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re SILL

I sent you an email but it did not work. The presentation on global warming was not informative. The man who provided the presentation proposing that action be taken was not very strong in his factual information. The man (con) from the Cato Institute was insulting with his humor and misinformation. Neither presenter did well on a very important subject.

CommV0303Gallo-Michaels

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Venice – Tuesday, 03 March 2009

Drs. David Gallo and Patrick Michaels: Global Warming: Reality or Fantasy?

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenters

Did not really address the important issue, i.e., “Is there proof that “man made” global warming enough to destroy the U.S. economy?”

Disappointed. Really no debate. Could have been much better.

Very interesting and well done. Thank you!

Speakers were almost too knowledgeable and have enormous amounts of information.

Dr. Michaels humor and reverence acted as a soil and fogged the debate. He dominated the question period.

Dr. Michaels stood in front of the screen during his presentation and blocked the view from those sitting on the right of the stage.

Dr. Gallo presented interesting material, but it did not directly address the issues.

Better preparation of technical equipment and by both speakers. Maybe poorest program of the season.

Cato speaker too over debate. Would like debate format in future, but not with same speakers.

Would like more debates with some more qualified individuals.

It is about time that this debate was made public! I hope the *Herald Tribune* reports it accurately!

Patrick Michaels’ position is somewhat extreme, but he spoke well, and was balanced well by Dr. Gallo’s perspective and the outstanding, knowledgeable moderator. In a debate that I feared would be somewhat ridiculous because of Michaels’ extreme position, it turned out to be excellent. Well done!

I learned to be more skeptical of some claims the problem is serious. I don’t agree with Michaels’ claim that affluence will solve the problem.

Debate too long.

Dr. Michaels was arrogant and flippant – “know it all” Dr. Gallo was (in my opinion) more in touch with his subject.

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re SILL

The moderator needed to give both speakers ample and equal opportunity to speak and answer questions.

Should have made more time for audience to ask questions.

Would have liked light on speakers during each presentation. Too bad problem with computer.

Technology glips again! Rehearse. Music series CD failed.

CommV0306Hurley

**PROGRAM EVALUATION
Venice, Friday, 06 March, 2009
Michael Hurley: Are We Safer Now?**

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenter

Yes indeed! Bring him back.

Best speaker.

One of the best speaker/topic all season!

One of the best speakers yet.

A large percent of this speech was information we already knew via the news arena. We have huge issues concerning our "open borders/ports" affecting our government to continue surveillance etc, nationally and internationally.

As citizens we need to be prepared more. If we could not resolve Katrina problems, you honestly think terrorism can ever be resolved? I doubt it! What about drug lords on our borders and spilling over into our states??

CommV0309Colaneri

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Venice – Monday, March 09, 2009

Joseph Colaneri: The Past, Present and Future of the Metropolitan Opera

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenter

Added to my appreciation of opera greatly. Needed to get an appreciation of the new atonality (sp?).

Brilliant!! I'm a novice to opera. You helped me to aspire! Thank you! Thank you.

Let's have more.

Mesmerizing! Fabulous.

Invite him to return – yes, yes, yes.

He shared his wealth of knowledge in a delightful, often humorous way. What an enjoyable presentation!

Terrific program. Will bring a dozen more people next time!

Great to hear you are expanding this music series! The music series is pure pleasure. Wow!! Inspiring!! Fantastic!! More of him next year, please.

Excellent presentation.

He was excellent!

A+. This series has been EXCELLENT. Thank you for offering it in Venice.

A perfect end to the series. Could we have more of this caliber? Prior lectures were a real disappointment.

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re SILL

Program went very smoothly. Sound problem (such as last week) solved.

A/V in the past has been poor. This one was a great improvement.

CommV0324Bay

PROGRAM EVALUATION
Venice – Tuesday, March 24, 2009

Janice Bay: The U.S. and the Developing European Union in a Changing World

VERBATIM COMMENTS: Re Presenter

Voice tends to drop at end of some sentences.

Speaker speaks too rapidly to the point of being unintelligible. Overuse of the word “and.”

Good speaker. Can she present other topics in her area of expertise?

An outline by the speaker or in a pass-cut would help the listener know where she was going with topic. “Setting the stage” with an outline of EU history was good; but then it wandered!

A little “drowney” and lectureish.

Knowledgeable of subject! Good speaker!

Absolutely invite her back. Clear, concise, knowledgeable, interest, Great!

Answers to questions very well done and very informative.

Excellent. She had the rare talent to give you a short, but comprehensive historical background and then a great, quite complex presentation.