Event Logistics

* Pre-Show (5pm-6pm)
	+ Greeting guests, assisting with stage-hand tasks
		- I will be loading in and getting stage & lobby ready the day prior
		- Arrive venue at 4:50pm for walk-through
*
* During (6pm – 9pm)
	+ *Intermission: Assist with set-change & items, Prep items for panelists (w/ Volunteer Cesar + possibly 1 more)*
* Post (9pm-9:30pm)
	+ Greet guests on outro, clean-up, load-out

Event Evaluation (Internal)

1. **Structure**
* Did the event flow in a way that helped generate dialogue
* Did the format allow panelists, audience members, and the facilitator to contribute meaningfully?
* Did the structure prohibit anything that you feel would have been valuable and if so what alternate format would you suggest?
1. **Dialogue**
* Was the conversation thought-provoking and relatable?
* What questions were raised?
* What questions weren’t raised that you wished had been?
* Were you surprised by anything in the conversation?
1. **Panelists**
* Did the panelists provide helpful perspectives or context?
* Did they navigate Q & A well?
* Was there anything that stood-out to you as particularly effective or helpful relative to the ways in which they responded to questions raised by audience members and the facilitator?
1. **Performances**
* How did the opening performance(s) and/or visual/slide-show sharings offered by the panelists contribute to the Q & A and Community discussion?
* In this symposium, given the topic of aesthetics of death, we opted to incorporate and aesthetic and theatrical flair throughout. Even if subtle, do you feel that doing so had an impact on the audiences’ conceptual understanding of the topic at hand? How did it contribute to your own thinking on the matter?
1. **Audience**
	1. How did community members engage with the material?
	2. Did they raise questions that ended up shaping the conversation in interesting ways?
	3. Were their areas they seemed to connect with or struggle with?
2. **Facilitator**
	1. How did the facilitator navigate the discussion (between panelists, and audience and panelists)?
	2. Did they offer their own perspectives to the conversation?
	3. Were there “techniques” used that you would identify as helpful?
	4. Would you describe their approach as philosophical and if so how/why?
3. **Community Philosophy/Public Philosophy**
	1. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Overview of Program Presentations/Structure/Flow

*\*\*See attached document\*\**

Event Flow

4:45pm:  Event Set-Up

5:15pm:  HCTV arrives & gets set-up (?)

5:30pm: Doors Open, Panelists arrive

6pm:  *Symposium Part 1 Begins/Welcome*

6:15pm – 6:35pm: Panelist 1 (Krys Holmes)

6:40pm – 7pm:  Panelist 2 (Tim Holmes)

7:05pm – 7:25pm: Panelist 3 (Ashby Kinch)

7:25pm – 7:45pm:  Intermission

7:45pm – 7:50pm: *Symposium Part 2 Begins/Welcome*

7:50pm – 8:10pm:  Facilitator Questions

8:10pm-8:50pm: Community Conversation

8:50pm-9pm:  Symposium Wrap-Up

Event Survey (External)

PREP

Review program presentations document

Come up with survey questions based on this (w/out it feeling like a test for people)

Include additional survey questions as applicable

Create online survey template (in the process)