

Evaluation of the 2006 Ryan White CARE Act Grantees' Conference

The 2006 Conference Marked the 15th Anniversary of the Ryan White CARE Act

The 2006 Ryan White CARE Act Grantees' Conference held in Washington, DC marked the 15th anniversary of the Ryan White CARE Act. It was the fourth biennial meeting of its kind hosted by the HIV/AIDS Bureau (HAB). More than 2,300 CARE Act grantees attended (46% of whom were attending for the first time) representing clinics, hospitals, community-based organizations, health departments, faith-based organizations, medical schools, and other HIV/AIDS service providers (see *Conference Participants* on page 2). This report highlights much of the valuable information gathered during this Conference.

Reasons For Attending the Conference:

Members of the CARE Act community came to the Conference to network, learn, and share models of care. When participants were asked to select the one reason they attended the Conference, the top response was "to network with peers," which was also the top response in 2004.

Responses were more evenly distributed than in 2004. The

most significant change was the number of people choosing continuing education credit as main reason for attending the Conference, which more than doubled from 2004. The complete breakdown is as follows:

- **24%** "To network with peers," down from 27% in 2004
- **23%** "To learn about CARE Act requirements," down from 24% in 2004
- **22%** "To share models of care," down from 24% in 2004
- **21%** "To receive technical assistance," up from 20% in 2004
- **10%** "To earn continuing education credit," up from 5% in 2004

Enjoyable Aspects of the Conference:

When participants were asked what they enjoyed most about the Conference, the number one response was "networking" (see *What You Enjoyed Most About the Conference* in the box to the right). In 2004, networking was also at the top of this list. The 2nd and 3rd most

popular responses were the *variety* and *quality* of the workshops, respectively. Some of the comments that fell into these category were:

- "I enjoyed the variety of [workshops] and keeping in touch with [many] bright and passionate people."
- "The organization and quality of the workshops were superb!"
- "The workshop topics / presentations seemed more thought-out this year."
- "The workshops were wonderful (the meals were pretty good too)!"
- "I enjoyed the workshops that illustrated what other people are doing."
- "Interesting workshops and many to choose from."
- "Much better workshops and topics in the Clinical Conference than in years past."
- "The [institutes] were excellent training sessions."

Although respondents enjoyed the workshops, there were also many helpful suggestions for increasing workshop variety and improving workshop and speaker quality. These suggestions will be considered when preparing

What You Enjoyed Most About the Conference:

1. Networking
2. Variety of Workshops
3. Quality of Workshops
4. Opening Plenary
5. Specific Workshops
6. Learning New Information
7. Closing Plenary
8. Clinical Plenary
9. Conference Organization
10. Clinical Workshops
11. Atmosphere (Support, Recognition, Dedication)
12. Location and Venue
13. Meeting Project Officers
14. Awards Ceremony
15. Focus on Quality



continued on next page...

Evaluation of the 2006 Ryan White CARE Act Grantees' Conference

...continued from front page



50% of all respondents were from a program funded mostly by Title III.

the 2008 agenda (see *Recommendations for Improving the 2008 Conference* on page 4).

Rounding out the top five list of the most enjoyed aspects of the Conference were the opening plenary and specific workshops.

The opening, closing, and clinical plenaries each made

the top 10. When asked about the usefulness of the plenaries, 90% of respondents found them very (54%) or somewhat (36%) useful.


When asked what they enjoyed most about the Conference, many respondents, rather than selecting a specific workshop, said that they liked the idea of having institutes.

The top four responses that made up the "Specific Workshops" category were:

- Electronic data workshops (CADR and CAREWare)
- Financial Management workshops
- Medicaid/Medicare workshops
- Quality workshops

"RECEPTION WAS WELL DONE! I ENJOYED NETWORKING WITH HRSA FOLKS IN A NON-WORK ENVIRONMENT."

Total Conference Participants by Type
n=1,291



Program / fiscal administrators and care providers made up 74% of the respondents. For a breakdown of respondents by category, refer to the chart titled *Total Conference Participants by Type* at bottom left.

Representation by Program

When asked to select the RWCA programs under which their organization is the grantee of record, 19% of respondents indicated that they represented organizations that act as grantees for multiple RWCA programs. Almost one third of respondents represented organizations serving as a Title I grantee. Nearly half of respondents came from organizations representing Title II grantees and half of respondents were Title III grantees. About 1 in 5 respondents represented Title IV grantees. Following is the breakdown:

- Title I - 31%
- Title II (includes ADAP) - 49%

- Title III - 50%
- Title IV - 19%
- AETC - 7%
- SPNS - 6%
- Dental - 5%

NOTE: Percentages do not sum to 100%. Respondents could choose from multiple funding streams.

First-time Conference Attendees


Almost half (47%) of the respondents attended the biennial Conference for the first time. One in four (25%) had attended one other Conference, 15% had attended two other Conferences and 13% attended every Ryan White CARE Act Grantee Conference since its inception in 2000 (see chart titled *Respondents' Frequency of Attendance* to the right).

Consumers

Twenty percent (n=256) of all respondents indicated that they were consumers of CARE

Act-funded services and 149 (58%) of them were attending the RWCA Conference for the first time. Among all consumers, 53% described themselves as care providers or clinicians, 20% said that they were program or fiscal administrators, 13% indicated that they were planning council or board members, and 14% represented some other category.

Respondents' Frequency of Attendance
n=1,180



Suggested Workshop Topics for 2008

Of the top 10 most requested topics for 2004, 7 remained on this year's list, although in a slightly different order: Program management and development jumped from the 5th most requested topic for 2006 to the most requested topic for 2008. Fiscal problem solving jumped from the 4th most requested topic for 2006 to the 2nd most requested topic for 2008.

Topics such as grant guidance and performance reviews dropped from the most requested topic for 2006 to the 5th most requested topic for 2008. Topic recommendations that centered around consumers and peers fell from the 2nd most requested topic for 2006 to the 10th most requested topic for 2008.

Topic recommendations for data, clinical updates, and quality continue to hold similar positions on this year's top 10 list as they have in the past.

Making the list for the first time and highlighted in blue are CARE Act requirements and reauthorization; linkages and networking (respondents would like to see more workshops around networking with grantees, mentoring and building grantee-grantee relationships); and women and children.

When respondents were asked what workshop topics they would recommend for the 2008 Conference, nearly 1 in 4 (n=317) offered sug-

gested topics. Following are the topics that stood out among those responses.

Top 10 Workshop Recommendations for 2008

1. Program Management / Program Development
2. Fiscal Problem Solving / Accounting
3. Data / Health IT
4. CARE Act Requirements / Reauthorization
5. Grant Guidance / Performance Reviews / Site Visits
6. Linkages / Networking
7. Clinical Updates
8. Quality
9. Women and Children
10. Consumers / Peer Involvement

Some of the subtopics under program management and development included: personnel management and leadership (30%); clinic infrastructure and procedures, program development and implementation (27%); program administration tools (17%); coordination of services and service delivery issues (13%); time management (7%); marketing (3%); and subcontracting (3%).

A closer look at the data shows that 72% of the responses categorized as "Data, EMR, and Health IT" were around data requirements, including HAB's expectations, sharing data, client level data, etc. Requests for

workshops on general information technology and health care accounted for 24% of this category, while CAREWare made up the remaining 4%.

Identified Populations

Only one identified population (women and children) ranked among the top ten recommended workshop topics for 2008. One participant suggested the following title: "Follow-up on children born to HIV positive moms. How are they doing?"

Following are the most requested topics for identified populations. Note that many received the same number of requests and are shown together. For example, Hispanics, long-term survivors / seniors, and substance users received the same number of requests. Similarly, African Americans, homeless, and Native Americans received the same number of requests.

1. Women and Children
2. Hispanic
Long-term survivors /Seniors
Substance Users
3. Rural Populations
4. African Americans
Homeless
Native Americans
5. Other (9 separate topics all receiving an equal number of votes, make up this category)

Conference Objectives

The percentage of respondents who agreed the objectives were met:

- **86%** Identify strategies for improved systems of care for PLWHA
- **73%** Increase grantees' knowledge of Federal programmatic and administrative requirements
- **83%** Provide opportunities to share/learn models of care
- **93%** Provide opportunities to network with peers

"AS MUCH AS I FEAR ELECTRONIC MEDICAL RECORDS, I DID LIKE THE WORKSHOPS ON GOING ELECTRONIC AND CAREWARE."




"I am new to the Title IV family. This was an excellent conference but being the QM / CQI /Database Manager, it was hard to attend both QM & CAREWare training."

Evaluation of the 2006 Ryan White CARE Act Grantees' Conference


Recommendations for Improving the 2008 Conference

Usefulness of Online Agenda in Deciding which Workshops to Attend n=1,241



"[I LIKED THAT] TITLE III AND IV SPECIFIC WORKSHOPS INCREASED THIS YEAR."

Clarity of Travel and Hotel Information n=1,215



Participants were asked to choose one aspect of the Conference they thought needed improvement and could select from the following:

- No Improvement Needed
- Registration
- Workshops
- Plenary Speakers
- Posters
- Exhibits
- Awards Ceremony
- Continuing Education
- Logistics (hotel, food, website, packet, etc...)

No Improvement Needed

A significant number (41%) of respondents thought no improvement was needed. One person wrote "I think everything went smoothly, especially with the number of people attending." Another stated "Overall, the conference seemed well organized and the workshops were informative."

Workshop Improvement

Although an overwhelming percentage (80%) of respondents felt that the workshops needed no improvement, 20% offered suggestions for the 2008 Ryan White CARE Act Grantee Conference. The suggestions provided by respondents will be considered by the planning committee when developing the 2008 agenda.

The responses fell under particular categories, for example, some participants believed workshop screening should be more rigorous whereas others offered suggestions for improving the program book, scheduling, or the format of the workshops. Some relevant responses are listed below and grouped by category.

Content and Quality

Many respondents enjoyed the quality of the workshops (see *What You Enjoyed Most About the Conference* on page 1). However, a few attendees did offer some suggestions for the 2008 agenda.

- "We need workshops presented by providers who have a higher number [of clients]. Some of the relevance is lost when the presenter has 150 patients and you have 800!"
- "Some of the workshops had very little detail [and was] more philosophic in discussion."
- "Workshops should focus on more replicable examples."
- "The workshop contents should be pre-screened and rated as basic, moderate, advanced."
- "Every session should not be basic/new staff oriented. There needs to be special sessions for seasoned/20 year staff."

Program Book and Workshop Descriptions

The variety of workshops was the 2nd most enjoyed aspect of the Conference (see *What You Enjoyed Most About the*

Conference on page 1). One downside of having so many quality workshops to choose from, is deciding which ones to attend! Some respondents offered suggestions for improving the 2008 program-book in order to help them pre-select workshops. For example, some thought workshops should be organized by topic or region. Others thought it would be helpful to rate workshops as basic, moderate, or advanced. One respondent felt the workshop titles could be more descriptive, stating "I felt misled by the titles of many of the seminars."

Scheduling

Overlap was another theme that emerged in the data. Some felt that even with better program book descriptions, it would have been difficult to attend similarly-titled workshops.

- "Too many similar workshops [that would be] of interest to the same people overlapped. For example, Admin/Program Development / QM / CARE-ware."
- "I would have liked to have the CM & Psychosocial workshops spread out or offered more than once so I could attend all of them."
- "Especially on Tuesday, there were many time slots [with] too many sessions I wanted to attend and then at other times there were none. Not sure how but they could be spread out better."
- "Too many good workshops competing at the same time."

...continued from previous page

Workshop Format

The majority of attendees considered the time duration for workshops to be adequate, particularly in providing sufficient time for Q&A. However, one attendee did request that future conference planning give consideration for shorter workshop time periods.

Logistic Improvement

A small percentage (12%) of respondents offered suggestions related to logistics. A few comments had to do with food selection, such as increasing protein for HIV-positive individuals and providing diabetic-friendly foods. Other respondents provided helpful ideas for improving the Conference Web site. For example, a few attendees thought it would be better to post a more detailed agenda, by

including workshop description and objectives, prior to the Conference.

Other Improvement

Only seven percent (7%) of respondents offered recommendations for the poster session. Comments varied and were related to poster quality (perhaps more rigorous screening); poster consistency (requiring the format of the posters be the same); and poster logistics.

Five percent (5%) of respondents provided suggestions for improving the plenary sessions. Most suggested more inspirational speakers and adding a plenary on CARE Act requirements/directives for future.


Another 5% of respondents believed the exhibits could be improved upon and would prefer the exhibits to be

more focused around HIV. One person wrote: “[We need] more vendors focused on educating instead of selling” while another stated, “[We want] more relevance, less commerce.”

Five percent (5%) also had comments related to continuing education. Most thought the process had improved over 2004 but believed there was still room for improvement.

A smaller percentage (4%) had comments related to the awards ceremony. Those who said the awards ceremony needed improvement specifically mentioned the length of the ceremony.

Finally, only 1% of the respondents believed the registration process could be improved. One person suggested having more staff available to accept onsite payments.



81% of all respondents agreed that the Conference Web site was easy to use, an increase of 12% from 2004. 92% felt online registration was convenient and easy to complete, up 4% from 2004.

“SOME OF THE WORKSHOPS WERE TOO GENERAL AND IT WAS DIFFICULT TO ACTUALLY APPLY IT TO MY AGENCY. NEVER THE LESS I WAS PLEASED WITH THE CONFERENCE, ESPECIALLY ITS ORGANIZATION.”

Daily Newsletter Keeps Conference Participants in the Loop

The RWCA Daily Newsletter was made available to all Conference participants. It was first introduced during the 2004 Ryan White CARE Act Grantee Conference.

A team of writers produced four editions of the newsletter throughout the duration of the Conference. The newsletters featured highlights from various workshops, included quotes taken from speeches made during the awards ceremony, and provided

other useful meeting information such as exhibitor times and Web site resources. The newsletter was distributed in morning workshops, lobby areas, and near coffee stops. The newsletters are now available online in the newly designed TARGET Center: careacttarget.org.

How Informative was the Newsletter?

Of the 1,235 Conference

participants who responded to this question, one out of four (25%) did not read the newsletter.

Of the 75% who read the newsletter, 50% of the respondents said that they found the newsletter to be somewhat informative. Another 34% found the newsletter to be very informative. Those who found the newsletter uninformative represented 16% of the respondents.




84% of respondent felt the RWCA Daily News was either somewhat or very informative.

Evaluation of the 2006 Ryan White CARE Act Grantees' Conference

Conference Received High Marks

Overall Conference Rating



Participants felt very positive about the planning and execution of the Conference. Eighty percent (80%) of respondents rated the Conference as excellent or very good, down from 89% in 2004 (see chart titled *Overall Conference Rating* at top-left.)

When the data were stratified based on participant type, responses varied. For example, 87% of consumers (up 14% from

2004), 86% of care providers / clinicians, and 81% of program / fiscal administrators gave the Conference a high rating whereas 74% of planning council / board members gave the Conference a high rating. Of Federal staff who completed a questionnaire, 90% gave the Conference a high rating.

Conference Length and Frequency

When asked about the frequency of the Conference,

the majority (91%) of respondents agreed that the Conference should continue to occur every two years (see chart titled *Preferred Frequency of Conference* at bottom left).

When asked about the length of the Conference, almost half (44%) of the respondents agreed that 3 days is sufficient time necessary to hold the Conference, while a

Most participants (84%) liked the location of the Conference and would like future conferences to be held at the Marriott Wardman in Washington, DC. A smaller percentage (11%) were neutral, and 6% preferred another location.

A large percentage (96%) of respondents agreed that on-site staff support was helpful, an increase of 2% from 2004.

When asked if the length and frequency of breaks during the Conference were adequate, 92% agreed that they were. The remaining respondents were either neutral (5%) or thought that the breaks were not adequate (<1%).

When asked if there were enough computers in the Cyber Café, 54% agreed that there were, 26% were neutral and 20% felt that there were not enough computers in the Cyber Café.

"Fantastic, over-the-top customer service!"


"USING RYAN WHITE'S PHOTO WAS VERY APPROPRIATE, REJUVENATING, AND APPRECIATED."

similar percentage (41%) of respondents thought the Conference should last 4 days. A much smaller percentage (12%) of respondents preferred the Conference last five days.

Conference Location, Support Staff and Organization

Participants were asked to rate hotel location, on-site support staff, the length and frequency of breaks, as well as the Cyber Café (see table below.)

Preferred Frequency of Conference



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I would like future Ryan White CARE Act Conferences at this hotel.	57%	27%	11%	3%	3%
On-site staff support was helpful.	75%	21%	4%	1%	<1%
The number and length of the breaks were adequate.	65%	27%	5%	2%	<1%
There were enough computers in the Cyber Cafe.	30%	24%	26%	12%	8%

Continuing Education Credit and Workshop Evaluation

Eighteen percent (n=427) of Conference participants requested continuing education credit. These individuals were required to complete a workshop evaluation for each workshop they attended. They were asked to rate the learning needs and environment, speakers, and workshop quality and usefulness.

The following information is representative of this select subgroup. Therefore, the results of this section may not necessarily reflect the views of all Conference respondents.

Learning Needs and Environment

When asked if the environment was conducive to learning, 89% agreed it was. However, some said it was difficult to hear in the larger workshops. Many (86%) also felt that the workshops that they attended as a whole met their learning needs.

Most comments about the workshops were favorable. Many respondents found that the information presented was practical and could be used when returning to their jobs. The real life examples used in the presentations helped the participants relate the information to their individual roles in the healthcare industry.

Speakers

Similarly, most comments about the speakers were

favorable. The participants found the speakers to be knowledgeable and engaging. They also thought that the discussion time at the end of most workshops provided useful insights from peers.

Workshop Quality / Usefulness

Over 3,000 workshop evaluation forms were collected by individuals requesting continuing education credit. When looking at a composite rating of all workshop evaluation forms, most respondents (92%) described the workshops as either excellent (52%) or good (40%). Another 7% described them as fair. Less than 2% gave the workshops a poor or very poor rating (see chart titled *Overall Workshop Rating* at bottom right.)

Participants were asked to rate the quality of the workshops on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest quality. Only workshops that were evaluated by five or more individuals were included in the analysis. The following workshops received the highest ratings by those seeking continuing education credit.

The Top 10 Workshops


1. The HIV Research Network: New Findings (457)

Title IV Consumer Leadership Training at its Best (482)

Collaborating to Support Hospitals in Implementing Rapid HIV Testing in Labor and Delivery (409)


2. HIV and Mental Health and Methamphetamine: Working with Methamphetamine Patients (520)
3. What Makes Workgroups Work: Strategies for Effective Communication (418)
4. The Warmline, PEPLINE, and Perinatal Hotline: Free Telephone Conversations for Clinicians (545)
5. Global Institute, Session 3: International Opportunities for RWCA Grantees through the Twinning Center (35.3)
6. Creating a Healing Society: The Impact of Emotional Pain and Trauma on Society and the World (394)
7. Integrating Peers into a Multidisciplinary HIV Primary Care Team (463)
8. The Perinatal Hotline: Integrating Distance-based Clinical Consultation, Rapid Testing and Patient Referral (544)
9. Effective Eligibility Determination Systems (507)
10. Community-based Dental Partnerships: Sharing Lessons Learned from the First Three Years

Continuing Education Requests by Discipline



"I LEARNED FAR MORE THAN I THOUGHT I WOULD. VERY GOOD CONFERENCE. BEST ONE YET!"

Overall Workshop Rating



NOTE: Represents cumulative number of workshop evaluation forms collected. Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

CARE ACT: COMMITTED TO ACTION

5600 Fishers Lane
 Rockville, MD 20857

For additional information on the 2006 Conference evaluation, please send a written request including your name, address, email, and telephone number to:

HRSA's HIV/AIDS Bureau

Evaluation Committee for the 2006 Grantees' Conference

5600 Fishers Lane, Room 7-90

Rockville, MD 20817

We're on the Web!
www.rwca2006.com

About the Data

The Evaluation Subcommittee was 1 of 7 subcommittees organized to plan the Conference and consisted of HAB staff, with support from Professional Scientific Associates (PSA).

Of the 2,324 people that attended the Conference, 1,304 (56%) participants completed and returned the questionnaire, a large increase over the 2004 Conference, which had an 18% rate of return. Such a big increase (38%) was most likely the result of offering an incentive (free t-shirt) for completing the questionnaire (see chart to the right).

PSA staff completed data entry and cleaning. HAB's Division of Science and Policy analyzed the data using Web Surveyor and SPSS.

Comments provided for the open-ended questions were entered into a data file as string variables. A content analysis framework was used to provide a representative example of the

common themes that emerged.

Participants were asked to rate some items on a scale of 1=disagree to 5=agree. For the purposes of this report, the committee interpreted that scale as follows:

- Strongly Agree (response 5)
- Somewhat Agree (response 4)
- Neutral (response 3)
- Somewhat Disagree (response 2)
- Strongly Disagree (response 1)


Unknown responses were not included when calculating percentages.

The data for continuing education and Conference registration were taken from the Conference Registration MS Access Database maintained by PSA.

The data for specific workshops were taken from the report developed by Corexcel from the evaluation forms submitted by

participants seeking continuing education credit.

Rate of Return on Evaluation Forms



◆ Rate of Return
 ■ Incentive

